

Minutes-October 13, 2005 Conference call

Taking part: Andrew Wray, Beverley Ackerman, Catherine Jones, Cliff Morgan, Evan Owens, Peter McCracken, T. Scott Plutchak

We began with round-robin introductions of all the participants, during which the following areas of interest were mentioned:

- * publisher internal versions (in scope or not?)
- * technical reports (same question)
- * errata, corrections, amended versions
- * retractions

The minutes of the previous call were approved as is and the conversation moved immediately into the use cases.

The vertical versus horizontal mental image that Evan proposed via email was discussed and was found useful. A comparable analogy was grandparent - parent - child (ancestry) versus sibling relationships.

It was proposed that we cast our net widely for examples and use cases and prune later, that we not try to limit things too soon.

Some characteristics of versions that were discussed included visibility (published, private, leaked), scope or size of the revisions, access control (related to visibility).

Our chairman reported that some members of the larger review group were getting anxious about our efforts but that he would not be giving them a blow by blow account of our deliberations, over and above that which appears in the posted minutes. We are aiming to provide our use cases for review at the beginning of January.

The JISC-funded VERSIONS project regarding papers in economics in digital repositories was described; the URL has been circulated in earlier emails. It is a related activity, and we have Kate Sloss from the LSE on our review group. Other than that relationship, we need not feel constrained to follow each other's work schedules that closely.

Action Items:

- * Peter to continue writing a broad set of use cases
- * Catherine to consider use cases from the user's point of view
- * Evan to think about characteristics or attributes of versions from a data model perspective
- * Andrew to write use cases for versions within a publisher's office (pre-publication)

Andrew took us back to the high ground by reminding us that in general the world only sees the two versions to which Google Scholar makes links: the pre-print and the publisher copy.

We discussed how we might coordinate the various use cases. The proposal was to number the use cases and letter the stages in an individual use case (e.g., 1A, 3A-B-C-D, etc.) and then look at all the use cases together cross mapping between them.

The use case of post-publication changes to an institutional repository copy (separate from the publisher's copy) was mentioned.

=====
Evan Owens, Chief Technology Officer
Portico www.portico.org