

Institutional Repository Project

Technical Advisory Group Minutes (unconfirmed)Thursday 5th June 2008, 1 – 2 pm

Present Allan Copley (Chair, AL), Phil Butler (PB), Steve Hall (SH), Anthony Taylor (AT), Mike Pigram (MP), Paul Johnston (PJ), Jenny Curtis (JC), Dave Cupit (DC), Nick Blackaby (NB)

Filename IRProject_TechnicalAdvisoryGroupMinutes_Meeting2008-06-05_v1-0.doc

Enquiries Dr Phil Butler, Tel: x51514, Email: p.butler@manchester.ac.uk

1. Apologies

Bill McLaughlin and Dave Rislely forwarded apologies; Paul Johnson and Nick Blackaby attended in their stead, respectively.

2. Introductions

Members of the group introduced themselves. AC asked if all group members were familiar with the Project's overall goals. PB noted that only PJ had not been talked with directly prior to the meeting.

3. Terms of Reference

AC and PB outlined the proposed terms of reference (previously distributed). PB asked if each member was comfortable with their responsibilities and that communication channels were clear. The Group accepted the terms of reference.

The Group noted that 'scope creep' was an issue. AC and PB confirmed the Project scope was well defined and that they would act to pull the group back if any creep occurred.

4. Project update

PB gave a brief overview of the Project and an update of its current status. PB noted that a business case and scale-up funds were pending approval as part of the Library's budget request for 08/09. The Project was to proceed assuming these funds will be made available. PB noted that current work with early adopters was proceeding and the Project was working towards an expected University-wide launch window of first quarter of 2009.

All documentation and information would continue to be made available on the Project website at <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/institutionalrepositoryproject>.

5. Identify and prioritise topics for consideration at future meetings

The Group discussed topics for consideration at future meetings. It noted that further consideration of hardware architecture required 'sizing' information and consideration of required levels of service. PB noted that some work had been done on these issues to develop costs for the scale-up budget. These were upper limit estimates. PB would distribute this information separately.

ACTION 01: PB to distribute business case for scale-up

PB noted that with a University launch provisionally scheduled for the first quarter of 2009, gave 9 months for implementation works to occur. Software selection and architecture needed to occur as a priority. The Group discussed issues around submission interfaces. It was suggested that this may be a none-issue. The Group prioritised the following topics for further discussion,

1. Software selection and architecture
2. Data migration issues
3. Service level requirements
 - a. storage
 - b. preservation
 - c. management
 - d. dissemination

- e. security
- 4. Hardware sizing
- 5. Data integration
- 6. Sustainability
- 7. Development roadmap

6. Other business

None.

7. Schedule for future meetings

AC asked the Group if it could meet at least 3 times in the next two months. The Group agreed and suggested meetings were scheduled for 2 hours to allow enough time for in depth discussions.

ACTION 02: PB to distribute alternative suitable dates for future meetings