

### 1. R4.0 architecture/testing issues

- ingest in foxml for collection object - the TOC disseminator breaks.. foxml disseminator bdef/bmech needs to be attached.
- MODS datastream ID convention. With analysis after the meeting, we to leave the naming convention as it currently is, i.e. use MODS and DC for outer IDs. The first internal ID will be DC.0 and MODS.0. With further edits of MODS we would get MODS.1, MODS.2, etc.
- OCR for books. There was much discussion on this topic because of the time it takes to do a pipeline OCR on a large book. We decided to do the following: a) we will limit pipeline ocr to 75 pages, b) WMS will check to provide a note to users if they try to do OCR with GT 75 pages, c) we need to spend some time as part R5.0 doing analysis of the OCR capability, including performance, multiple processes (how many to allow?) (Jeffery, Dave, Sho), d) given the misunderstanding with Jersey City Public, we will scan the 6 or 7 books they have for ingest (Isaiah will communicate), e) we need to replace the ocr datastreams on the 12 Chronicle issues and f) for future scanning, communicate to PI that we want all text files concatenated as one file.

### 2. R4.0 Testing

Kalaivani reported that extensive testing has been done with a total of 155 bugs reported of which 56 are still outstanding. With additional testing and bug fixing required, we have reset the R4.0 dates as follows: a) complete phase 1 of lefty ST on 1/19, b) intensive developer bug fixing from 1/22 thru 1/24, c) complete lefty ST on 1/26, d) completion of mss2 ST on 2/7, e) notice of downtime to partners - 2/2, f) delivery of R4.0 to Systems - 2/8, and g) R4.0 release to public - 2/13.

As part of this discussion we also concluded that the MADS module for WMS should be included in R4.1 along with metadata updates for DNGs and the ETD export/WMS handshake.

### 3. R5.0

We had a brief discussion of R5.0 noting that several R4.0 features (64 bit architecture, OJS export, ETD-WMS handshake) are moved to R5.0. Also, we will be upgrading to Fedora 2.2 in the R5.0 timeframe.

### 4. Open discussion

There was considerable discussion about the upcoming meeting of the software developers. Concerns that were raised include: a) where does the group get its authority? b) what is the oversight group - the steering committee, sw\_arch, or some other group, c) won't this group be redundant with sw\_arch, d) is sw\_arch focused on only on repository architecture, e) is the "repository steering committee" focused only on the repository, f) how do we handle common architecture issues that span both RUCore and other applications such as WAAND?, g) why is the software developers meeting limited only to software developers?

We decided the following: Chad will proceed with the first software developer meeting with an open invitation to others who want to attend. This first meeting will address some of the above issues. Ron will pursue these issues with Grace, Ann and steering committee.