

MINUTES OF MEETING OF JAV TECHNICAL WG, 16 February 2006

Present: Bev Acreman, Cliff Morgan (chair), Evan Owens, John Ober, Catherine Jones, Scott Plutchak

Apologies for absence: Andrew Wray, Peter McCracken, Bernie Rous, Claire Saxby

We reviewed the minutes from the previous meeting and addressed any open questions.

1. "Author's Original"

Cliff had sent email proposing to revisit this choice. We discussed which term best conveyed a sense of "stage" but agreed that this was subjective. As there were no strong feelings about changing this, this will stay as is for the review committee.

2. "Corrected Version of Record" Changed to "Updated Version of Record"

We agreed on "updated" as a more neutral term and suggested that best practice would be to note the reason for the change. We moved on to discuss "Author's Updated Version of Record" and eventually decided to drop that altogether and instead suggest that "Updated Version of Record" had three key metadata properties in best practice:

- a) who made the change; default is the publisher
- b) what was changed
- c) where the original is (a link)

We proposed that if the changes are so extensive that the work would qualify for a separate copyright, it should be called a new work and not an update. We defer to copyright principles and practice on this point.

3) What to send to the Review Group?

- a) terms and definitions
- b) narrative, including John's diagram on relations once updated, and some mapping or observations about other term sets. For example, we might want to try to express the NIH mandate in JAV terminology. It was also suggested that we should say that we tried to disambiguate 80% of the cases, not 100% and that the focus was on what makes a difference for readers, not content creators or providers.

c) a small set of key use cases updated for the new terminology

d) an appendix with the full set of use cases

Cliff will prepare one sample use case using the new terminology and in the format needed for the report and then put out a list of other cases, each committee member to do one.

4) Time Table and Next Steps

The goal is to get the document to the review committee by the end of February; they will then have March to read and comment. We will reassemble in April to evaluate the comments. Cliff will request conference call times for all Thursdays in April, but the exact schedule will be determined later with consideration for holidays and upcoming conferences.