

### **Agenda**

1. Quick updates and Announcements
2. R5.0 status
3. First pass at WMS R5.1 Requirements
4. Continued discussion of ETD content model
5. Quality initiatives

### **Announcements and Quick Updates**

Ron presented a quick review of the Mellon retreat that Grace attended. There are some very interesting projects underway including Collection Space (focused on museum collections) and DuraSpace – a joint Dspace/Fedora effort focused on a dark archive. He also reported on an NJVid conference call which has resulted in a better understanding of the commercial video process – see below for more detail.

### **R5.0 Status**

The final metadata changes are underway and should be finished Friday (3/13), resulting in our code freeze for R5.0. Kalaivani mentioned that there is significant testing work yet to be done. Given the architectural changes in both WMS and Fedora, we have to make sure that testing is comprehensive. For example, we discussed the change in how we handle alerting and the role of the person ingesting the object. The alerting software cannot depend on “OBJCreator” being the role for the person ingesting. Basically, alerting software will have to be changed to look for another field in the digiprov record (this issue has been resolved subsequent to the meeting).

### **WMS R5.1 Requirements**

We started reviewing WMS R5.1 requirements by discussing the approach for xacml policies and licensed videos. From scenarios discussed in CISC and the NJVid conference call, it is clear that each licensed video will need to have its own unique policy. This approach results from the fact that an institution can do item-level selection when licensing videos. It was originally thought that we might simplify this procedure based on a relatively few number of commercial packages. We agreed that WMS can treat the xacml policy similar to how we handle structure map files, i.e. a structure map file is “managed” and can be either a default file or one with pre-established policies already present. On ingest, WMS would include the proper file from a pre-established area in the WMS temporary store. There is much more discussion required in this area before we can finalize these requirements.

### **ETD Content Model**

There was extensive discussion regarding the ETD content model which ultimately ranged into a broader discussion of how we are dealing, in general, with content models. At the end of the discussion, it appeared that everyone was comfortable with proceeding with the notion that an ETD content model would consist of a parent dissertation object and separate objects for each of the supplemental files (this is the representation shown in the content model document by Shaun).

The broader discussion focused on the notion that, in some cases, different policies are required for the same content model, depending on the application. We tentatively decided that we have four major application areas: RUcore/NJDH, Faculty Deposit, NJVid, and ETDs. To illustrate the problem, a manuscript for faculty deposit is likely to have a different archival master than that for ETDs. We agreed that our objective is to define content models that are generic across all application areas, however this may not be possible in some cases. If you imagine a 2x2 matrix with applications as columns and content models as rows, if every application area requires a unique content model across our 15 CMs, we end up with 60 content models – not a desirable situation. However, we would expect that there are many cases where a content model applies across all areas, e.g. photographs and maps can probably be generic across all applications.

We decided the following:

- We should design CMs to be generic across all application areas.
- Adding additional presentation formats should not require different content models. For example, we are likely to evolve our video content model to have QT streaming, Flash streaming, and Flash download as three possibilities, each of which might be optional.
- The policy issues focus more on the archival master. There are basically three approaches: 1) we allow any format type to be an archival master and WMS doesn't do any validation, 2) alternatively, we take a more typical archival stance and reject for ingest any archival master that does not adhere to our policy. Another slight modification is to allow ingest of non-standard archival masters and mark the objects as not subject to preservation treatment or 3) another option discussed was to have "premium quality" content models, which would need to adhere to strict standards and "standard quality" content models, which would still need to conform to content model standards, but would pose less of a burden to "user-generated" content.

Considerable more discussion is required on this topic.

### **Quality Initiatives**

We had refreshments to celebrate the completion of our first quality initiative, i.e. all objects pass the signature check. Ron proposed that our second quality initiative focus on increasing our downloads.

Currently, we are seeing about 1000 downloads per month for January/February which is a significant increase from the October, 2008 timeframe. He also distributed a bar chart that showed that the two collections that have significant numbers of objects and are experiencing the most downloads are the Dutch Immigration Experience and the ETD collections. This quality initiative involves a number of areas including Google indexing, metadata, portals, showfed code, export to IRIS, etc. Jeffery will pull together a document for review that outlines possible areas of improvement.

#### **Related Items**

- API/A xacml policies will be tested Monday morning (3/16) which will require some downtime for Fedora. Lefty64 will be up during this period.
- Given recent unpublished quick fixes, Chad requested that we, as a group, must communicate these fixes on software.libraries.rutgers.edu. These fixes frequently have far wider impact than expected, e.g. on other software and on system testing. The group agreed that we will adopt this approach as a major improvement in our communication process.
- Jie will work with Rhonda and Ron to continue to update the WMS R5.1 requirements in the areas of faculty submissions and commercial video ingest, respectively.

#### **Pending for Next Meeting**

- Setting up testing on mss2, e.g. all of just a sampling of objects
- Continue discussion of ETD content model
- Second pass at WMS R5.1 requirements
- Review of requirements for increasing downloads
- Shibboleth configuration for R5.0 on mss3.
- Finalize config/compile options for R5.0
- Video scenarios