

NAB-Z Committee Report June 2000

Here's the report of the NAB-Z committee which was presented Wednesday morning. This report does not include the discussion from Wednesday (for example, the discussion on the advisability of presenting the gateway at the ILA October meeting.).

This list of "issues" for the NAB-Z committee was largely generated at the November, 1999, NAB meeting, and gently modified since then.

1. Plan for implementation of LiLI-Z; possibly phased implementation. We hope to unveil the limited edition at ILA in October.

There could be a presentation--possibly Margaret St. Pierre from Blue Angel Technology--and there will be a table in the exhibits area.

Considerable work needs to be done before we're ready to market LiLI-Z, including work on the interface, on minimum standards for participation, and possibly on ILL protocols.

2. Levels of participation; criteria for participation (see also 6,8,9 below).

Everyone will be able to search LiLI-Z. There could be some restrictions connected with using LiLI-Z for ILL or cataloging support.

We'll ask ITTF to develop minimum requirements for a Z39.50 server to be searched by LiLI-Z. The minimum requirements may change, too, over time (that is, in "phases").

3. Marketing, including soliciting participation by libraries.

We see a primary and three secondary "purposes" of the gateway.

Primary: Support for resource sharing--especially ILL, but also "walk-in."

Secondary: 1) Access to high quality and uniform cataloging records

2) A gateway to varied information, including GILS and GIS, thereby "championing libraries."

3) Providing a uniform interface for searching resources.

For marketing purposes, LiLI-D has the content; LiLI-Z has the information about content (catalogs and other metadata). This distinction is likely to disappear in time, as we will increasingly find "content" through Z39.50 searches.

Libraries will be asked to participate, at least initially, because it's the right thing to do. Although there may be some benefits to the library's local patrons because of the uniform search interface, exhibiting on LiLI-Z could be "costly" because of increased ILL demand. We could make exhibiting on LiLI-Z a requirement for getting some other network services, however.

4. Protocols, such as who's at the top of the list, how is the list organized, how many lists are there, etc.

Arranging the lists will make more sense when 1) We have more libraries to search, and 2) We develop the ILL protocol.

5. What should Idaho's virtual catalog do/provide/look like?

We have an idea of the purpose (see #3, above), and we expect that ITTF will refine the interface. There is still plenty of room for discussion in the area between the purpose and the interface. For example: we know that we want to support ILL, and we know that we want the interface to be attractive and easy to use. We don't know if we must have merged and sorted results sets.

6. How can small libraries participate? (regional hubs?)

For small libraries, some kind of cooperative effort will probably be necessary to achieve the minimum standards for the server and to ensure technical support. The shared servers may be organized by region, but they may also be organized by vendor, type of library, or other principle.

7. ILL plans, in cooperation with the NAB ILL committee.

The Z committee left this to the ILL committee.

8. What agreement might be necessary between ILS/LiLI-Z and the libraries whose catalogs are searched.

No formal agreements are necessary at this time.

9. What technical and policy requirements are necessary for libraries to participate?

These are to be determined. ITTF will develop the "minimum standards" for the Z39.50 server.

--

Max Leek, Library Director NOTHING IS SIMPLE

Marshall Public Library

113 S. Garfield

Pocatello, ID 83204

208-232-1263, extension 29

max@spidaweb.eils.lib.id.us