AUL Report
Agnew reported on the CNI (Coalition for Network Information) conference she recently attended. She presented on the “Research Metadata Application Profile.” Based upon the feedback she received there is a lot of interest in the community for guidance on managing research data. She stressed how we encourage reuse of data and interdisciplinary research.

Womack’s equivalent from Johns Hopkins was in attendance. She talked with Agnew about how they need a standard for research data metadata and that she wants to propose one to NISO. She asked if this was something Rutgers would be interested in co-chairing. Agnew said we would give it thought. Hopkins is also struggling with data format. There was talk about forming an east coast research data consortium to share ideas and experiences. Agnew asked Womack and Morgan to consider what this would entail. Additionally, identity management is an area in which a lot of universities are struggling. Agnew asked Purger to consider hosting an identity management seminar.

Digital Project Management
Konin is responsible for tracking all digital projects in the Libraries. He gave an update on his efforts in organizing all the relevant information about current digital projects and how he is currently managing that information.

Konin has identified all ongoing digital projects and gathered significant data. All of the data has been input into a web based project management tool to allow him to get a clear overview of the efforts underway. (This tool is a temporary solution until a project management software package is picked for the Libraries.) He provided a quick overview of the main project page listing all of the projects. He reviewed specific information about one of the projects (Yearbooks) to give the group an understanding of the types of data he envisions tracking. He also reviewed the reporting function. The processes which will be used to get new projects into his queue and then track the milestones are still being developed. Agnew said the project management team should help create this workflow.

A discussion also took place about the importance of project priority and documenting levels of complexities within projects. Agnew said CISC would be a good place to test out any new project processes. The talk turned to the project management tool selection. Purger gave a brief update. Mills said he’d like to see the list of criteria for the tool and Agnew asked Purger to post the criteria to the CISC SAKAI site. Marker mentioned that as she has worked with Konin to organize project information she discovered her criteria for a project management tool isn’t as extensive as she might have previously imagined. Agnew asked the project management team (of which Konin is a member) to identify common milestones for digital projects and report back to the group.
Digital Object Identifiers (DOI) for RUL Digital Content
Jantz reviewed what he researched about Digital Object Identifiers (DOI) and how they may be applied within the repository. DOIs provide persistent identifiers for digital files. Using them would provide us with the opportunity to stop running our old handle server.

Jantz provided a brief history of DOIs, what they’re used for, and registration agencies which are needed to assign DOIs. He discussed the options for RUL. They include becoming our own registration agency, becoming a publishing member of CrossRef, or becoming a member of DataCite.

The first option (becoming our own registration agency) is impractical and too expensive. CrossRef’s annual fee is small, but they appear to be primarily focused on journals. It is unclear if they work with media and image files. This is a significant concern and further investigation is required. DataCite has a smaller client base and a higher annual fee, but appears to handle a larger variety of file types. Agnew asked Jantz, Womack, Radick and Mills to do further investigation on both CrossRef and DataCite and present a recommendation at the January 25 meeting. A technical analysis of how to convert back files must also be done.

RUcore Release Schedule
Jantz reviewed key deliverables in the RUcore 6.x and 7.0 release schedules along with some additional capabilities not release related. Agnew noted it’s especially important to address reconciling the data project structure on mss3, migrating to JPE, and the migration of the Cranberry project in January.

“API to SKAI” was added to the requirements and architecture list for March/April. Purger, Womack, Morgan and Mills will work on this.

“Ingest of large files” was added as an important deliverable to be addressed immediately once release 6.5 is implemented (upgrade to Fedora 3.5.x).

After additional discussion “EAD support” was moved from Release 7.0 to Release 8.0. Agnew said this is a major effort which should not be included as a line item in a larger release.
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