

**Software Architecture Working Group
Minutes of December 18, 2008 Meeting**

December 19, 2008,

Agenda

1. Quick updates
2. WMS 5.0 code complete status
3. Finalize shibboleth spec
4. Review of Darwin spec
5. Finalize thumbnail spec
6. Finalize annotation spec
7. Pending
 - ETD spec
 - NJEDL spec
 - Relationship management layer
 - Handles using rucore vs. mss3
 - Relating objects to more than one collection
 - End of year money

Quick Updates

Ron reviewed some of the more relevant talks and poster sessions from the Digital Curation Conference. He will route a set of notes for those who are interested. In the recent CI meeting, we reviewed goals. The goals for sw_arch remained essentially unchanged from our previous review. We are now at a stage where we have finished our first official quality initiative in which all objects pass the signature check. We will plan refreshments to celebrate this event some time in February. Please send suggestions to Ron. Also, for R5.1, Jeffery should make two changes to the signature notification (email) indicating 1) pass 1 of n, pass 2 of n, etc and 2) when a signature actually fails, the email should be highlighted to distinguish it from the email when all signature pass.

WMS Status

Yang reviewed the status of the major components of WMS as follows: collection hierarchy – done, faculty deposit – code complete on the local computer, needs to be moved to lefty64, WMS edit – almost complete, etd import – almost complete, need to handle tar archival master as in previous releases, R5.0 changes – in progress, migration to new WMS – in progress. Chad will assist Yang in updating files with the proper header. WMS will not use SSL until R5.1 – only used with faculty submission in R5.0. Regarding ingest, there remains a question as to how to handle multiple sets of metadata. The original proposal indicated that we will use rels-int to link the multiple sets of metadata. Yang and Jeffery will discuss this approach offline. Yang feels he is still on track to meet the January 21 code complete date. As a part of this discussion, we agreed that Jeffery will work with Sho to provide “version” document in preparation for release to Dave.

Shibboleth Specification

Jeffery reviewed the remaining issues with the shibboleth specification. We agreed to stick with the current version as implemented, although it looks as if we can achieve some architectural simplicity by not using the symlink approach. We'll investigate further and make changes as appropriate in R5.1.

Darwin Specification

A subgroup of Jeffery, Dave, Isaiah, and Sho met and proposed a method for protecting QT streams on Darwin. The approach generates a SMIL file on the fly with generated rtsp URLs pointing to the Darwin sever. A temporary symbolic link will be created on the Darwin server which points to the QT file on Darwin. A cron on the Darwin sever will clean up symlinks whose timestamp has expired. Jeffery has prototyped the approach and it looks like it is working according to the specification. Jeffery will finalize the specification and Ron will route it to Chuck, Grace and Sujay for review. We will need to update all R4.5 video objects and the content model to reflect these changes. In particular, we will no longer use the SMOV-1 datastream and the MOV-1 will contain the QT stream for archival purposes (rather than the SMIL file in R4.5).

Thumbnail Specification

Chad reviewed the thumbnail spec for R5.1. We will implement this specification in R5.1 for single image tiff file objects which includes all photos and maps, a little over 9000 objects in the repository. Thumbnails for videos will have to be handled manually. The tiff file used for generation of images will be a maximum of 1600 pixels in the greater dimension. For download statistics, we decided to count the selection of a thumbnail but to make sure we can identify these hits in the statistics report.

Other Items

Kalaivani mentioned that we should note for NJVid that there is no special submission module (e.g. like faculty submission) for videos. This need has to be identified with the NJVid steering committee and requirements developed for R5.1.

We also discussed what objects will be needed on mss2 for R5.0 sanity testing prior to installation on mss3. One approach might be to move all 14,000+ objects to mss2 where most of these objects have a redirect link to the archival master (given the storage limitations on mss2). This approach and other options will need to be discussed soon.

Pending for Next Meeting

1. Annotation spec
2. Finalize ETD spec
3. NJEDL spec
4. RUcore performance analysis
5. Mss2 test objects
6. Relationship management layer
7. Handles using rucore vs. mss3
8. Relationship management layer