DCMI UB Review of the Collections Working Group Application Profile (CDAP) for describing collections of resources

The full application profile is located at:
http://stage.dublincore.org/groups/collections/collection-application-profile/2006-08-24/

The task of reviewing the CDAP was divided among the UB Members, with a set of questions (work packages) to be asked of the CDAP. Their review of the CDAP, based on those work packages, is summarised below.

WP1   General (Stuart)
"Does the AP meet the community's needs?"

Stuart's conclusion as a result of a preliminary review of the AP documentation is that it appears to achieve its stated goals and, therefore, meets the needs of the community as defined.

Stuart sees overlap between this question and the questions in work package 2 regarding the functional requirements and the data model. ACW suggests this is due to his own inadequate framing of the question which might be better expressed as: has the relevant community expressed a need for an application profile, and does the current version of the application profile meet the expressed need of the community?

WP2   Functional requirements and Data model (Andy)
Are the functional requirements for the AP stated, and does the AP conform to the stated functional requirements?
Does the AP data model make sense?
Corollary question: Does an AP need its own data model?

Andy's conclusions to the first question: "Yes, they are stated. I have a personal dislike of the use of the word 'identification' in the functional requirements section - because that word is being used as in FRBR, and I'm not sure that such usage will be intuitive to everyone.

Yes, as far as I can tell, the AP meets the stated requirements."

Regarding the second question Andy is very familiar with the model, having worked with it since it was first developed and in his view it does make sense. He suggests that the section in the data model describing "'locations', 'services', and the 'describes' relationship between collections and collection descriptions and collection descriptions (fig 2)",would benefit from real-life examples of each of these?

As to the corollary question Andy's view is that an application profile definitely needs a data model before it can be developed properly.

WP3   AP Documentation 1 (Joe)
Are the purpose and scope of the AP clearly stated?
Is the introductory material complete and adequate?

Are the terms well described - what descriptive elements are present?

Joe's comments were long and detailed. He's assessed the AP against the questions and also made some recommendations for each. Joe's comments are attached separately.

On the first question Joe concludes that the purpose and scope are stated, however, he raises some issues about structure, and poses a number of questions that need to be discussed.

On the second question Joe again raises concerns about the structure of the information in the introductory material.

On the third question I think Joe is suggesting that not all the terms are well described. He regards the explication of attributes as inconsistent across the application profile, and says that a number of terms appearing in the AP are undefined, eg. 'rich representation'.

WP4   AP Documentation 2 (Akira)
How sensible are the labels for the descriptive elements?
Are the obligations consistent across the properties?
Do the recommended encoding schemes exist?

The labels look consistent. Akira has a concern about the label for "Collection-Description", which in a previous version of the application profile was "Catalogue or collection description". For Akira, its easier to grasp the meaning of the old label because it shows a typical case. He thinks it "may be confusing that "Collection-Description" is not the "Description" of the collection, though it is a sub-property of it. And it is not just a description of the collection, but also have to be a second collection."

The Obligations in the term descriptions look consistent. Encoding schemes specified do exist.

WP5   AP Terms (Diane, Andrew)
Using the term decision tree, http://dublincore.org/architecturewiki/TermDecisionTree check that each term conforms to the Abstract Model.
Are any AP-specific encoding schemes appropriate?
Are the terms in the encoding scheme defined adequately, are the terms sensible, do they conform?

Diane made detailed comments on the terms in the application profile. Rather than summarise them all here Diane's comments are included separately. However, a couple of Diane's main points should be noted:
- Collection description type [dc:type] is non-conforming
- Accumulation date range [dcterms:created] may be non-conforming
- The usage proposed for Collector [dc:creator] should not be approved as conforming