
Attendance: Matt, Brad, Rae, Aaron, Felipe, Kevin, Corey, Jeeyun, Hubert, Sohum, Dave, Derek, Barnaby (TA), Dr. Wong, Mr. Scanlon and wife
Absent: Yuan (test)

- Partial meetings
  - Prefer that everyone attends
  - Hope that more people are active in discussion
  - While it may seem like a waste of time, it is still valuable

- Late meetings
  - Meeting should commence at 6 pm exactly, regardless of whether everyone is there or not

- Progress reports
  - General
    - Content, user and tags can be stored
    - View, upload and search input/output are functional
    - Authoring is functional
  - Detailed progress
    - Barebones video player is functional
      - Controls work: Play, Pause, Seeker, Volume
      - Progress meter turns a different color to show loading facility
    - Search
      - Search interface works and returns results that are linked to video
      - Doesn’t return anything
    - Uploading
      - Uploading files work
      - Text editor is functional
      - You can tag files after they are uploaded/adder

- Immediate goals
  - Available on powerpoint

- Discussion about database
  - Challenges
    - Fast enough to do searching easily
    - Easy to maintain once different types of content are added
  - File optimization
    - Still discussing what format files should be in
    - Need to do something to be able to serve low-bandwidth connections feasibly

- Pros/Cons list about tags and trust (Rae)
  - Content ratings
    - Why shouldn’t users enter their own categories?
      - Mistyped categories would cause duplication
        - Felipe: Could check if the category is empty and alert user regarding the same
      - SW: There are standards out there regarding hierarchical standards
    - Why would we spend time ranking content if users are going to use other users’ credentials to decide the content validity?
      - This would affect search positioning
  - Tags
    - Removing invalid tags
      - Do we automatically remove tags that are marked as being invalid or does the author remove them
      - Author can recommend tag removal—prevents skewing of content search data
• A recommended removal tag should be removed automatically after a small period—perhaps people can vote for it during that time
  ▪ Tag rating
  • Do we want tags to be rated in addition to content? Seems to be overloading (LS agrees)
  ▪ Public tagging
  • Author gets to decide whether someone else can tag their content
  ▪ Personal tagging
  • SW: Doesn’t the notion of personal tag go against the grain of collaboration
  • Can use these tags to place things higher in search results
  • Maybe using friend’s tags to influence search results, depending on the trust network
  • If something is not fundamentally capable in an underlying system, it is not capable for future enhancement

• Other discussion
  o Brad: to calculate the value of a page, you look at the rating of that content, and also how similar content is ranked
  o Features are running out of control
    ▪ Search looks to be going out of control, although it is the unique selling point of the project
    ▪ LS: We should probably now make a decision about featureset, now that we have discussed all the possibilities
    ▪ Should come up with a featureset that is extensible
  o Another important thing is deciding how things look—especially organization of profile pages and such
  o Level of aggressiveness in finding resources out there seems to be lacking. Happy with finding of SPARQL.
  o Deadlines/timelines
    ▪ Have a full feature-list done by next customer meeting (Brad)
    ▪ When do we have users using the thing—what level of functionality do we want?
      • User profile system
        ▪ Should have a functional, but ugly, system
      ▪ Search is a big part—it is defining what all the relationships mean and how they will all be used
      ▪ “Borrowing is good. As long as it is borrowable.”
      ▪ Looking to have people using it within a month and a half
        • LS: A month.
        • BD: It won’t be a finished product.
        • LS: That’s okay.
      ▪ We’ll have a deliveries list in place
    o Going to use the customer site actively
      ▪ Post a link to the document in announcements

• DELIVERABLES
  o User profile section
  o Renderings of the screens
  o Timeline with long-term deliverables list
  o “What I want to see”
    ▪ Storing and retrieving video
    ▪ Storing and retrieving text
    ▪ Feature list—capabilities/chart of what the functionalities are
    ▪ Implementation of tags
    ▪ Profile/home
    ▪ Value system (proof-of-concept)
- User’s guide/documentation (developer documentation)
- Internal documentation (MSDN code comments)
- Deployment guide (Database, IIS parameters, registry things)
- What deliverable each group is going to be responsible for

- Challenges
  - Silverlight currently only supports wmv
    - This will be addressed this week
    - The solution will probably be to store everything in our format and then pull it up so that it is viewed in a standard format
    - Storage options: store original + converted vs. store converted vs. store multiple conversions
      - If you store the original, you can get the high quality back later
      - If you store just converted, you cannot later decide to make use of the high quality
      - The third option is to store multiple conversions of the same video and serve content based on bandwidth
        - The high quality conversion can be stored in the server and the lower quality conversions can be made as they are requested (created on the fly for the first time)
  - When should we convert video?
    - Option 1: When the user has uploaded the video
    - Option 2: When the user is requesting the video