MINUTES FROM CONFERENCE CALL 10 Nov 2005

Participating:

•   Andrew Wray

•   Bernie Rous

•   Catherine Jones

•   Claire Saxby (Minutes)

•   Cliff Morgan (Chair)

•   John Ober

•   Scott Plutchak

Apologies:

•   Beverley Acreman

•   Evan Owens

•   Peter McCracken

Actions from last call were discussed:

•   John had circulated use cases from an IR perspective.

•   Bernie had provided detailed information on technical reports, articles, and conference proceedings from computer science. Cliff said we need to consider whether this extends our scope too far; we may need to re-focus.

•   John had sent FRBR URL. Cliff felt that we are looking at manifestations as opposed to works. Technical reports might be considered different works by scientists.

•   The attribute list was updated by Evan in response to feedback from the last call.

•   Everyone had been asked to look at the use cases and apply the attributes/values document to the versions described by them.

The latter action point was discussed. The number of different use cases produced so far was felt to illustrate the complexity of the problem we are trying to solve. Discussions to date have taken an intellectual approach to the problem. It was agreed that the attributes table is a useful starting point. The challenge now is to put this to practical use.

The TWG is trying to solve a semantics problem with the aim of producing best practice guidelines. There is the need to know the status/key features of a version

and how it relates to other versions – this is an issue for many groups. For example it was discussed that at the most basic level, there is confusion about the meaning of the term post-print. Cliff said that it would a good achievement for the group to produce definitions of post-print and pre-print.

The following approach was suggested:

Each member of the group to take ~6 use cases and for each case identify each discrete version described therein. Then for each version assign attributes and values.

Each use case should be broken down in this way by at least two members of the group.

We can then cross match versions identified across all of the use cases – some may not be distinct and can be grouped together; for others, even if they are distinct the differences may not be deemed particularly important and could be disregarded.

Andrew commented that we probably have more use cases than article versions. However this is useful because the different use cases describe versions from a different perspective.

The above process will also test how useful the current attributes table is – some attributes are likely to be more important for defining versions than others. Also some attributes will have lots of possible values (e.g. for scope and source).

Actions:

•   Cliff to circulate full set of use cases and assign 6 to each member of the group.

•   All members to break down their use cases into distinct versions, and assign attributes and values to each.

•   Bernie to add technical/conference report use cases to the use case document.

•   Those unable to join the next call (Thanksgiving) to send feedback by email beforehand.