UCL DAMS Project Tasks and Timeline

- Major tasks as charged (with discussion notes)

05/04
- NEXT STEPS/ACTION ITEMS
  - All - solicit/schedule/obtain local campus feedback
  - LS - contact non-represented campuses to solicit/schedule/obtain local campus feedback re: reqs & heads up re: data on costs of implementation of current DAMS (UCB - Lynne G, UCM - Emilee Lin, UCSC - Sue Perry?, UCD ?)
  - MB & JA - decide which non-UC Hydra implementations to analyze, update Appendix A: Vendor comparison from POT 1 LT1C final report

05/18
- Discuss implementation strategy for gathering feedback & revising requirements doc
- Due: first revised requirements spreadsheet
- Due: "Vendor comparison sheet template (to be filled out by later date)"

06/01
- Due - team members' campus feedback
  - Due - instruments and process for obtaining costs from UC DAMS managers

06/15
- Due - other campus feedback

06/29
- Due - team members' campus feedback

07/13
- Due - instruments and process for obtaining costs from UC DAMS managers

07/27
- Due - other campus feedback

07/29
- UC Davis DAMS Managers Meeting

08/10
- First draft report 2
- Some details re: costs and tech specs for draft report ?
- Discuss provisional recommendation for draft report ?

08/24
- Report revisions?
- Due - final cost estimates on other UC DAMS implementations
- Due - final tech specs from platforms under consideration (vendor spreadsheet vendors)
- Confidential feedback from outside stakeholders?

08/31
- Final revisions

09/01
- Due - final report

Major tasks as charged (with discussion notes)

Requirements stream - Goal - determine what else is required beyond confirmed specs

- Review and revise POT1 2012 functional requirements
  - Use spreadsheet from DAMS implementation and solicit yes/no on ones 2 DECISION Older requirements considered confirmed. Solicit additional requirements.
  - Survey the satisfaction dimension - what are people using now? What are their likes/dislikes or barriers to using . ACTION LM create first draft and MC will do second overview. Suggestion to include checklist component for ease of data gathering by multiple team members. Discuss strategy for implementation at next meeting. Try to have a few iterations done prior to next meeting.
  - Next ACTION team members go to people who can answer those questions and we can derive the nuances.
  - Identify and contact participants - same as last time or functional equivalent, notify AULS to ensure it's done, participants to solicit input from local stakeholders
  - Compile results, write revised requirements document
  - Update vendor comparison chart (p.12 NGTS POT 1 LT 1C). Treat Hydra comparison as multiple options (MC lead, JA help to break these apart). Add to shared Google folder.

Generate technical requirements - Keep scoped to this team and technical pros esp those who will be doing the implementation MC, JA, BT as sub-team to do this work.

Analysis stream - Goal - decision on recommendation

- Analyze DAMS currently deployed in the UC, including costs for implementation and maintenance
  - Islandorada implementation at UCLA
    - DECISION - Detailed review of Islandorada is off the table due to UCLA's extensive experience. Save time on analyzing costs etc. Instead (LM to?) provide rationale for why it's not advisable for the final report, ex. cost in FTE, staff skill-set, Drupal slow to load on work stations frustrating editors, production relies on modules which break with Drupal version updates and have syncing and interdependency issues with other modules.
  - Hydra implementation at UCSD
  - Hydra implementation at UCSB
  - Other campuses
    - UCB?? Environmental design archive uses Nuxeo, Bancroft considering using Nuxeo. What happened with Alfresco?
    - UCI using Nuxeo, limited use of DSpace for edge case of restricted access materials "virtual reading room"
    - Merced using Nuxeo
    - UCSF Special Collections using Nuxeo
    - Davis ?
    - UCSC?
- Analyze relevant Fedora-based implementations outside of the UC system
• Stanford (putting resources into developing Hydra-in-box)
• Note ASU has top layer based on Python & Django
• ETDs with Hydra heads?
• List on Fedora site is dated. Call and ask David Wilcox?
• Cost/Benefits ??? see bullet point #5 of deliverables "recommendation for system wide model for funding, implementing, hosting .... "
  • How to articulate to decision makers that adoption of Fedora/Hydra solution likely requires radical change in operations
  • Definitely need to include opportunity costs for staying with Nuxeo

**Reporting stream - Goal - implementation plan and writing final report for CoUL**

• Write implementation plan for alternative if selected (FP suggest broad strokes)
• Write final report