



NJVid Project Team Conference Call
June 24, 2009 – 2pm-4pm
MINUTES

Present: Grace Agnew, Isaiah Beard, Sujay Daniel, Jane Hutchison, Ron Jantz, Judy Jeng, George Laskaris, Sandie Miller, Tom Nemeth, Sheri Prupis

Commercial Video Collection Launch (FMG Evaluation) – Development Issues:

The call commenced with discussion of a few development issues that had recently arisen.

A) Removing an institution's access to a video

Sandie asked how access removal will be administered given that some commercial licenses will expire. When a licensee's license period runs out, will the system automatically remove access to a video or will a human being have to remove access? Isaiah responded that lacking a consistent variable for the system to use to determine whether to provide access or not, it would have to be a manual process. However, Rutgers is working on providing an embargo period for digital objects where no access would be granted until a specified date. This is the reverse of what NJVid needs, but the underlying technological principle is similar. XACML supports access limitation according to date range via a statement such as "This digital object is available from Date X to Date Y." Dates representing each object's access period should be coded into a dropdown menu. This interface feature needs to be further developed, but in theory, potentially a reverse of the embargo period feature could be programmed; it just would take added time to code this. Ron will be able to advise when this feature could be coded. In any case, we ought to go ahead and test this now in hopes of integrating it into our production workflow process.

The Super Collection Manager (SCM) fills out a web form for each title, creating metadata within NJEDge.Net's RUcore platform. He/she enters an access time period for each title for each institution. Then a script converts the input to an XACML statement. The SCM pulls the record, makes any appropriate changes to it, and re-ingests the object into the repository. This part of the process is manual.

Sandie wanted to know how the SCM would find out that a new NJVid-participating institution had licensed a title. How would the institution be added to the drop-down menu? She also had the same question with regard to newly licensed videos. Can commercial video vendors regularly supply lists of licensees so that we will know which institutions should be granted access and which should not? The group liked the idea of adding a request for license records to the commercial video vendor master agreement.

When an institution decides to license a new video, some event could alert the SCM to acquire appropriate documentation for the video. Then the individual licensing institution would create a rights event for the video. Currently URLs can be used to do so.

B) Acceptance of Annotation Tool

There is still some confusion over FMG's acceptance (or possibly lack thereof) of the NJVid annotation tool. Will they permit NJVid users to use it on FMG videos or not? Jane recently spoke with FMG and they seemed to agree at least in part to limited uses of the feature. We will add a statement to the master agreement that will enable a commercial video vendor to simply indicate whether they permit NJVid users to use the annotation tool on its videos. This will clarify the ambiguity.

C) Using the Annotation Tool in various Ways

Technically speaking, will the annotation tool enable users to construct playlists of FMG videos and Commons videos? Videos of other commercial video vendors as well? Combinations thereof? How versatile and restrictive will the tool be in terms of the number of ways in which users may use it? Grace responded that these variations of use are not easy to program. The Annotation Tool can't filter out one commercial vendor's videos from another. What will be available is the option to indicate at the resource level whether the video may be annotated or not. If so, then users will be able to bring the video into the tool and annotate it; if not, then they simply will be unable to annotate the video.

D) FMG's Pre-defined Learning Objects

Will NJVid recognize FMG's bookmarked learning objects? If so, FMG can provide data in support of such, thus allowing NJVid to replicate their learning objects that FMG has made accessible through their user interface. We won't be able to utilize FMG's learning objects right away. We will need to develop a mapping schema to import the data. We could ask FMG to export to us the learning object data in such a way that it would automate the process. Otherwise, they would have to give it to us separately, and we would have to upload it manually. We would need FMG to provide us with a minimum of three metadata fields worth of data for each learning object.

E) Super Collection Manager

Can the cost of hiring an SCM be built into the fee for participating in NJVid? The answer is difficult to determine at this time. We will need to isolate the various costs involved with hiring this staff member. How will we apportion the video collections to determine the NJVid fee? Will each institution be allowed to contribute 50-100 videos each? Anything over that amount would incur a monetary fee. An alternative is to apportion according to video storage size. If we were to adhere to the Research Channel model, each institution would be allowed to contribute X amount of videos to the Commons, and for any additional videos, the institution would have to pay a certain amount. Will institutions that are granted access to commercial videos be charged an additional fee thru VALE? Membership scales (e.g. Portico) can also be used as models. Answers to these questions have yet to be decided.

Commercial Video Collection Launch (FMG Evaluation) – Development Timeline:

The RUcore upgrade (Fedora 5.0) will be ready for installation at NJEDge.Net by July 15th. Steps that remain toward achieving that goal include:

1. Test the upgrade on the staging server
2. Migrate the 15,000 digital objects back to the production server to ensure compatibility with the new architecture
3. Dave Hoover, the production systems manager, will check to make sure everything is working ok and the underlying software is configured properly
4. The upgrade will be released to Rutgers University on July 6
5. RUcore will be available to be mirrored at NJEDge.Net after July 6
6. Hardware installation finalized at NJEDge.Net (Fedora 3.0, Apache, MySQL, handle server are all being installed as of late June).
7. Install RUcore at NJEDge.Net
8. Ron Jantz will meet with Sujay to discuss configuration, middleware and management
9. NJEDge.Net system training
10. NJEDge.Net ingests the 47 Commons objects
11. NJEDge.Net tests their system, including web video portal for the Commons
12. NJEDge.Net ingests the 25 FMG objects and tests their NJ Trust A&A federation

FDU, NJIT, Ramapo, Rutgers, and WPU have Shibboleth providers up and running. Is it possible to point everyone to the development machine to ensure the appropriate attributes are being passed? Sujay will send an unbroken test link to Brad Trotte who set up WPU's Shibboleth.

Can Georgian Court join the FMG test? Yes. They need to fill out Sujay's identity management survey. Sujay's ok with having them join NJ Trust. They have Active Directory, but they also use EZProxy. We still need to ask if they want to set up central LDAP or run Shibboleth themselves. Sujay will respond to them after receiving their responses to the identity management survey. The requisite for participating in the FMG test is a long term commitment to licensing FMG content with the intention of accessing that material via NJVid.

Commons Update

There are currently 47 Commons videos. Tom has identified 55 institutions to contact right now – 48 higher education plus seven others that are already involved with NJVid. K-12 schools, museums and public libraries will be contacted later. He's been able to narrow down contacts at 31 out of 55 (49%).

He's had recent phone conversations with 21 of those. Out of the 21, four have content ready to contribute right now (19%) – Montclair, St. Elizabeth, FDU, and NJIT. Five institutions don't have content (24%). Twelve (57%) say they have content but need to meet internally first or generally just need more time to decide how they would like to begin participating. Tom is advising them to get signed releases for all future recorded events and programs. He is checking with academic libraries' media circulation departments and video production departments. NJEDge's Video Network Managers webpage has a helpful list of contacts for that he is using for reference.

Further outreach: Bob Wolk's survey will go out soon if not already. With respect to municipal libraries, Rob Zangara at the New Jersey State Library offered his assistance. He has access to a few listservs. However, he first wants to know how A&A of public libraries will work. Can we reach out to the Jersey Access Group via Sheri? Linda Langsheid might have contacts thru her work on NJDH, as well as additional advice for Tom.

Annotation Tool/Advisory Board Reflections

Responses to Judy's Year 2 Evaluation Survey elicited a few comments regarding the web site. Either Robert could make the changes himself, or we could wait for NJEDge's webmaster to make the changes. After all, when the Commons is transferred, NJEDge will have to create a new web site anyway. NJEDge's webmaster will train with Rutgers; specifically, he will work with Chad to learn how to set the video portal.

Sandie asked if we will have access to video analytics in RUCore to determine usage. Yes, usage stats will be available. For example, Fedora 5.0 includes a statistics package which lets one analyze each object collection, video resource, etc. Ron will look into this a little further and see if he can send summaries of statistics to Sandie.

Due to time constraints, discussion of recent presentations given was postponed to July's conference call.

Call ended at 4pm.