

SW Arch Meeting Minutes – April 10, 2014

Agenda

- Announcements and Updates
- R7.3.1 status
- Specification – MP4/Wowza
- Specification – Embargo “forever”
- Specification – Article cover sheet and versions
- Review of R7.4 and R7.5 Releases
- Reminders

Announcements and Updates

From the CISC report, Ron noted that there is increasing interest within the university and the library to begin an open e-textbook project. Chad reviewed the features and bug fixes in R7.3. Also, release content for R7.4 and R7.5 was reviewed in CISC; changes are noted below.

Chad reported that we will need to re-visit the issue of putting author email in digi-prov metadata. There are many digi-prov records and software would incur overhead in trying to find the author’s email address (note this is a discussion for R7.5 and notification features). The group also agreed that we should install the PHP Clam module for doing virus detection. Rhonda noted that users have praised the simplicity of the faculty deposit user interface.

For our meeting on April 27, we will have bagels and your favorite beverage – to congratulate ourselves on the R7.3 delivery and to fortify ourselves to push out two additional releases this year.

R7.3.1 Status

The patch for DOI metadata has been tested on development, staging and introduced to the production version. All appear to be working. We are now set to run the first phase of the DOI metadata update. Jeffery will contact Dave after he gets back from vacation.

Wowza/MP4 Specification

Chad reviewed the Wowza/MP4 streaming media specification for R7.4. The proposal was accepted with no changes. It was noted that android phones do not support the RTMPE and HLS protocols so streaming will not work for Android phones. We expect that sometime in the future Android phones will support HLS at which time streaming will work for these phones. Rhonda raised a policy issue about whether we should continue to support FLV and MOV as video presentation formats. Alternatively, we could restrict new video ingests to use only MP4 (more discussion needed here). From an earlier discussion with Grace and Isaiah, we concluded that we have sufficient restrictions in place and do not need to support DRM with the HLS protocol.

Embargo “forever”

Rhonda explained that we will not embargo forever and provided a basic algorithm for calculating the embargo expiration date. This date can be calculated by adding 156 to the current year (details for this calculation are in the specification). One question remains to be resolved and will be forwarded to Jane and Laura. Specifically, who is authorized to enable this embargo: 1) an OA administrator, 2) RUcore staff, or 3) a depositor?

Specification for the Cover Sheet and Article Versioning

Ron reviewed the preliminary specification for the cover sheet and article versioning. For the cover sheet, the following should be clarified: 1) citation format for multiple authors, 2) do all deposits get cover sheets or only articles? and 3) do non-peer reviewed articles get cover sheets?

We also reviewed the three approaches to implementing article versions. We agreed that Fedora versioning should only be used for administrative purposes. The two other options were discussed but we did not have time to agree on the best approach. The issues for the two approaches are summarized below:

Issues for both options.

- does every deposit have a cover sheet? If not, how do we filter?
- are refereed and non-refereed article treated the same, i.e. do all get cover sheets?
- how is access to previous versions determined? Is this a faculty (depositor) decision?

Option 1- versions are all in one object.

Pros

- follows the FRBR principle, i.e. versions represent one work
- users have an immediate view of all versions without linking to another object

Cons

- DOIs will not uniquely identify a version (until we implement DOIs at the file level in 7.5)
- We must create a dialog with faculty to identify the object (previously ingested) in order to add a new datastream (version) to an existing object
- The faculty deposit service will need to be significantly modified to search for and modify an existing object (now it only needs to create new objects)
- When we do implement DOIs at the file level (R7.5), will these DOIs go directly to the file or does each DOI have a new landing page

Option 2 - a new object is created for each version

Pros

- Each version has a unique DOI and unique landing page
- The dialog with the depositor is not required to identify the object to which a new datastream must be added
- This approach greatly simplifies the FD implementation in 7.4
- This approach allows us to postpone the implementation of DOIs at the file level. We need to think clearly about what objects in RUcore should have DOIs at the file level.

Cons

- Doesn't adhere to the FRBR principle

- Relationships would have to be created between object versions after ingest
- We would likely want to eliminate previous versions from search results

These options will require more discussion. Ron will bring in an updated version of the specification to the next sw_arch meeting.

Discussion of R7.4 and R7.5

Ron reviewed the changes to release content that were accepted in the recent CISC meeting. ORCID id was moved above the line to be a part of the R7.4 August release. We also moved both EAD capability and ROA submission and registration as the highest priority items “below the line” for R7.4. If these can’t be done in R7.4, they become the highest priority items in R7.5.

We briefly discussed issues related to several features in R7.4. When a virus is detected in FD, an email should be sent to depositor with language similar to the following: “We have detected a virus in the file you are uploading and have canceled your submission. Please contact your department UCS representative for advice on how to clean your file before resubmitting.” Also, we agreed that this email should be addressed to the proper RUcore administrative list. Yang also noted that the UMDNJ deposit capability is dependent on the creation of the proper department code for UMDNJ departments. This work is in progress but we have no control over the schedule. If the code is created in the R7.4 development time frame, we can implement this feature as part of this release; if not, it will have to be in R7.5

Reminders

We did not have time to discuss the reminders items – delete VT objects, delete NJVid videos, unpack tar files for legacy objects, and signature failures on four videos – all of which will be added to the new project area.

Other Items

We set an objective of having all specifications completed by April 25 in order to meet our code freeze date for R7.4 of June 30. Also, Chad proposed that we enter items from the specification into software libraries in order to provide more granularity for developers and to make sure we don’t miss some of the detail. We’ll try this approach out with some of our recent specifications.

Agenda Items for the Next Meeting (April 24, 2014)

- Outstanding technical issues (Kalaivani)
 - File upload: tarfile, video file upload
 - DIR file upload and techMD
 - Review file renaming process in WMS
- R7.4 specifications to be reviewed
 - Threaded discussion for Analytics - Chad
 - SOLR date ordering - Jeffery

- Article cover sheet and versioning – Ron
 - ORCID in MODs – Kalaivani/MWDG
- Reminders
 - delete VT objects on production
 - delete VT collection objects on development
 - delete NJvid videos (RARCH)
 - unpack tar files
 - signature failure on four videos
 - DOI metadata upate
- Celebration with bagels, etc.

rcj – 04/25/2014