Notes from JAV Technical Working Group

8 December 2006

Present: Peter McCracken, Evan Owens, Scott Plutchak, Bernie Rous, John Ober, Bev Acreman

Apologies Andrew Wray, Catherine Jones, Claire Saxby

• CM to ensure minutes are posted to the website; liaise with Jane Thomson
• BR/CM to complete their use case spreadsheets
• CM led discussion on the use case reviews, and it was agreed that we should go back into the descriptions (as opposed to the spreadsheets) and add more specificity, especially with regard to identifying “unknowns”, and noting where attributes could vary.

Attributes
a) Relationship – Dublin Core not as helpful as hoped – review
b) Source – needs renaming – possibly to “Type of location of a given version”; all to consider
c) Specify Formats in use cases, but not using MIME format which is too techy
d) Final vs Version of Record – Scott to check with NLM as to suitable alternative terms (e.g. “Official”; “Authentic”; “Authorized”; “Published”; “Definitive”; “Reference copy”)
e) Bibliographic Context – to be deleted from the attributes list since can be covered by “Relationship”
f) Visibility –JO pointed out that Visibility is related to the Source (and therefore inherits its characteristics), so this attribute can be deleted from the list
g) Peer Reviewed/Not Reviewed – agreed a very useful attribute, notwithstanding the various degrees of review that the term can encompass. Suggest adding a pointer to a description of the PR process used in a particular instance
h) Status – might be useful once we’ve added detail to the use cases
i) Delivery Context, Scope and Format – overlap so aim to reduce following more analysis of the use cases
j) add Date to the attribute list

Any Other Business
• CM to circulate V-ISAN standard which has version criteria to see if useful to this working group
• RCUK interested in our work and will embrace our proposed terminology
• Aiming to close work by the end of Jan, but this is a soft target for releasing some data
• Date of next conference call: 22/12/05