

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

May 17, 2017, 1:00 – 3:00pm
(Special off-cycle meeting)

Attendees: Todd Grappone, Chair (UCLA), Donald Barclay (UCM) , Felicia Poe (CDL), Michael Kim (UCSB), Ann Frenkel (UCR), Peter Brantley (UCD), John Renaud (UCI), Julia Kochi (UCSF), Beth Dupuis (UCB), Catherine Friedman (UCSD), Sarah Troy (UCSC) Catherine Nelson, LAUC (UCSB), Lorelei Tanji (CoUL)

Recorders: Julia Kochi and Felicia Poe

Guests: Patti Martin

Preparation Reading Required by Attendees

FRSPT Final Report

DOC Project Team Liaison: Catherine Friedman

Meeting Background

This is a special off-cycle meeting convened to discuss the recommendations outlined in the "Final Report – Future of UC Resource Sharing Project Team Phase 2" (April 21, 2017)

FRSPT Phase 2 Recommendations include:

1. **Reassess the benefits of a consortial ILS:** We recommend that UC reassess the benefits of implementing systemwide consortial integrated library system (ILS) with robust resource-sharing features.
2. **Continue to monitor and assess vendor software:** We recommend that CDL, in collaboration with the ILL Operations Advisory Group (ILL-OPS), monitor and report on OCLC development of Relais D2D and Tipasa to assess when it might be feasible to use either of these products as a replacement for VDX. *[see report for full recommendation]*
3. **Explore integration with alternative resource sharing systems:** We recommend that CDL mitigate risks 1 and 3 by developing strategies for integrating Request with ILL products other than VDX (Relais D2D, Tipasa, and WorldShare ILL) as well as with the ILL features available in next-generation ILS.
4. **Understand campus workflows and dependencies on VDX:** We recommend the Interlibrary Lending Services Common Knowledge Group (ILL CKG) form a working group to examine and document campus ILL workflows and dependencies on VDX. *[see report for full recommendation]*
5. **Address high priority VDX issues:** Given a replacement product for VDX will not be forthcoming for 18 months or more, we recommend that the UC libraries and UC senior management work with OCLC to address known issues in VDX and/or priority be given to finding workarounds for these problems. *[see report for full recommendation]*

Duration	Lead	Activity	Notes/Decisions
5 min	Grappone	Expected meeting outcomes: CoUL will have a F2F meeting at UCSD on June 19-20. DOC goal is to complete a conveyance memo and forward it and the FRSPT Final Report Phase 2 report to CoUL by June 12, 2017.	ACTION: DOC to draft conveyance memo for CoUL. Due 06/12/17 to Danielle Westbrook.

FRSPT Discussion

<p>Guest Discussion: Patti Martin, California Digital Library</p> <p>Patti Martin acted as project sponsor, but did not influence work of project team in drafting recommendations. In her role as the CDL Discovery & Delivery Team she does have staff reporting to her who are on related projects, including the RLF ILS project team.</p> <p>Overview of CDL-managed resource sharing services and the tension of local (campus) systems working well for individual campuses but not able to scale up to regional/national level.</p> <p>Note: Currently, three UC campuses have ILS RFPs open.</p> <p>P. Martin shares following perspectives:</p> <p>Short term: OCLC will continue to support VDX for a certain amount of time. They have good intentions of continuing to support VDX until a solid alternative solution is launched. UCL should form a group (DOC or CoUL level) for regular communication with OCLC on important developments.</p> <p>Medium term: Need to be in continuous conversations with OCLC on Tipasa and Relais. OCLC product development estimates are generally optimistic. The development timeframe estimated by OCLC is ambitious.</p> <p>Rec 1: Best avenues - realistically what products/service architectures are up for consideration? What's achievable? UCL trailing other consortia using shared ILS. No single technology will be magic bullet; there will always be something that doesn't work perfectly.</p> <p>One plus for moving forward is getting policies, procedures, and expectations lined up. Moving forward with a shared ILS would be a foundational activity for the next 3-5 years.</p> <p>The argument for an ILS: Four UCL groups in the past ten (?) years have</p>	<p>ACTION: Patti Martin proposes UC Libraries create a small group at the AUL / UL level to launch regular tracking and discussion with higher-level OCLC management re VDX, Tipasa, Relais.</p>
--	---

<p>recommended a shared ILS or something similar: BSTF, NGTS, RLFs, Future of Resource Sharing Project Phase 2. Value in managing, developing, analyzing collection. Other consortia claim significant cost savings. At UCL, work is often done 10-12 times (e.g., HathiTrust, JACS, etc.).</p> <p>Now is the time to have the conversation re whether we should go with a shared ILS. In favor of exploring more deeply; advocates for a cost/benefit analysis. Would need to form multi-campus group to issue RFP, interview vendors, etc. Optimistically, if UCL were to make the decision to launch a serious exploration, we could migrate within three years.</p> <p>PB: Discussion/exploration of unified system would allow us to imagine new services, analytics, offerings not currently possible. Freeing up people to participate in more interesting space rather than worrying about maintenance. Better interface for public and staff.</p> <p>AF: Would it be possible to do a cost/benefit analysis of resource sharing comparing keeping VDX with shared ILS functionality?</p> <p>PM: Could get ballpark figure of savings if we eliminate VDX component but uncertain how many of other factors/components a shared ILS could address.</p> <p>Rec 2: Supports.</p> <p>Rec 3: Significant work to set up prototypes to prepare for “just in case” worst case scenario. PM thinks likelihood assumed in Rec 3 is low risk. May not have optimal solution but will be able to do some system-wide sharing.</p> <p>Rec 4: Would be a precursor to any new solution to understand workflows and reaffirm the goals and standards for the service. Should be put on plan and timeline for the project but not immediate to start.</p> <p>Rec 5: VDX development has been frozen but UCL has some ongoing major issues; not reasonable for us to have a subpar service while waiting for a new solution. Requires immediate intervention with OCLC. Don't hesitate in putting this this recommendation into action.</p> <p>Note: At close of above discussion Patti Martin leaves DOC call</p>	
--	--

<p>DOC Discussion</p> <p>Rubric: Decision not to utilize DOC Decision Rubric for today's discussion.</p> <p>In conveyance memo:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include recommended characteristics of group: senior members of CDL 	<p>DECISION: Recommendation 2 accepted / endorsed</p> <p>DECISION:</p>
--	--

<p>who work on resource sharing and other high-level campus members (AUL) who work on resource sharing. 3-5 members. Report to DOC (DOC Project Team).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefit to having a UCL coordination team interacting w/OCLC relative to VDX issues specifically. UCL's needs for future resource sharing products should be dealt with through the lens of VDX. • Recommendation 2: Endorse w/out reservation. In conveyance memo, Yes and this shall be the responsibility of the Ill Operations Advisory Group (ILL-OPS). Report back to DOC. If something comes up that warrants attention please report to DOC. • Recommendation 3: Not accepted at this time. If there is a triggering event, e.g., OCLC announces it's turning off VDX w/out alternatives, then we will take action at that time. For now, limited UCL resources combined with low risk leads DOC to suggest we dedicate resources to other issues. • Recommendations 4, 5: Endorsed <p>Recommendation 1: Discussion begins with straw poll reflecting DOC members' personal views on the following: Recommend that UC reassess the benefits of implementing a systemwide consortial integrated library system (ILS) with robust resource-sharing features?</p> <p>Straw Poll Results: Yes -> All ten campuses plus CDL No -> None Pass -> L. Tanji</p> <p>UCB: Is there a way that the ILS option can move forward that might include ten campuses being on the same vendor's system? Not a single system but a true consortial system. Not necessarily tying every campus to an identical user interface / discovery system?</p> <p>UCD: There are a number of ways that the system could be architected that might support CoUL in making a decision, e.g., APIs that support different discovery systems.</p> <p>CDL: There is value in the campuses aligning themselves and launching projects that can only be accomplished via a shared ILS.</p> <p>UCLA: The FRSP2 Phase 2 report is important is that it is informing us (UC Libraries' leadership) directly of those activities we soon will no longer be able to do as a consortium.</p> <p>UCB: At the root of this decision should be what we want our user base to be able to accomplish.</p>	<p>Recommendation 3 not endorsed at this time. Revisit later if necessary.</p> <p>DECISION: Recommendations 4 & 5 endorsed</p> <p>DECISION: Recommendation 1 endorse and describe a plan of action that moves us closer to decision.</p> <p>ACTION: C. Friedman will begin drafting memo, including overall framework and endorsements relative to R 2-5.</p> <p>Grappone, Brantley and Dupuis will craft section on R1.</p>
---	---

Tanji: There is interest on CoUL in a ILS but timing is essential. This recommendation does not require listing out all the costs and benefits; the previous SAG3 (or 2?) report was solid; CoUL supported the RLF shared ILS project. Craft a message as to why it is advantageous for us to do this now versus waiting.

UCB: Our issue is not listing out costs and benefits one more time. Our issue is are we willing to be on this path or are we walking away from it altogether? How to get to a place where CoUL can make a decision and charge DOC to take steps forward?

UCD: Ask for an endorsement from CoUL for a course of strategy, not for another assessment group.

Tanji: In conveyance memo , describe the strategy required if in fact we want to pursue an ILS. What is a feasible path? Outline phases.

UCD: Does CoUL want DOC to craft a way forward for how to implement an ILS? Yes or no? We need something discreet to ask each campus "Are you willing to do THIS THING X now?" We can ask, do we start pursuing this now? If yes, we name a project team. Begin to describe the architecture.

Plan: Draft recommendation. Ask CoUL to endorse. Craft a project plan, e.g., "If we're going to build the Empire State Building, it will take X years. This is what you can expect in Y1, Y2, Y3. Looking across the system, the optimal timeline for a systemwide migration will be 20##."

Tanji: The proposal for the shared ILS for the RLFs has not yet been endorsed. CoUL agreed to consider this. Some campuses are hoping that by doing the RLF/shared ILS project, we'll learn quite a bit. If what DOC is recommending is that in addition to the RLF/shared ILS project we also support an additional parallel track, be explicit.