

Minutes of October 14, 2010 Meeting

Agenda

1. Updates and Announcements
2. Testing of R5.1.3
3. Portal specification - continuing
4. WMS R5.2 specification
5. R5.2 Target dates

Announcements and Quick Updates

- Yang's review of WMS architecture was very useful. Chad will also be giving a similar review on the portal architecture. Ron will ask Jeffery to do the same for dlr/EDIT.
- Dave and Kalaivani indicated that shibboleth was working on mss2. Dave will work to move the capability to mss3.
- Ron mentioned we need a more concerted effort to get Google and Google Scholar indexing our material. Google finds some 100 NJDH objects on lefty64 and around 20 on mss3, out of a total of over 3000. Ron proposed an ad hoc working group consisting of Jeffery, Kalaivani, Linda, and Rhonda (Jeffery will be the convener). This group should identify and rank the possible actions in terms of benefit and effort. Given the time we have had a site map submitted, one might speculate that the site map is actually not working. The group should interact with other institutions that have solved this problem. In addition, it would be useful to join the Google sitemap group.
- Chad indicated that he has made changes to outputs so that it only allows display of the datastreams with approved IDs. Testing will proceed on lefty64 and on mss2 in the next few days and then the updated module will put in place on mss3. We'll need to discuss more long range solutions to this problem in subsequent meetings.

Portal Indexing

We revisited the portal specification, specifically to discuss the proposal of adding a capability in WMS to specify a major portal or portals to which the resource should be assigned. Given that all collections will be pre-assigned to one of the three thematic portals, we observed that assigning a resource to another portal will create some confusion, especially for the non-expert user. For example, when does a user need to assign a new collection to a portal? Does this assignment have to be made before any resources are ingested. (Editorial comment: The answer depends, in part, on the nature of the collection. If the collection clearly belongs to only one of the thematic portals, then resource ingestion can proceed and the collection-to-portal assignment can be made at a later time.) It was also acknowledged that this was a partial step and a more comprehensive solution could be provided in R5.2.1. After considerable discussion, we agreed to proceed with the proposed solution with the following updates to be provided by Rhonda, Kalaivani, and Yang: a) a proposal as to where to place the screen that allows the assignment to a portal. For example, the screen might be taken out of the main flow and put under a selection for "Advanced

Assignment” and b) a preamble to the assignment function that explains the purpose and who will need to use it. We will continue this discussion in the next sw_arch meeting.

WMS R5.2 Specification

Jie review the specification that covers all the proposed changes for WMS in R5.2. In order to support embargo of all objects, we decided to add a capability to WMS to query the user for the end date. In addition, there were some minor wording updates. Jie will make the edits and post the document.

Modification Requests to be Submitted to Software Libraries

1. Resolve the tmp-link issue.

R5.2 Code Complete

We will discuss the code freeze date in more depth in the next meeting. However, based on the discussion and review of the specifications, the immediate response was that the code freeze date needs to be set at the end of January, 2011.

Agenda Items for the Next Meeting

- Portal specification – one more time
- Any other specifications for R5.2
- Movement of JPE videos to mss3
- R5.2 code freeze target (all)
- Pending items
 - Djvu java applet
 - Performance of handle server

rej – 10/25/2010