

Minutes of July 22, 2010 Meeting**Agenda**

1. Updates and Announcements
2. R5.1.2 – content, testing, and schedule
3. Portals for ETD programs/schools
4. Future releases

Announcements and Quick Updates

Updates are as follows:

- The RUcore/DCRC Open House came off very well with probably around 80 attendees. We had a good representation from library faculty and staff and also several faculty from SC&I attended.
- From the NJVid conference call, we agreed to not release the annotation tool in R5.1.2 since the ability to annotate progressive download is not of much value to them. We will proceed to deliver the annotation tool in the R5.1.4 release (see release summary below). We will also help NJVid ingest FMG video clips (annotations). They will be able to view the annotations in R5.1.2 but will not be able to interactively create annotations.
- Several members of sw_arch (Chad, Isaiah, Rhonda and Ron) will meet with Marianne and two university librarians (from UPenn and Temple) on July 22 to discuss opportunities for collaboration.

R5.1.2 Status

Ron reviewed the revised and simplified R5.1.2 release which will basically contain the following: a) relationship support for annotations, b) indexing support for annotations, c) statistics reporting for collection managers, and d) WMS configuration for an additional video file format: MP4. We will not deliver the annotation tool and we also decided that shibboleth support was not needed in this release.

The following decisions were made regarding the R5.1.2 release: 1) the rels display in showfed will be commented out – we need more time to discuss how this display will be handled, 2) for indexing annotation objects, indexing software will use contentModel=“analytic”. We noted that this is not a totally generic fix and, for the future, we need to consider an index/no index flag and possibly also what is to be indexed in the object (e.g. MODs, datastreams, etc), 3) the ID for the MP4 datastream will be MP4-1. We noted that there remains some inconsistency in how we are creating these IDs – see the section below on modification requests to be filed in software libraries, 4) the analytic/annotation ID will be EMAP1 – no hyphen and 5) Jeffery will create an “analytic” content model and modify the video content model to accommodate the MP4 file format.

We concluded that we had achieved code freeze for this release and that several weeks of testing would be required. A related task is to create the collection structure and do a test ingest for NJEDL on lefty64. This will also allow us to test that statistics is picking up all the major portals, i.e. NJDH, NJEDL and RUcore. The release should be available for the public in the mid-August timeframe.

ETD Search Portals for Programs

Ron reviewed an approach for indexing and creating search portals for specific programs. After advertising this capability in the Open House, we realized that we could not uniquely identify certain programs, e.g. a search on History would also yield ETDs from Art History. Both Jeffery and Chad made some quick changes which will uniquely identify the program by using the attribute value of “RUETD” that is associated with the program in MODS. This change plus the creation and indexing of hyphenated program strings (e.g. art-history) provided the capability to uniquely identify the program. In this process, we also encountered an Amberfish search term limitation of 32 characters, i.e. with hyphens, the search term becomes very long. Although we need to file this problem as a bug, it appears that truncation at 31 characters (plus the truncation character) will still uniquely identify the program.

With the limitations above, we would not provide the capability for the public to search for programs in R5.1.2 although we should plan to do this for a future release. For delivery of ETD search portals, we would need to construct a search string with hyphens (e.g. art-history) to uniquely identify the program. When editing the search, this hyphenated string would be visible to the user. Rhonda indicated that she had some concern about this issue and would review it with Kalaivani for final resolution.

Release Summary

Ron summarized a possible release schedule that covers the next year or so as follows:

- R5.1.2 – to be delivered to the public in August, 2010
- R5.1.3. This will be an upgrade of Fedora to release 3.2.1. The objective is to take advantage of the available bug fixes. We will not use any new Fedora features and will also not incorporate any new RUcore features. Sho believes we can do an update in place so this release should go fairly quickly. The target is to get this release out in late September.
- R5.1.4 – an “annotation only” release to be delivered in late October or early November in time to demo at the NJEDge conference in mid-November.
- R5.2. There are many potential items for this release and we will need to discuss it further.
- R6.0. Ron proposed that this release be a major architectural release to include Fedora 3.4, a new search engine, support for data, and possibly other items related to our infrastructure (e.g. a read-only system).

The group was OK with the R5.1.x releases. More discussion is required for R5.2 and R6.0.

Modification Requests to be Submitted to Software Libraries

We agreed to initiate a new process that would help us track proposed changes to RUcore. We frequently note required changes in the sw_arch meeting minutes, however these changes may not be picked up and scheduled for a later release. Ron will note these changes in this standing section of the minutes and ask a work study student to enter these changes, after review, into software libraries. Changes noted in this meeting include the following:

1. We should enhance the signature checking capability to create an integrity checker that would also check for valid IDs and the appearance (or lack thereof) of a file size. Other integrity checks are also possible.
2. Investigate a more permanent solution for delivering ETD search portals that would enable searching on program without the hyphenation and without the need to truncate.
3. We should change the ID “XML-1” to “OCR-1”. This would require software changes and a mapping update to update all the existing IDs.
4. We need an indicator as to whether an object should be indexed and what elements of the object should be indexed.
5. What are the implications of deprecating PERL?

Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- Collection structure
- Revised RU advanced user interface
- R5.2 features and required specifications.
- ETD search portal resolution
- Goals for AY 10/11

rcj – 07/27/2010