

CDAP Comparison Rubric for UB Meeting Barcelona 2007

Documents reviewed and review materials from Manzanillo at [2]

DCAP response by Sarah Shreeves and Muriel [5]

Usage Board review [1]	DCAP Response and additional changes [5]	Evidence found for revision	Comments or evidence to the contrary
<p>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.</p>	<p>We have attempted to clarify the data model by making clear that, while derived from the AMCC model, it does stand on its own.</p> <p>After discussions with the task force, we clarified that the data model does stand on its own and, although it is derived from the Analytical Model of Collections and their Catalogues, there are not dependencies. External references to the Analytical Model of Collections and their Catalogues have been removed and a simple reference to the model has been left. The relationships between entities have been described. The correspondences between the relationships represented in the data model and the DC Collections AP properties have been listed. See the introduction to the Application Profile.</p>		<p>Footnote #1 page 54.</p> <p>jtt: They say in this note that their model is derived from [7] and [8] claiming it both a subset and a simplification of the model. I would suggest stronger wording claiming what they claim here in the second column to the left.</p>
<p>The document should include a summary statement of the purpose and scope of the CDAP.</p>	<p>A new section "Purpose and Scope" has been added to the Application Profile. It describes the objectives and scope of the profile. It clearly defines that the profile can be used to describe either collections as aggregations of physical or digital resources or catalogs or indices as collections as aggregations of metadata that describe a collection.</p>	<p>pg. 9 in [9]</p>	
<p>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</p>	<p>After discussions among members of the task force, it did not appear necessary to create two distinct profiles. However, the terminology has been clarified to avoid possible confusions. Whenever possible specific statements have been made for the use of the DC Collections AP for collections or for the use of DC Collections AP for collections descriptions. The collection descriptions have been renamed to avoid</p>	<p>Model: pg. 10 and 11 in [9].</p> <p>Properties listing: Pg. 13 for</p>	

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.	confusions.	Describing a Collection and pg. 32 for Describing a Catalogue or Index in [9]	
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.	<p>We have attempted to clarify "collection-description" by recategorizing "collection-description" as "catalogue or index", and making the necessary changes to the vocabulary terms and classes.</p> <p>The term "collection-description" has been replaced by "Catalogues or Indices". This term encompasses a range of non-unitary finding aids including, catalogues, finding aids, and indexes. This label covers more adequately the intended scope of the application profile. In addition, we deleted the class http://purl.org/cld/cdtype/UnitaryFindingAid because, as Pete Johnston points out, the DC Collections Application Profile does not support the description of UnitaryFindingAids, it supports the creation of UnitaryFindingAids. We also asserted that the three classes, HierarchicFindingAid, IndexingFindingAid, and AnalyticFindingAid, are subclasses of http://purl.org/cld/cdtype/CatalogueOrIndex. We think that this has helped to clarify the terminology and model.</p>		
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.	The reference to "Content" has been removed. The definition for item is: A physical or digital resource.	pg. 10 in [9]	Location is still problematic
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.	We have tried to extract the reliance on the AMCC document for the data model and include necessary definitions. It would be useful to know if there are other references that need clarification.		
	The profile itself has been renamed "Dublin Core Collections		

	Application Profile". This better reflects the resource that the AP is meant to describe (collections).		
	In addition we have made minor modifications to update the profile (for example, aligning the definitions and labels for dcterms with the most current document).		
“Provisional Report of DCMI UB Review of DC CD AP” by Pete Johnston – items presented here do not overlap with Usage Board review [6]		Evidence found of revision	Comments or evidence to the contrary
- Concept of Location is not well defined for Digital Collections. Suggest limiting is-Located-At relationship to case of Collections of Physical Items (i.e. two slightly different data models for Physical Collection and Digital Collection)			jtt: No acknowledgement of the difference between physical and digital collections in location.
- Some lack of specificity in use of VES/SES (e.g. Size/dcterms:extent), requirement for value strings (e.g. Location/cld:isLocatedAt)			

References

- [1] <http://dublincore.org/usageboardwiki/CdapFeedback>
- [2] <http://dublincore.org/usage/meetings/2006/09/manzanillo/profile-cdap/html/>
- [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>
- [5] <http://dublincore.org/usageboardwiki/AgendaBarcelonaCDAP>
- [6] <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A2=ind0611&L=dc-collections&P=60>
- [7] Heaney, Michael. An Analytical Model of Collections and their Catalogues <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/rsdp/model/>
- [8] Heaney, Michael. Users and Information Resources: An Extension of the Analytical Model of Collections and their Catalogues into Usage and Transactions <http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/cd-focus/model-ext/>
- [9] <http://dublincore.org/usageboardwiki/AgendaBarcelonaCDAP?action=AttachFile&do=get&target=2007-03-17.barcelona-cdap.pdf>