2012-01-24 Meeting

2012-01-24 Meeting Minutes

Attendance

- Gregg Vanderheiden
- Andy Heath
- Gottfried
- Liddy Neville
- Jutta Treviranus
- Alexandros Mourouzis
- Vassilis Koutkias
- Trifon Trifonov
- Kasper Markus

Assign minute taker

Gregg Van

1. Review Action Items

- [ANDY] Recruit participant experts in Digital Literacy: (Andy will make a cold contact.)
  - in process
- [GREGG V] To get a contact with Deaf - Blindness
  - Very interested in participating along with a group of deaf-blind individuals -- wants to know what they should do
  - Jutta said that there is a list of what we want them to do on the WIKI
- The first consultation with end user experts representing aging has met. This has gleaned a number of new needs and preference facets related to privacy, security, trustworthiness and credibility assessment. Further consultations will be taking place over the coming weeks.
- Jutta: Make a list of user groups involved, and those whose needs haven't been captured yet
2. Discussion of timeline and deliverables
   • Don’t want to wait till we have full list of properties or we will never be done -- never be able to start
   • so want to have an extensible list
   • so should use a Registry Model
   • Standard defines the structure for storing them (name-value pair)
   • and the process for adding them.
   • this allows us to put together a list of properties
   • Value pairs can include context variables as well as features or settings or material descriptors
   • Allows more organic process for adding things.
     • Method for adding to the Core
       • informal?
       • informal?
   • Pairs idea is great but not enough. Places you want to express relationships
   • Start simple and add as needed.
   • Start with core set and allow people to add
     • a few rules --
       • if you add something it is important to tell what category it belongs to... or some such.
     • (is this new or a refinement of something there)
   • TWO ideas
     • one - have a CORE set of key value pairs and a LIVE set of
       • allows both a stable set and a
     • Alternate views of the value pairs - different groups
     • people asking for a credibility assessment when being asked for private information
       • how safe is it to give this web site information.
       • so this would be a value pair of SITE CREDIBILITY
     • perhaps have different levels 1 to 4
     • Better to have the values mean something to user
     • categories can help group things and there is precedent
     • methods for grouping/relating items
     • in this instance of the new standard we need to take into account the user perspective
     • Use TAGGING instead of CATEGORIES since things may belong to more than one category
     • after that focus use cases and semantic issues (defining the set of descriptors)
   • CORE handled through registry maintenance
   • Split into two groups ???
     • one on structure and process etc (that would be standardized)
     • one that would be value pairs that would be registered.
     • Or is this just a sequence issue. structure and then content -- but needs to be iterative because the interact.
   • Which of the available structures we want to use.
     • flat ?
       • algorithmic?
     • Categories? Tags?
     • Shouldn’t be inventing a system.
     • Structure and Content need to involve common people
       • structure needs to attend content
     • content may be less interested in structure (til its done)
   • Registry maintenance allows for
     • should include items being kicked out

3. Scope and structure of standard to be developed

4. Housekeeping

5. Other business

5. Next week
   • Formalized registry vs less formal way to include things.
     • structure
     • separate overall group for collection of needs and prefe

Adjournment
   • at 20:05 UTC