

Minutes of February 4, 2010 Meeting

Agenda

1. Updates and Announcements
2. Annotation specification
3. WMS requirements from MDWG
4. R5.2 review

Announcements and Quick Updates

Ron requested that documents that have been reviewed and approved in sw_arch should be posted, noting specifically the two statistics documents, the thumbnail update document, and the NIH/PubMed document. Chad will also look to see if he can find Shaun's document on compound objects for ETDs. The thumbnail update for maps and photos is complete although we may want to address thumbnail issues for other objects in the future. For now, thumbnails for other objects such as videos or books, if desired, will have to be created manually. Regarding other quality issues, Jeffery will see pursue the submittal of our ETD collection to Google Scholar. At this point, the ETD collection, with over 1000 ETDs, is the most useful and prominent collection in RUcore that would be of potential interest to scholars. If the ETD approach works, we will decide how to deal with other collections, e.g. faculty deposits. There are several outstanding and important bugs that need to be fixed – see discussion below on regarding R5.2. Regarding the move of the NJDH portal to lefty64, we will look to Linda to make the final decision and then she will contact Sho for the DNS change.

Annotation Specification

The annotation capability has some major implications for RUcore. We made progress in this review but will need to continue the review in the next meeting. Decisions and recommendations from this meeting are listed below:

- The annotation application will provide for management of annotations, e.g. editing and deleting annotations.
- Does WMS need to be able to edit annotations? The recommendations for R5.2 are as follows:
 - In general, published annotations should not be edited, i.e. in this sense they are like a published article. If there are edits required, this will be done in dlr/EDIT.
 - Given that there is an inline xacml policy, WMS will need to make sure the policy is not deleted if someone attempts to edit the annotation object in WMS.
 - It is suggested that a WMS policy-editing capability be implemented in the R5.3.
- In what collection does the annotation belong? The group recommended that the annotation should be placed in the collection where the annotated resource is located. Following this recommendation, the following apply:
 - The annotation metadata will be indexed, however the annotation object will not be listed in the results. For example, if "Professor Jones" is identified in the annotation metadata and

has annotated video A, a search on “Professor Jones” and video A would list video A in the results and not the annotation object. The user would be able to navigate to the annotation object from video A.

- How are annotations for licensed videos handled? Here again, it is recommended that the annotation be located in the licensed video collection. This annotation could have the same xacml policy as the annotated video and would be pulled into the respective institutional collection via the dynamic collection capability.
- How is the annotation of a public video handled when the annotation is intended to be restricted? In this case, the annotation would be located in the public video collection that is associated with the institution, however it would be blocked by the appropriate xacml policy.

WMS Requirements from the MDWG

We began the review of the requirements from the MDWG. Yang indicated that he would be able to do items 1, 2, and 10 on the list but he would need more time to determine the timeframe for completing the other items on the list, most of which require some significant re-architecting of WMS. This issue led to the discussion of code complete dates for R5.2 (next section).

R5.2 Release

In discussing code complete dates, Chad estimated that the code complete date for the annotation capability is probably in the June timeframe. As a result, we began discussing an R5.3 release and a bug-fix release. The thinking is that there are several significant bugs that should be fixed and can't wait for another major release. These include the LDAP department update, the organization name being deleted from ETDs in a WMS edit, changes required for ETDs, etc. The group recommendation is to put out a bug-fix release (R5.1.1). To facilitate this process, Kalaivani will be put together the list of bugs and we will determine a code complete and release date for R5.1.1 in the next meeting. Ron will update the R5.2 release content and we will continue the discussion on whether to release R5.2 possibly in May without the annotation capability and then delivering R5.3 (primarily annotation) in the August-September timeframe.

Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- Set target dates for the bug-fix release R5.1.1.
- Continued review of annotation specification
- Rights-event/document linking capability
- Batch ingest for NJEDL – statistics and process
- Storage management on lefty64