

[Current as of 22 July 2002]

## Metadata User Requirements Team Timeline/Action Items

Use Case Formats: The group discussed the use of a standard Use Case format for each member of the User Requirements group to uniformly gather and report their findings, which ascertain and represent public broadcasting user needs according to the areas each User Requirements team member represents (listed below). Use cases typically identify actors and actions. For our purposes, the actors are our internal and external constituents, and their actions are the ways in which they access and use public broadcasting data. (See attached, and timeline below.)

Bea Morse, PBS - (Representing PBS Archive, PBS and station Traffic/Ops.)  
Robin Mudge, OnCourse - (Representing educational assets of pubcasters.)  
Tim Olson, KCTS - (Representing interactive and other new media.)  
Richard Ruotolo, PRI - (Representing national and local radio interests.)  
James Steinbach, WPT - (Representing television production and collaboration projects.)  
Steven Vedro, Consultant - (Representing infrastructure and interconnection.)  
Tracy Vosburgh, WPSX - (Representing university connections, local production, state networks.)

- Working Group Adjunct Members: It was reported that an additional ten or so people would be invited to participate as Adjunct Working Group members, to round out the group's areas of expertise. In recognition of the need to incorporate additional feedback while keeping the size of the Working Group manageable for decision-making, the adjunct members will not attend the 2nd meeting, but will participate in phone calls with User Requirements members. It was agreed that Marcia and Alison would provide a list of core questions each Adjunct member should be asked (see timeline), and that each User Requirement member would ask additional questions specific to the discipline(s) they represent (as listed above). Phone call assignments for each User Requirements team member will follow as the invitation responses come in (see timeline). The previously sent suggested activities for this group have been slightly revised to reflect this (see below).

## Timeline/Action Items

- July 19: Marcia sends Use Case Format (see attached).
- July 19: Marcia sends "strawman" (with Alison's help ) list of data sources for review (see attached).

- July 19: MB sends "strawman" list of external and internal constituents for review (see attached).
- July 23: Group sends back feedback re: constituents list, and prioritizes each (in terms of those most important for our work to reflect where known, i.e. the number one Web search is for program listings).
- July 24: Marcia sends back finalized constituents list to group.
- July 24: Richard sends to Marcia a "strawman" list of core questions each User Requirements team member will ask Adjunct Working Group members.
- July 25: Marcia sends the list of core questions for the User Requirements calls to the Adjunct Working Group members .
- July 26: User Requirements team sends back comments/revisions to core questions as needed to Marcia.
- July 26: Adjunct Working Group members confirmed by.
- July 29: Marcia sends list of Adjunct Working Group call assignments out to User Team (with incremental updates as possible, as confirmations are received).
- July 29: Marcia sends finalized questions for Adjunct Working Group calls.
- July 29 through August 6: User Requirements team completes calls to Adjunct Working Group.
- August 7: User Requirements team sends all use case information to Marcia for aggregation/submission to the Data Dictionary Review team.
- August 9: User Requirements team submits its findings to Dictionary Review Team.
- September 4: Dictionary Review team sends preliminary recommendations report to Working Group for review prior to discussion at 2nd Working Group meeting.

#### Revised Activities of the User Requirements Committee

1. Identify Public Broadcasting,s existing and future constituencies (both internal and external).

2. Generate list of possible sources of information regarding how constituencies will use PB data and content (e.g. actual "use cases," ratings, web site statistics, consumer focus group reports, "DTV-ATP/Orion" ascertainties, SABS, etc.).
3. Engage in dialogue (using a standardized script or questionnaire) with Adjunct Working Group members (see below) to confirm the list of constituencies, the likely ways in which the constituents will use PB data, and possible sources of information above.
4. Determine how to express (e.g. in a "use case" format), to compare and to summarize the information that may be gathered.
5. Determine how this group will achieve the environmental review task.
6. Scan/review available information as needed.
7. Engage in detailed dialogue (using a standardized script or questionnaire) with Adjunct Working Group members regarding their generation and use of rich media data. As possible, solicit input regarding authority files/controlled vocabularies used in the disciplines represented by members.
8. Using agreed upon form or method, generate preliminary "findings" for Dictionary Review Group (by August 9, 2002).
9. As needed, continue review and refinement of User Requirements.