

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

October 28, 2016, 2:30-4:00pm

**<https://zoom.us/j/4346138649>**

**Attendees:**

Todd Grappone, Chair (UCLA), Beth Dupuis (UCB), John Renaud (UCI), Donald Barclay (UCM), Ann Frenkel (UCR), Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Michael Kim (UCSB), Felicia Poe (CDL), Catherine Nelson, LAUC (UCSB)

**Excused:** Julia Kochi (UCSF), Sarah Troy (UCSC)

**Recorder:** John Renaud (UCI)

**Guests:** Gunter Waibel, CDL; Laura Smart, UC Irvine

**Preparation Required by Attendees**

<https://ucmerced.box.com/s/b2u5rm1ih7ql8d558a1r3h22w4mtshd1>

DRSST Report: [https://app.box.com/files/0/f/11809832588/1/f\\_99169431238](https://app.box.com/files/0/f/11809832588/1/f_99169431238)

DAMS Report: <https://ucmerced.box.com/s/0dxqj58zusud90xji36g46ag2hclxgsd>

Duration	Lead	Activity	Notes/Decisions
<b>UCLAS Updates</b>			
2:30 - 2:40	DB, LT	CoUL update	Provost Aimee Dorr met with CoUL regarding funding options and process relative to NRLF expansion. Complex, long process.
2:40 - 2:45	TG	DOC update for UCL staff	Zoom meeting update was successful; at one point there were 50 people on; good questions. Turned out well. Well attended; we will have to do this again. Lots of folks from CDL on call.  Post call complaint: If you don't have software, Zoom is a toll call. Folks may not understand that they can get a Zoom account. Not a problem we need to solve, just highlight that it is a toll call for next time.
2:45 - 3:15	TG Intro	Gunter Waibel, CDL Associate Vice Provost / Executive Director	Gunter has been @ CDL for 6 months. Gaining exposure to committees that are the UCLAS structure has been important for him.

		<p>Gunter outlined career history. Longtime connections with CDL. @ Smithsonian implemented large scale digitization program.</p> <p>First impression at CDL: One goal is to work more broadly with the developer communities on the campuses. DAMS report has recommendation of collaborative development, which CDL welcomes. Expect to launch a formal strategic visioning process in near future – nimble, narrowly scoped and not looking under every rock. A strategy that allows</p> <p>Strategy they are putting in place is a way of live and allows us to thrive in an environment that changes quickly. Campus Libraries are key stakeholders; when CDL engages with consultant, he thinks that CoUL in particular will have deep involvement.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>1) How does Gunter see an organization like DOC participating or contributing? A lot of this is emergent; Still interviewing consultants; need help in designing a process that supports nimble development of a plan is a time frame of about 6 months; Scope consultation with stakeholders to be able to offer something within 6 months; Look big, act small, move fast is the goal. CDL wants to move on this. There won't be a grand mapped out 6 months timeline; we will move very deliberately into this; We must acknowledge that there is uncertainty that we must live this.</p> <p>2) Before UCLAS 2.0 there were Strategic Action Groups that had many connections with CDL; Now not as clear how that happens. UCLAS structure that we've been existing is shaped and defined by a desire for the system to work collaboratively; One of the places where that happens within the system is through CDL. Should we create a structure within this system to aid CDL in achieving its strategic goals. Gunter agrees that without the regular meetings, it is not clear how that collaboration occurs. But across the system people feel that they are spending too much time on committees. How can we find the middle again, where there is connection without creating a burden which sinks all of us. We need to find a better answer. DOC shares that vision.</p>
--	--	--

			<p>3) It is noted that most Shared Services has an administrative home at CDL but the clients are the users. Do we need customer committees and provider committees? These are different roles. Getting the right people and the right number of people on each committee.</p> <p>Open invitation for Gunter to speak to DOC extended. Gunter is happy to do that.</p>
3:15 - 3:45	FP Intro	Laura Smart, UCI, DOC Committee Chair "UC Libraries DAMS Technology Report" Review of recommendations	<p>Laura chaired DOC project team to examine DAMS technology and will talk about recommendations.</p> <p>The origin of the work was in the CoUL system wide annual plan; This team was charged to work on “revisit methods to provide aggregated access to the UC Libraries’ digital collection.” Looking at Fedora Hydra, and potential to transition to Fedora Hydra. It’s about storing digital objects and their metadata.</p> <p>They analyzed current DAMS with NUXEO and whether we should move to Fedora. First they assessed what was desirable, then what the resources where. In addition look at how NUXEO is serving those campuses that are using it.</p> <p>Don’t need an immediate switch.</p> <p>If a switch were desirable, due to the excitement surrounding Fedora. Would involve discussions with key stakeholders across the campuses. Appendices detail information on which recommendations are based. Functional requirements were done in a in-depth professional process were developed in 2013 and formed the basis for the work. NUXEO is fulfilling functions, and it can be further developed.</p> <p>Bigger questions came from in-depth on-on one conversations; brought concerns to the fore. Want to be able to meet emerging use need requirements for a repository. Recommendation not tied to any particular technology, but because Fedora Hydra is used by our peers is has a co-development model baked into it. Would do an installation of Hydra in Box – Hydra head that allows for multi-tenant development for repositories. We would need to do a pilot to get more</p>

			<p>information for the executive level decisions.</p> <p>Issue with Fedora is that programming belongs to the Regents so we'd need special permission/ exemption to "donate" this to Fedora.</p> <p>We have not at this stage specified the linked data requirements.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Difficulty in projecting costs –Could we as a collective of libraries afford someone with MBA/IT expertise to aid us in projecting costs in these scenarios. Question is, "What is the business case?"</li> </ol> <p>LS: The business case looks at total cost own ownership; what are risks and opportunities;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2) Contributor license – Challenges? Heard a lot from Declan at UCSD about getting permission to contributing software to Fedora; Had to make case to General Counsel.</li> </ol> <p>Felicia believes that all 10 UC libraries could sign on with DuraSpace and once - Katie Fortney could potentially investigated and draft document to allow for this.</p> <p>Could we potentially get centralized support for this type of OpenSource license; Great if we could have model to participate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) Hydra in a Box: UCLA has had scale issues with Fedora. Todd is concerned that as we go into process leading to system wide DAMS, we have strong basis and do testing.</li> </ol> <p>Felicia indicated that the scale issue is well known in the Community and the Hydra in a Box is a mild recommendation; not recommending that it become the foundation for the next generation of</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>UC libraries’ DAMS, but allows us to assess it in a practical way; can lay a foundation for thinking about how collaborative work might take place; Would allow us to have informed conversations with those campuses already involved in this; CDL is sensitive that campuses are doing their own investigation.</p> <p>4) What does co-development model look like? Is Fedora the best foray into that conversation, or does it come in a different guise like linked data.</p> <p>LS: We didn’t think of that as specifically tied to that. The base question was, IF Fedora Hydra is desirable and we want to pursue it, what would we need to do.</p> <p>Felicia: desire for co-development seems key. Do we piggyback on something that is already in development beyond UC, or do we do something grass-roots within UC.</p> <p><b>ACTION: When final draft is available, DOC must create transmittal document that sends to CoUL;</b></p>
--	--	--	--

**UCLAS Organizational Discussions**

10 min	TG, BD	DOC Webinar Follow up and Zoom Team: Recruit a few (3?) UC Library folks to develop a how-to/best practices for using Zoom at the level of CKGs, Project Teams, etc.	<p>Volunteers for next DOC ZOOM call: Discussion</p> <p>Communicate through LAUC to ensure attendance? Reach out to make sure topics that people want covered are covered? DAMS work, etc ... CKGs, Shared Print. SCLG, NRLF expansion, HathiTrust; Need a format? Start list in DOC BOX of topics, and slot in; Block out next year’s dates and times;</p> <p><b>ACTION: Catherine Friedman will start document in DOC BOX.</b></p>
--------	--------	--	--

--	--	--	--

10 min	CRF	DRSST: Report about surcharge and okay to research alternatives	<p>Catherine Friedman on Head's UP from Digital Reference Shared Service Team:          At some point, OCLC may request a surcharge, so document is a background. Team doesn't want us to be surprised; We haven't met lower threshold for a while. Pricing is pretty modest; we've been doing this for 6 years with current software; Surcharge, lack of development causes Team to want to look at other options.          Don't want to throw 24/7 out with bathwater, but worth investigating other options.</p> <p>Team need to further discuss and put together a project plan for review. See if it's even possibility. This might require an RFP because we are already spending \$66K Catherine will report that back to group.</p>
<b>Committee Logistics</b>			