

1. Major architectural issues for R5.0

Ron summarized some of the major items we will be discussing for R5.0. These include: a) archival masters for born-digital objects, b) integrating with the Fedora checksum creation/verification capability, c) open-source WMS, d) preservation services portal, e) integrating with Sakai, and f) using the Fedora relationship services for collection modeling.

2. Faculty submissions requirements. This topic created a lively discussion. Points that were brought up include: a) limiting submissions in R4.0 to library liaisons acting on behalf of faculty. This would server to gather better requirements and help limit the types of uses in R4.0, b) in R4, presentation formats for Word and Powerpoint must be prepared offline as pdf files and submitted to WMS, c) there was some concern that we did not understand the requirements sufficiently and we should therefore not release this capability on mss3, i.e. keep it as a prototype on lefty. After considerable discussion, we decided that there was minimal risk in releasing on mss3 and some benefit in simplifying our release procedures and providing a tool that liaisons could us to work with faculty.

3. Collection hierarchy. This discussion continued from the last meeting. The primary issue was basically the problem of having two databases representing collection hierarchy (the structure map and the working database) and not being clear about which is the master. In the end, we concluded that both were necessary, and that you could probably designate either one as master and then synchronize the slave database with the master.. Jeffery and Chad will investigate further and make a recommendation.

4. OJS version update. Shaun indicated that we will proceed with update of the OJS platform to version 2.0. He will work with Sho to update the software. We actually have to update through an intermediate release before getting to 2.0. We'll try the new platform out on one of the journals where problems will be least impacting.

5. WMS Help Center. Dynamic content changes will be installed directly on mss3 rather than going through a standard release procedure. This approach is similar to the way we handle website content on NJDH and RUcore. Shaun will work with the MDWG on the process for updating content (e.g. definitions of metadata).

6. Archival masters for born-digital content. We have decide for R4.0 that we will capture the original source document (e.g. a Word file) as the archival master. Everyone agreed that this was not the final solution. For faculty submissions and for ETDs, a likely scenario would be to have a PDF/A created offline and then to automatically convert the pdf to xml for the archival master. This might be accomplished using tools such as provided by the Xena project.

7. Release procedures. Kalaivani provided an update of the release procedures which provided updates on how decisions were to be made regarding putting a fix into a dot release or waiting until the next major release. We also agreed to add wording that indicates in some cases we will bypass our formal release procedures. For example, if a bug has a major impact on a user but is easy to fix with low risk, we will probably just install it on mss2 and mss3 without announcing down time of NJDH and RUcore. Details are posted in the Developers' area on RUcore.

8. We decided that we will schedule monthly meetings of sw\_arch in the morning on the second Thursday of each month. So our next sw\_arch meeting will be on Dec. 14.