Zpráva ze zahraniční služební cesty

Jméno účastníka cesty	**Mgr. Jan Hutař**
Pracoviště – instituce, adresa	Národní knihovna ČR, Klementinum 190, Praha 1, 110 00
Pracoviště – zařazení	Referát digitálních knihoven 1.7
Důvod cesty	účast na setkání Technical Working Group Evropské digitální knihovny (TEL) za NK
Místo – město	**Haag**
Místo – země	**Nizozemí**
Datum (od-do)	**27. březen 2008**
Podrobný časový harmonogram	– 27.3. odlet z Prahy 6:25 > účast na setkání > večer odlet z Amsterdamu 21:20 zpět do Prahy – Amsterdam < > Haag vlakem
Spolucestující z NK	/
Finanční zajištění	- NK
Cíle cesty	- účast na setkání technické skupiny jako zástupce NK - změna struktury a cíle technické skupiny TEL - rozčlenění do pracovních pod-skupin
Plnění cílů cesty	- viz cíle cesty
Program a další podrobnější informace	viz zápis níže – jde o oficiální zápis, který zachycuje kompletně dění a jednání na setkání
Přivezené materiály	
Datum předložení zprávy	28.11. 2008
Podpis předkladatele zprávy	

**Minutes of the 12th European Library Technical Working Group Meeting
27th March 2008, 09:00-17:30, National Library of the Netherlands, The Hague**

Participants:
Bernd Althaus (BA) – Germany
José Luis Bueren (JLB) – Spain
Sally Chambers (SC) – The European Library Office
Robina Clayphan (RC) – United Kingdom (Chair)
Paula Clemente (PC) – Portugal
Markus Enders (ME) – United Kingdom
Liina Enok (LE) – Estonia
Nuno Freire (NF) – Portugal
Christine Frodl (CF) – Germany
Jan Hutar (JH) – Czech Republic
Max Kaiser (MK) – Austria
Adam Horvath (AH) – Hungary
Ivars Indans (II) – Latvia
Gilles Karmasyn (GK) – France
Jakub Kostynowicz (JK) – Poland
Krunoslav Rendulic (KR) – Croatia
Elisabeth Mazur (EM) – Belgium
Eric van der Meulen (EvdM) – The European Library Office
Bill Oldroyd (BO) – The European Library Office
Pantelis Papaconstantinou (PP) – Cyprus
Gilberto Pedrosa (GiP) – Portugal

Georg Petz (GP) – Austria
Mikhail Shvartsman (MiS) – Russia
Sjoerd Siebinga (SS) – The European Library Office
Matios Stratis (MS) – Greece
Willy van der Pijpen (WvdP) – Belgium
Theo van Veen (TvV) – The Netherlands
Julie Verleyen (JV) – The European Library Office
Tamara Butigan (TB) – Serbia
Christian Zeising (CZ) – Sweden
Maja Žumer (MŽ) – Slovenia

In attendance:
Adeline van den Berg (AvdB) – The Netherlands (minutes)

Apologies:
Georgia Angelaki (GA) – The European Library Office
Oliver Ardo (OA) – Slovakia
Meinrad Büchel (MB) – Liechtenstein
Andrey Chakalov (AC) – Bulgaria
Aubéry Escande (AE) – The European Library Office
Thorsteinn Hallgrimsson (TH) – Iceland
Laila Heinemann (LH) – Finland
Brian McKenna (BmK) – Ireland
Sandra Leknickiene (SL) – Lithuania
Hansueli Locher (HL) – Switzerland
Patrick Pfeiffer (PPf) – Luxemburg

09:20 – Welcome to new participants and round table
RC welcomed everybody to the meeting. A round of introductions was made.

1.   Minutes and actions 11ᵗʰ meeting, 19 October 2007

[See also: *Paper agenda item #1 (1) Minutes of the last meeting*]

The agenda had been amended to put the reporting from the breakout groups at the end of the day so that the FUMAGABA members could join the meeting. RC asked for any AOB to be indicated now in order to allow time before the end of the meeting.
The minutes of the 11ᵗʰ meeting were accepted as a true record.

[See also: *Paper agenda item #1 (2) Actions*]
Action 1:
JV reported that this action is complete. A link has been placed and a paragraph about OAI-PMH is added to the Handbook. The application has been uploaded and tested.

Action 2:
JV reported on behalf of GA that they had received about 20 responses. This action will be continued: libraries are still invited to provide records.
[Action 12.1⁽¹⁾: All libraries to provide records of the materials published in Romani to Georgia.angelaki@kb.nl]

Action 3:
This action will be discussed at agenda item 2.1, the report of the Metadata Working Group.

Action 4:

JV reported that an e-mail had been sent to the working group. This will be discussed in the breakout session from the Character Sets sTWG.

Action 5:
The results will be reported at agenda item 2.2 .

Action 6:
The WP2 plans have been reported to JV in an e-mail by NF:

"In WP2 of TELplus will have functionality to monitor OAI-PMH servers, SRU and Z39.50 servers. The expected functionality to be implemented is the monitoring of availability of the servers, providing availability statistics and email notification in case of unavailability. Because the tools to monitor these services don't support all the required protocols a new tool will be developed. These tools will be based on open source implementations of the protocols in Java.
Work has already begun, but only for OAI-PMH servers. Work on SRU and Z39.50 monitoring is likely to start only in 2009."

This action is ongoing and will be placed on the action list for the next meeting.

[Action 12.2[(1)]: Nuno Freire to report on development of server monitoring functionality at next meeting]

Action 7:
BO will report on this action at agenda item #2.4.

Action 8:
JV reported that the prioritising was put on-hold: since the last TWG meeting a new project & service plan was produced and approved by the Management Board. The technical strategy section gives the key objectives for 2008. A technical plan will be created in order to realise these objectives. This will also be discussed at agenda item 3, the restructuring of the TWG.

Action 9:
SS will report on this at agenda item 2.5

[Action 12.3[(1)]: TEL Office to circulate technical plan to TWG by end of June 2008]

Action 10:
JV reported that the table was sent on 29th of November 2007 (see also paper agenda item #1 Action 10 of last meeting). Everyone is asked to read the table and to give feedback via e-mail if the answers given by the office are not complete enough.

[Action 12.4[(1)]: TWG members to send their feedback to the office on the table given in "paper agenda item #1 Action 10" if any. Follow this URL http://www.theeuropeanlibrary.org/portal/organisation/for_partners/meetings/twg20080327/item_6_TWG19-10-2007.doc to get the paper]

Action 11 and 12:
Actions 11 and 12 relate to the functioning of the TWG and form part of agenda item 3.

Action 13:
TvV reported that he had received 1 response. He proposes to put this action on-hold until there is an evident need for it. NF mentions that there is a sTWG that has this specific focus

in the context of the CENL Resolver development. This action will therefore be moved to the breakout session which will be renamed as the Resolver sTWG.

Action 14:
JV reported on behalf of GA that the papers have been distributed on the 15th of November. SS has commented them. This issue is related to WP3 task 1 in TELplus. JV will give the feedback to GA. The action will be put on-hold until then.

Action 15:
SS reported that TELO is looking into the relevance of the use of sparql endpoint in the Europeana context. This will be reported after the release of the prototype of Europeana.

The recommendation of the TWG that the MB should **not** contact Ex-Libris with respect to the TEL AP has been followed and no letter has been sent.

2.   Reports

2.1   Metadata Working Group activities
[See also: *Presentation agenda item #2.1 Metadata Working Group activities*]

RC reported on the work of the MWG since last October. This was a) assessing how to make the transition to the registry database b) functioning of the MWG in the context of the TWG. A report with a task breakdown will be produced in the breakout session this afternoon. There are no comments.

2.2   Character Sets Working Group activities
LE report on behalf of the Character Sets Working Group (CSWG).
The transliteration is possibly not integrated in this version: this subject will be discussed this afternoon. The issue is how useful the implementation will be in relation to the effort that has to be made and regarding the new character sets that will be used in TELplus.
As regards to the other actions from last meeting:
-    The correctness of the virtual keyboards needs to be checked. If partners notice errors in the layouts of the virtual keyboard they are asked to notify TELO.
-    Different requirements have to be made to accommodate the search logic of each library.
-    Draft-versions for help texts for the current version will be made during the breakout-session this afternoon and will be eventually added to the helpmenu. A firsttime-user guide will also be added to the organisation menu.
Second item that will be discussed this afternoon is the central index and the propositions that need to be made for software devices, and also what efforts need to be made for the implementation. Third item to be discussed is the adding of the new charactersets and transliteration.

2.3   OAI-PMH module of Aleph
[See also: *Presentation agenda item #2.3 OAI-PMH module of Aleph*]

JV reports on behalf of Walter Zabel.
Regarding the 2nd issue, the fact that although a flexible schema can be defined it does not work: both Austria and Denmark have the same problem. NF asks if an XML validation schema for *The European Library Application Profile for Object* (TEL AP) is available. JV says that usually a schema is defined by each partner separately. NF says there is a standard XML schema for the TEL AP that has been created in TELplus, that the MWG could look at although it's not updated / complete. SS says that there is no standard TEL-schema developed by the TELO, but that one could be inferred or created. JV proposes that a standard XML schema for *The European Library Application Profile for Objects* is published

by the MWG on the Metadata Registry website where TEL-terms and a namespace policy could be declared.

[Action 12.5[(1)]: TELO & MWG to plan the creation of a standard validation schema for *The European Library Application Profile for Objects*]

TvV inquires if the portal checks the metadata records' compliancy to *The European Library Application Profile for Object*. JV answers that it will be the logical next step, but that it's on-hold for the time being. There is a discussion about the problems of validating against a standard schema when records vary so much. There would be the danger of producing many errors. TvV suggest records could be validated but not rejected if they fail in order to take advantage of the extra fields. He suggests a level of soft validation that could give warnings which could also be very useful for each partner in testing

[Action 12.6[(1)]: TELO to plan introduction of "soft" validity check of records at portal level, using the standard schema (see the previous action)]

2.4 Portal testing: Search interoperability and performance

1) Search interoperability tests report
[See also: *Paper agenda item #2.4 (1) Interoperability tests report*]
[See also: *Presentation agenda item #2.4 (1) v1.6 Interoperability search tests report*]

BO reports that 16 Tests have been received, the partners in question are thanked. Annotated versions will be returned to the partners.
The questions BO brings up are:
- Analytical records are stand-alone without relation to their parents. At this moment this problem isn't being addressed, because it implies significant adjustments to the gateway. Only 3 partners responded to this issue, so is it worthwhile to add this functionality to the gateway to retrieve linked record info?
  BO answers positively to NF's question to whether it's solvable in the future.
- Would it be worthwhile to implement a transliteration function for non-latin based character sets?
RC asks who will take take the decisions about these issues and who will cost the varioius options. Since there is no ready answer it is proposed to create these as actions for the TWG. The issues will be further discussed in the Search Interoperability and Results breakout group..

[Action 12.7[(1)]: TWG: To consider global issues resulting of interoperability search tests and to report to TELO an assessment of importance and amount of work needed to solve them]

2) Performance test report
[See also: *Paper agenda item #2.4 (2) Portal 1.6 performance test report*]
[See also: *Presentation agenda item #2.4- 2.2 v1.6 Performance test report*]

The results of the performance tests were reported by JV who asked for the partners comments. RC asked whether TELO would pick up these issues. These issues were identified for only few collections in the context of portal v1.6. V2.0 will be released soon and, with it, a new search mechanism designed to offer a better performance. TELO proposes to re-run the tests for all collections using the new portal.

[Action 12.8[(1)]: TELO: To plan new performance tests for all collections with the new search implementation of portal v2.0+]

JV says that bad performance results are in some cases due to the limited number of concurrent Z39.50 connections authorised by the servers. GK acknowledges this problem for the French national library's catalogue and proposes to discuss ways to solve the issue during the breakout session.

MŽ asks if there will be a test of the central index performance? JV answers that the performance test done by the external company covered Z39.50 targets but also the central index. The result for the central index shows that the response time is good even when the number of users searching simultaneously increases.

CF raises the problem of the absence of notification to partners in case of non responding targets during the testing. JV answers that an automatic notification mechanism needs to be put in place. A monitoring and alerting system will be developed within WP2 of TELplus project.
GK remarks that maybe the BnF can forward their own alert during these times? JV reminds partners that they can notify the Office of the unavailability of their servers (maintenance, problems, etc…) so that an alerting message can be placed on the website.

2.5 Update on v2.0 development
[See also: *Presentation agenda item #2.5 Update on v2.0 development*]

SS reports about v2.0 development. He explains the various techniques chosen such as DWR (execution of Java code through Javascript functions).and small open source programs similar to Google web application tools.

V2.0 is scheduled for 22nd of April. RC informs that all relevant documents will be available on the website.

3. Re-organisation of the TWG: position paper + split into sub-groups for afternoon breakout sessions

[See also: *Paper agenda item #3 The European Library TWG Position Paper V.1.0*]
[See also*: Comments from National Library of Finland*
Comments from Swiss National Library
Comments from The European Library
[See also: *Presentation agenda item #3.2 TWG re-organisation*]

RC says there is a need to define where responsibility for decision-making lies. JV presents the position paper and requests that the outcome of the discussion should be the re-definition of the lTWG's terms of reference and the definition of the sTWG.

RC starts the discussion by asking for the partner's view on this new structure. MŽ requests that the Terms of Reference are discussed first, because these lead to the rest of the decisions that need to be made. She agrees with the general structure. The discussion centres on page three of the position paper 'Roles and responsibilities'. MŽ agrees with the general spirit of this paragraph, but has problems with numbers 1, 2, 6 and 10 specifically. In discussion the word "responsibility" in points 1 and 2 is replaced with "advise on" as the TWG is seen as being advisory in nature.

BO agrees that the TWG has no decision making responsibility and proposes that a small group, a so called "Design Group", should be created. RC asks how the decisions will be made as it is not clear how they are made now. It is aknowledged that TELO has only the task to implement. Only CWG and the Management Board can exercise their veto. JV clarifies that the process of decision making depends on the subject. RC remarks that perhaps this Design Group should have the responsibility for the TEL product.

BO asks who is responsible for the user and the role of the CWG in this? The responsibility for the part of the user is for the CWG. RC asks why no TWG-members should be involved in the technical decision making process. JV thinks that some of the subjects are too technical for general discussion in this sort of group and that the real decisions have to be made in other groups elsewhere for practical or political reasons.

TvV notes that TELO is responsible for the portal and ensuring that it works to industry standards. EvdM notes that the responsibility for the (meta)data lies with the partners and for the portal and communication protocol it lies with the TELO.

RC brings the discussion back to the issue of decision making: as it stands, it seems that the task of decision making lies with TELO. If that position is retained, the other groups will only have the function to be consulted and asked to approve as being the technical contacts from each partner. EvdM adds that this is already the present practice, so it should stay that way. JV noted that sometimes feedback or approval on decisions is difficult to obtain from the TWG. TvV suggests that feedback and/or approval will only be needed in cases of doubt. MŽ comments that the central activity of the TWG should be the ones mentioned in number 5 & 6, but including making strategic decisions and advising on issues.

RC sums up the two activities for the TWG as discussed so far: first, function as an advisory group in cases of doubt, second, review and confirm decisions. TvV adds to this the function of being a two-way channel of communication between TELO and the partner libraries ensuring responses are forthcoming and implementation is carried out.

A discussion follows on the wording of the roles and responsibilities and it becomes clear the workflow of decision making is very vague. SC proposes to make an outline of the workflow: who and in which cases a group can make a decision. The TWG accepts this proposal and would like to make the workflow fast and efficient as decisions need sometimes to be made in a very short period.

RC summarizes that:
  a) the TWG approves of the numbers 3, 4 and 5 of the roles in the position paper.
  b) some words will be added about strategic technical directions to number 5
  c) number 7 will be reversed - TELO makes the recommendations to the TWG
TELO will make the decisions and the TWG will advise when needed and will function as a channel to the MB about technical issues.

Unfortunately there is not enough time to finish this discussion but the TWG agrees upon the general ideas about the role of the TWG. The Terms of Reference need to be refined and will be again considered afterwards.

[Action 12.9[(1)]: JV & CF: adjust the Terms of Reference, circulate for online discussion and include decision workflow diagram]

Regarding the outstanding issues of BO it is agreed upon that these should receive more attention within TEL. JV will therefore bring these under the attention of Louise Edwards.

[Action 12.10[(1)]: JV: discuss outstanding issues BO with Louise Edwards]

SC proposes to create a small advisory group for urgent decisions to solve the issue of the need for fast responses. RC proposes that the TWG thinks about a mechanism for speed responses.

[Action 12.11[(1)]: all: consider option for mechanism of speed responses]

The discussion continues about the proposed sTWG's and timing of communication with the lTWG which will only met twice a year. This will be handled by on-line reporting in between.

The sTWGs will work as the MWG currently does – in direct communiction with TELO plus reporting to the TWG both to let them know what is happening and to receive their input. A mailing list will be established to allow the Chairs of the sTWGs to communicate with each other for issues that may have an impact on other groups. Possibly each Chair should also be in communication with a specific expert on the TWG. RC suggests that we should agree this so far and see how it works in practice

The responsibility to distribute the information within the libraries remains with the at the TWG-members in question.

The issue of making the responsibilities of each group explicit should be clarified by each group producing a Terms of Reference document. The MWG has already produced one of these which may serve as an example..

[Action 12.12[(1)]: SC to send terms of reference MWG to TWG]

The discussion moved on to consider which sTWGs were needed and which would meet in the afternoon.   The two Search Interoperability and Results Quality groups will be merged. The Technical Requirements group will not meet today as the business user requirements specification needs to be broken down to a lower level first. The creation of other groups will be considered during the afternoon sessions.

II proposes to form a group for the FUMAGABA members to function as a guide for the new users. This proposal will be brought up this afternoon when the FUMAGABA members join this meeting. (Note: This did not happen.)

The sTWG's that ultimately met are:

- Metadata (previously formed)
  Members: RC (chair), SC (secretary), CF, JLB, MK, WvdP, BA.
    [See also: Presentation agenda item #6.1 Break-out session report from Metadata Working Group]

- Character Sets (previously formed)
  Members: LE (chair), II, PP, JV
    [See also: Presentation agenda item #6.2 Break-out session report from Character Sets Working Group]

- Search Interoperability and Results Quality (both focuses, distributed indexes and central index are merged)
  Members: BO, CZ, MZ, TB, ME, MS, GP
    [See also: Presentation agenda item #6.3 Break-out session report from Interoperability Search & Results Quality Working Group]

- Architecture and Technical Strategy
  Members: TvV, AH, GP
    [See also: Presentation agenda item #6.5 Break-out session report from Technical Architecture Strategy Working Group]

- Resolvers

Members: NF, GK, EM, JH, KR

4.   **Date of next meeting:** This hasn't been discussed during the meeting [Note: a date will be proposed by e-mail].