

Technology Committee Minutes

December 14, 2011

Present: Rob Mader (Cluster 1), Shannon Schultz (Cluster 3), Trisha Priewe Frankland (Cluster 4), Sue Ann Kucher (Cluster 4), Julie Chase (Cluster (6-7), Tana Elias (Cluster 8), Carol Froistad (Cluster 9), John Schmitt (Cluster 10), Brian Simons (Cluster 11), Janus Merkle (Cluster 12)

Absent: Charles Danner (Cluster 2)

SCLS Staff present: Jon Mark Bolthouse, Vicki Teal Lovely, Martha Van Pelt, Dan Jacobson, Kerri Hilbelink, Pat Dolan

1. Call to Order
 - a. Introduction of guests/visitors: None
 - b. Changes/Additions to the Agenda:
 - i. JM Bolthouse suggested moving Action items to the beginning of each meeting.
 - ii. A cluster rep expressed interest in discussing a system-wide deployment of Google Chrome.
 - iii. A cluster rep mentioned that the TC meetings are not showing up in the group calendar. JM Bolthouse will talk with H. Moe about this. He also mentioned that the next TC meeting will be held Feb. 8 and then in April, June and August (the 2nd Wednesday of the month). Final meeting dates may depend on the next AC since they will also be talking about a meeting schedule.
 - c. Requests to Address the Committee: None
2. Approval of previous meeting minutes
 - a. September 7, 2011 Meeting Minutes to be approved
 - b. T. Elias moved. ? seconded. Vote: motion carried.
3. Action items
 - a. E-mail working group report
 - i. The final report, <http://www.scls.info/committees/tc/documents/email-summary-FINAL.pdf>, was submitted to the TC two weeks ago for review.
 - ii. Acceptance of the report was requested. C. Froistad and T. Frankland accepted the report.
 - iii. A comments and questions discussion ensued:
 - A cluster rep asked on behalf a cluster member: “If Exchange was adopted, would libraries have to pay for it separately from what they currently pay?” Answer: It would be a separate additional charge unless there was unanimous interest by all libraries. If there was unanimous interest, the charge would be rolled into a single payment.
 - Google Apps has a government e-mail version. It offers 10 years of archiving at \$83/year/account.
 - Will SCLS be upgrading Thunderbird as it ages out? Yes, SCLS will continue to support/upgrade Thunderbird as long as this product is maintained by Mozilla.
 - The migration from Eudora to Thunderbird took a lot of time. The “Current SCLS email services” costs don’t take migrations into account.
 - If a library doesn’t use SCLS email, does the library get a price break? No, not all libraries participate in all SCLS services. Think of not using

email services like cable TV where you get a bundle of channels but you don't necessarily watch all of them.

- Motion to accept the report: "Yes's" were voiced. No "no's" were voiced. No abstentions were voiced.
- iv. It was recommended that the TC "implement" the report, meaning that SCLS will continue with email services 'as is'.

4. Announcements

a. Cluster Reports

- i. Opportunity for Cluster Reps to share news or issues from their cluster
 1. Nothing to report.

b. Technology Updates

- i. Wireless: an update on both the legacy wireless and Enterprise wireless services
 - Legacy wireless: When Public IP went down, wireless services were moved to the SCLS network at the majority of SCLS libraries
 - Enterprise Wireless (EW): Implementation has been very successful. 24 sites are now using EW and are receiving monthly email reports.

ii. Windows 7 / Windows 2008

1. Windows 2008: A significant amount of work has been done on the back end with Windows 2008: server purchases, installation and virtualization. Other back end services are being developed: SCCM (for PC remote control) and WSUS (for Windows updates). There's a high learning curve for both of these. Storage and backup are also part of this project.

- The question was asked, "What is being backed up? ". Answer: Server files and PCs are being backed up.
- The question was asked about the backing up of library PCs. Answer. SCLS HQ PCs are being backed up. Bandwidth is currently a limiting factor when it comes to backing up member library files.

2. Windows 7:

- Planning for the patron image continues. The image will include DeepFreeze, software to lock down patron PCs. A laundry list of software that may go on the image was also generated. Any software that's to be included will need to be assessed to see how much patron information is stored and how easy is it to remove it between patrons. Having Library Online reboot between patrons will erase all data between patrons but there's a cost for Library Online.
- The question was asked if the Adobe product(s) associated with OverDrive are being tested. Adobe Digital Additions is needed so that OverDrive can download to a device. Response: OverDrive's most recent contract states that the Overdrive Media Console is no longer allowed on library patron PCs. OverDrive's Digital Download Station is OverDrive's new solution but it's not really ready for prime time yet. If the library experience is different than the home experience, it's not an incentive for patrons.

- The question was asked if the WPLC digital media buying pool of \$1,000,000 gives WI any leverage as far as OverDrive making a better product. WiLS is the product manager for WPLC and is aware of this issue.

iii. SCLS Network Convergence

After the fiber grant was no longer an option, SCLS assumed that BadgerNet would be an available and affordable broadband solution...once the contract was signed. We were led to believe that BadgerNet would offer more bandwidth at a reduced rate. In that vein, SCLS staff began bringing non-LINK PCs onto the SCLS network at libraries where there appeared to be sufficient bandwidth (pre-BadgerNet contract). Prior to each convergence, a network assessment was done (both in terms of available bandwidth and available network cabling in the building). Now that the BadgerNet contract has been signed and we know what's in it, we're probably going to have to retool. This will be discussed further in the "BCN bandwidth discussion" section later on.

iv. Drupal

The software has been installed and the development of a proof of concept began in Oct. The calendar still needs work. Creating a configuration that is scaleable for all member libraries will influence the pace of this project. Documentation will be written for both internal and external staffs.

The question was asked if Drupal-hosted web pages would be accessible for modifications from the web, e.g. "The library will be closed because of snow. Can you update the library's web page from home?" Answer: Yes.

5. Discussion Items

a. BCN bandwidth discussion

- i. An opportunity to discuss the recent Badgernet contract and its ramifications on SCLS member libraries
 - For the past 2 years, SCLS has wanted to offer a more integrated PC experience via converging nonLINK PCs onto the SCLS network. The goal was to increase the level of service at a decreased support cost. At the time, the thinking was that after convergence, 3rd party ISP services could be dropped at member libraries, if they so chose.
 - Two years ago, there was going to be sufficient bandwidth to converge LINK and nonLINK networks because of the fiber grant. When the state dropped the fiber grant, SCLS was led to believe that there would be sufficient bandwidth offered at reduced rates via BadgerNet. The 5 year BadgerNet contract was signed in November. DPI, DOA, TEACH, and Library System staffs met on Dec. 1 to discuss the contract.
 - In the new contract, the cost for bandwidth has not necessarily been reduced. Any bandwidth over 5 Mbps will cost an additional \$150/mo/library and is tied to the number of Internet patron PCs reported in the 2010 annual report. (Where applicable, SCLS may be able to cover the additional \$150/mo for 2012 if participating member libraries can start paying that additional cost in 2013.)

- DOA/TEACH indicated that any bandwidth increase requests would need to be “justified” (as in “need” would have to be demonstrated).
- DOA/TEACH indicated that new BadgerNet sites would not necessarily be added until current BagerNet sites were reviewed for bandwidth upgrades first. (There are 7, nonBagerNet SCLS libraries that have expressed interest in joining the SCLS network via BadgerNet in 2012.)
- TEACH needed to receive bandwidth increase requests from all Library Systems no later than Dec. 9.
- SCLS’s initial bandwidth increase requests were rejected on Dec. 13. TEACH wanted to receive modified requests by Dec. 16. Much of this information is also posted in the SCLS Technology blog: http://scls.typepad.com/scls_technology/
- Network convergence has been a strategic planning point. SCLS may not be able to move forward as we had thought. We may be looking into a VPN solution but that is completely untested at this point. Distant libraries with poor-quality ISPs may be ranked more highly for BadgerNet since they have fewer options.
- The question was asked if there is anything that libraries can do politically. Response: No, the contract has been signed and is good for 5 years until 2016.
- The question was asked if there has been any thought to no longer offering “cradle-to-grave” PC support. Response: The TC is here to shape and inform how SCLS staff spends our time.
- A comment was made that with rapid changes in technology that a cloud solution might be less expensive than what libraries have now. Response: We’ll need to rethink how we’ll do this.

b. System-wide deployment of Google Chrome as a 3rd browser.

i. An opportunity to discuss Chrome and its ramifications

- This topic was also raised about a year ago. There are issues with locking down Chrome on patron PCs. Chrome is on a rapid release schedule and it autoupdates on Google’s timeline. Autoupdates can break things.
- The SCLS Tech team has designed the patron IE and Firefox browser experience to erase patron info between log outs.
- It was noted that Chrome is meant for one user building a personalized browsing experience. It’s not necessarily designed for use in a shared environment. Google doesn’t offer a mechanism to easily erase data.
- A summary was offered that Chrome may be “popular but not necessarily viable” in a library environment at this time.
- There is a business need for more than one browser and SCLS is currently supporting both Firefox and IE. Chrome on an SCLS staff PC is an option (but be aware that it’s targeted towards a personalized browser experience and many staff PCs are shared).
- The question was asked, “Is it our job to train patrons to log off of patron PCs [so that the personalized browsing experience can be erased between patrons]?”
- A rep. responded that their library has extensive signage for PIN numbers yet patrons still don’t notice them. The rep suggested that,

“Our job ends when there isn’t a safe way to do it [browse].” “Safe Internet is a higher priority.”

- A comment was made as to the benefits of document sharing with Google Chrome.
- A comment was made that Google Docs document sharing is browser agnostic.
- A suggestion was made to consider the business needs or advantages of Google Chrome before deciding to make it a 3rd browser.
- A question was asked, “Could certain libraries get Chrome and others not?” JM Bolthouse responded: “Not with the current model we’re working with.” In the far future, SCLS would like to offer the Partnership Program for patron PCs after we have a Windows 7 patron PC image developed and locked down.” In the near future, we’ll be piloting the Partnership Program for staff PCs with a member library. The staff pilot program will last for at least several months and requires signing an MOU.
- A question was asked as to when the Partnership Program may move out of the pilot phase. JM Bolthouse responded that a very rough estimate would be 6 months.
- It was noted that Windows 7 will only be rolled out to Dell Optiplex GX780s and GX790s. A library will need to have newer PCs in order to have Windows 7 installed.

6. Review of Meeting

a. How did the meeting go?

A suggestion was made that TC attendees could briefly report what they are doing. A suggestion in response to this suggestion was that those interested in sharing could do so after the meeting was convened.

b. Could we have done anything better? No response

7. Plan for next Meeting of Technology Committee

a. February 8, 2011

b. Preliminary agenda items

c. Goals for next meeting

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm

Pat Dolan, recorder