

DCMI Usage Board Assessment of the Collection Description Application Profile: Feedback to the DCMI Collection Description Working Group

3 December 2006

The DCMI Usage Board undertook an assessment of the Collection Description Application Profile (CDAP) at a meeting in Manzanillo Mexico [1] on Sunday, 1 October 2006. Members present were Tom Baker (chair), Diane Hillmann, Andy Powell, Akira Miyazawa, Stuart Sutton, Joe Tennis, Andrew Wilson (designated shepherd of the Collection Description proposal), and Makx Dekkers (ex officio). This note holds an interim response to the DCMI Collection Description Working Group, short of being a formal review of a submitted application profile. This note includes comments on the Collection Description application profile as a whole. See [1] for links to the actual documents reviewed.

The Board is of the view that this application profile is almost ready to be submitted as a complete proposal to the Usage Board for formal review and compliments the Working Group and the chair Pete Johnston, on the dedication and effort that has been put into the work. The Board asks the working group to resubmit its proposal for re-consideration and recommends the following changes and additions:

1. The data model used for the CDAP needs a better explanation. This explanation should include a statement about how the model in the Application Profile diverges from or otherwise amends the AMCC model cited as the basis for the profile. The Board feels that more explanatory material is needed to assist in relating the data model to the AP where dependencies exist.
2. The document should include a summary statement of the purpose and scope of the CDAP.
3. The Board feels that the distinction between "use of CDAP for collection descriptions" and "use of CDAP for collections of collection descriptions" is a bit confusing, and the CDAP should more clearly separate the two. This might be achieved by splitting the current CDAP into two separate APs -- one for collection descriptions and one for collections of collection descriptions. Editorial decisions of this nature are at the discretion of the working group.
4. The Board suggests the Working Group reconsider the change of label for the term 'Collection-Description' [2]. The Board feels that the old label, 'Catalogue or collection description' [3] is clearer and easier to understand because the label itself is an example of a typical use for the term.
5. The term 'Content' is not defined in the AP, but is used in a definition for 'item' [4]. The Board asks the Working Group to include a definition of `content` in the AP Glossary.

In general, the Board prefers that Application Profiles be able to 'stand alone' as documents; ideally, readers of the CDAP should not need to refer to external documents in order to understand its logic and suggests that the working group consider adding some additional contextual information from external documents as an aid to the reader.

- [1] <http://dublincore.org/usage/meetings/2006/09/manzanillo/profile-cdap/html/>
- [2] <http://dublincore.org/groups/collections/collection-terms/2006-08-24/#cldcollectionDescription>
- [3] <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/dcmi/collection-application-profile/2005-08-25/#dcdescription>
- [4] <http://dublincore.org/groups/collections/collection-terms/2006-08-24/#clditemType>