OUTLINE

Part I—Usage Board Overview, Meetings, Documentation
1. **Usage Board Membership**
2. **Meetings**
3. **Categories of Usage Board Decisions**

Part II—Proposals: Form and Process (MOST REVISIONS)
1. **Proposals for New Terms**
   a. **DCMI Namespace Terms**
   b. **Alternative Namespace Terms Accompanying Application Profiles**
2. **Proposals for Endorsement of Existing Terms (e.g., LOC relators)**
3. **Proposals for Registration of Application Profiles**
4. **Proposals for Term Revisions**
   a. **DCMI Namespace Terms**
   b. **Terms Accompanying Application Profiles**
5. **Proposals for Application Profile Revisions**

Part III—Usage Board: Internal Procedures
1. **Revision of Usage Board Processes**

{{ NOTE: Currently, we have deleted the section on registration of controlled vocabularies assuming that aspects of this dormant task would be subsumed by the application profile registration processes. }}

{{ NOTE: In this set of revisions, we intend to 'flatten' the process document's section structure to fewer levels of hierarchy. }}

Preface

The Usage Board acts in accordance with its charter under the DCMI Bylaws, Article II, section D. While providing more guiding detail then the broad mandate of the DCMI Bylaws, the following process statements are intended to comport fully with that mandate. Should discrepancies between these process statements and the DCMI Bylaws emerge, the DCMI Bylaws control.

The following process statements guide the Usage Board in executing it responsibility "to ensure an orderly evolution of the metadata terms maintained by the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative." The process statements are amended from time to time to reflect the evolving nature of DCMI and metadata.

Part I—Usage Board: Overview, Meetings, Documentation

1. Usage Board Membership

1.1. The UB will consist of at least seven and no more than eleven people (nine is ideal) appointed by the DCMI Directorate.

1.2. Usage Board member terms shall be for two years, renewable ~~once~~. Initial appointments will be made so as to stagger terms.

1.3. Members should be selected based on the following criteria:

1.3.1. Knowledgeable concerning the development history and purpose of the DC element set and its relationship to the metadata world at large;

1.3.2. Related to a metadata community relevant to DCMI;

1.3.3. Willing and able to commit time and energy to the functions of the UB;

1.3.4. Able to communicate verbally and in writing in English well enough to prepare documents and discuss complex issues in a group setting;

1.3.5. Geographic and domain distribution of members is relevant but will not override other criteria.

1.4. The UB Chair will be appointed from one of the membership by the DCMI Directorate. The term of the chair shall be for two years, renewable ~~once~~.

1.5. Liaisons from DCMI affiliates may be appointed by DCMI management in consultation with the Usage Board Chair.

1.5.1. Liaisons are non-voting and do not serve as shepherds, but are encouraged to participate in discussion on the Usage Board list and at meetings.

1.6. For internal communication the UB uses the closed mailing list dc-usage@jiscmail.ac.uk. The messages are archived and publicly available at http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/lists/dc-usage.html.

2. Meetings

2.1. Scheduling

2.1.1. Meetings should be held at least twice a year.

2.1.1.1. One meeting should be scheduled during the annual DC general workshop/conference.

2.1.1.2. The second should be scheduled at a different time of the year, preferably close to other conferences, so as to make attendance convenient for

as many members as possible.

2.1.1.3. Scheduling should be done far enough in advance so that as many UB members as possible may be present.

2.1.1.4. The calendar of UB meetings will be announced prominently on the UB DCMI homepage and announced on the DC-General mailing-list.

2.2. Funding for regular UB members attendance at meetings should be supported as much as possible by DCMI.

2.2.1. Funding for the attendance of Liaisons at UB meetings should be supported by their institution.

2.3. Meeting agenda

2.3.1. The UB Chair maintains the agenda, which cites links to relevant supporting documentation, including JISCMAIL postings.

2.3.2. All materials pointed to in the agenda are archived at http://dublincore.org/usage/meetings/ after the final pre-meeting version of the agenda has been distributed. After the meeting, the archive version of the agenda is edited to point to these archive copies.

2.4. Attendance by members

2.4.1. Members must attend at least one meeting in a given year to maintain membership in good standing.

2.4.2. Members who miss two meetings in succession may be replaced by the DC Directorate.

2.5. Attendance by others

2.5.1. Attendance at UB meetings by other than the UB is by invitation.

2.5.1.1. People interested in attending should request an invitation via the UB Chair or the Managing Director.

2.5.2. Participation in discussion of proposals by any interested parties is encouraged.

2.6. Agenda preparation and distribution

2.6.1. The UB chair is responsible for preparing the meeting agendas and assigning shepherds to proposals.

2.6.2. Agenda items shall include the name and email address of the UB member responsible for shepherding the proposal through the UB process.

2.6.3. Agendas shall be available at http://www.dublincore.org/usage/meetings/ a few weeks before the meeting.

2.7. Important decisions will be assigned a number for citation purposes and documented on the DCMI website.

3. Categories of Usage Board Decisions

3.1. *Recommended:* Elements, Element Refinements, and DCMI-maintained Vocabulary Terms (e.g., member terms of the DCMI Type Vocabulary) useful for resource discovery across domains.

3.2. *Conforming:* Elements, Element Refinements and Application Profiles may be assigned a status of conforming. Elements and Element Refinements assigned a status of conforming are those for which an implementation community has a demonstrated need and which conform to the ~~grammar of Elements and Element Refinements~~DCMI Abstract Model, though without necessarily meeting the stricter criteria of usefulness across domains or usefulness for resource discovery.

3.3. *Obsolete:* For Elements and Element Refinements that have been superseded, deprecated, or rendered obsolete. Such terms will remain in the registry for use in interpreting legacy metadata.

3.4. *Registered:* Used for Vocabulary Encoding Schemes -and language translations for which the DCMI provides information but not necessarily a specific recommendation. {{ NEEDS REVISION }}

3.5. Endorsed: Terms managed by registration authorities other than DCMI that assert a relationship with DCMI Terms ~~are~~ may be endorsed by DCMI for use in DCMI metadata instances as though they were promulgated by DCMI. {{ e.g., LOC relators }}

Part II—Proposals: Form and Process

1. Proposals for new (cross-domain?) terms

1.1. DCMI namespace terms

1.1.1. Sources of proposals may be: (a) existing DCMI working groups; (b) new

working groups established for the purpose of developing proposals; (c) metadata implementers; or (d) the UB itself.

1.1.2. Requirements for proposals for "Recommended" (cross-domain) status

1.1.2.1. Information to be supplied by the proposers (see table below):

Proposal Requirements Table	
Name	A suggested unique token for use in encodings
Label	A suggested human-readable label for the proposed term
Definition	The suggested definition of the term
Comment	Information concerning the possible application of the proposed term
Examples	Examples of use of the proposed term, making clear what type of literal values are expected
Type of term	Is the proposed term an "element," or an "element refinement" (as defined in http://dublincore.org/usage/documents/principles) [NOTE: Encoding schemes are registered using a separate process]
Term qualified	If the proposed term is an element refinement, which term does it qualify?
Why needed	A justification of the need for the proposed term
Working Group or community support	Demonstration and documentation that the proposed new term has substantial support of Working Group members as well as others in the relevant community. Evidence of such support can include votes held on mailing lists or in face-to-face meetings or positive endorsements from members of the DC-GENERAL mailing list.
Proposal status	Is the term proposed as Recommended or Conforming?
Related DCMI terms	A discussion of possible overlap with existing terms
Related non-DCMI terms	An annotated listing of related terms in non-DCMI metadata vocabularies
Impact on applications	An annotated listing of existing applications that could be affected by recognition of this term
About the proposers	A pointer to a description, in standard form (to be specified) of the working group or organization putting forward the proposal: its scope, aims, a brief history, current status, and a pointer to archives

1.1.2.2. To be supplied by the UB shepherd:

1.1.2.2.1. A summary history of the post-announcement discussion

1.1.3. Guidelines: The following criteria are offered as guidelines for developing a proposal -- they reflect criteria that the Usage Board will use in its decision-making. They do not constitute further requirements for the formal documentation of a proposal.

1.1.3.1. Among the major criteria used for evaluating a term proposal are the following:

1.1.3.1.1. Clarity

1.1.3.1.1.1. Can the term be clearly defined?

1.1.3.1.1.2. Can the semantics of the proposed element or element refinement be expressed precisely, unambiguously, and briefly?

1.1.3.1.2. Practicality

1.1.3.1.2.1. Is the term practical?

1.1.3.1.2.2. How difficult would it be for people creating metadata to comprehend the semantics of the proposed element or element refinement and to apply it reasonably in the description of resources?

1.1.3.1.3. Placement

1.1.3.1.3.1. Does the term refine an existing element?

1.1.3.1.3.2. If the proposed term is an element, can it reasonably be handled as effectively as an element refinement or encoding scheme for an existing element?

1.1.3.1.3.3. Are there alternative ways of implementing the term? Within the conceptual framework of the Dublin Core Element Set (i.e., element/element refinements and encoding schemes), are there alternative ways to achieve the ends sought?

1.1.3.1.4. Needs

1.1.3.1.4.1. Is there a clear requirement in existing implementations for the term in support of resource discovery?

1.1.3.1.4.2. Is there a demonstrated need for the proposed element or element refinement?

1.1.3.1.4.3. Are there existing implementations or encoding schemes, etc., which use the term?

1.1.3.1.5. Fits with other DCMI-maintained terms

1.1.3.1.5.1. Follows existing principles of refinement

1.1.3.1.5.2. Is well-formed

1.1.3.1.5.3. Does not conflict with or create ambiguity with regard to existing DCMI-maintained terms

1.1.3.1.5.4. Does not create problems for existing legacy implementations if those implementations have followed recommended practice

1.1.4. Decision tree for assessing the need for a new term

Decision Tree Table		
Condition 1:	Can the need be solved with a vocabulary encoding scheme for an existing DCMI Element or Element Refinement?	If so, do that; else …
Condition 2:	Can the need be solved through an application profile that references an element or element refinement from an existing and recognized non-DCMI namespace?	If so, do that; else …
Condition 3:	Can the need be solved with a new refinement for an existing DCMI element?	If so, do that; else …
Condition 4:	Create a new DCMI Element (and, if necessary, Element and Vocabulary Encoding Scheme) to meet the need.	

1.1.5. Process for Moving Proposals

1.1.5.1. Appointment of Shepherds

1.1.5.1.1. Each proposal shall be assigned a shepherd by the UB chair from among the UB membership.

1.1.5.1.2. Shepherds should have knowledge of the proposal issues or be connected to the WG originating the proposal.

1.1.5.1.3. Responsibilities

1.1.5.1.3.1. Monitor discussion on relevant lists (shepherds should be members of the relevant DC WG list during the time of consideration of a proposal and are encouraged to join in the discussion to ensure that all relevant issues are exposed during the discussion period).

1.1.5.1.3.2. Summarize the comment period discussion and points of contention of the proposal for the UB, either verbally at the meeting or in writing prior to the meeting (preferred).

1.1.5.1.3.3. Serve as liaison to the relevant WG or community during the time the proposal is under discussion and after a decision has been made.

1.1.5.1.3.4. Verify registration information for the DCMI Web Team.

1.1.5.1.3.5. Prepare draft of UB official decision on the proposal for review and approval by the UB.

1.1.5.2. Proposal is received by DCMI Managing Director or UB Chair.

1.1.5.3. Proposal is given preliminary review for completeness by DCMI Managing Director and UB Chair.

1.1.5.4. If complete and no revisions needed, proposal is circulated to UB members and announced for public comment by the Managing Director. A period of two weeks will be allowed between the date of the decision on completeness and the public announcement of the proposal to provide time for preparation of the supporting materials for public dissemination.

1.1.5.5. If incomplete or revisions needed, proposal is returned to originator, with request for revision or additional information.

1.1.5.6. Announcements

1.1.5.6.1. Announcements of comment period for proposals to be discussed by the UB shall be made in the following manner:

1.1.5.6.1.1. Announcement of the start of the public comment period shall be made on the DC General mailing list.

1.1.5.6.1.2. Comments regarding a proposal may be addressed to the relevant Working Group mailing list, the DC General mailing list or privately to the shepherd.

1.1.5.6.2. At the commencement of the public comment period, proposals for new terms must be moved to the DCMI Web site, given DCMI page headers and a status of 'Proposed term'.

1.1.5.6.3. Announcements of proposals shall be made by the shepherd.

1.1.5.6.4. Announcements will include:

1.1.5.6.4.1. Links to relevant information to be considered with the

proposal

1.1.5.6.4.2. Relevant deadlines for comments

1.1.5.6.4.3. Addresses for comment submission

1.1.5.6.4.4. Information about UB meeting at which the proposal will be discussed, including place, time, and how to request an invitation to participate

1.1.5.6.4.5. Name and contact information for the assigned shepherd

1.1.5.6.4.6. The announcement should ask specifically for communications supporting the proposal in order to gauge the level of community support.

1.1.5.7. Communication Responsibility Table

Communication Responsibility Table			
What	**Where**	**Who**	**Comment**
Proposal draft posted	WG list, DC-General	WG Chair	
Proposal added to UB agenda	UB Website, UB list	UB Chair	
Proposal announced for public comment DC-General	DCMI Managing Director	Proposal announced for public comment DC-General	
Usage Board Outcome DC-General	DCMI Managing Director	Usage Board Outcome DC-General	

1.1.5.8. Comment period

1.1.5.8.1. Comment period on proposals should be managed on the DC-General list.

1.1.5.8.2. Comment periods should be at least one month in length and commence at least six weeks before the UB meeting at which action is to be taken.

1.1.5.8.3. Public discussions of UB related issues during public comment periods should take place on DC-General or other working group mailing lists as specified in the announcement. The public discussion must start at least six weeks before the UB meeting at which the issues will be discussed.

1.1.5.9. Voting

1.1.5.9.1. Voting shall be limited to scheduled meetings and conference calls.

1.1.5.9.2. Voting shall be limited to UB members present at the meeting or conference call and able to participate in the discussion.

1.1.5.9.3. UB members who cannot be present may present their arguments for or against a proposal in writing prior to a meeting (this shall not constitute a vote).

1.1.5.9.4. UB members who cannot be present may explore other options with the chair, if they cannot be present for an important vote. In all cases, a vote may not be cast by a member who is not present, either physically or virtually, for the relevant discussion.

1.1.5.9.5. A proposal is approved if more than 50% of assigned votes in are in favor and fewer than 25% of assigned votes are against the proposal. Every effort will be made to achieve a firm consensus on a proposal before it is deemed approved.

1.1.6. Decisions of the UB are forwarded to the DCMI Directorate for endorsement and approval.

1.1.7. Registration of UB Decisions on Proposals

1.1.7.1. A document explaining the UB decision regarding a proposal will be written in a timely fashion by the shepherd and approved by the UB.

1.1.7.1.1. The decision will include brief statements of recommendations being issued and detailed explanations of UB decisions not to issue recommendations.

1.1.7.1.2. UB decisions will be in a form determined by the UB and numbered consecutively for the purpose of citation.

1.1.7.1.3. UB decisions must be sufficiently documented so that the rationale for the decision is clear and useful in guiding the development of future proposals. This is particularly true where the decision rejects a proposal or recommends further action.

1.1.7.1.4. The DCMI Web Team will publish UB decisions in the Documents section of the DCMI Web site in a category named DCMI Usage Board Decisions.

1.1.7.2. Recommended terms will be put into the official DCMI

documentation by the UB Chair.

1.2. Proposals for terms accompanying application profile submissions

1.2.1. New terms appearing in application profile submissions must be evaluated for compliance with the DC Abstract Model prior to evaluation of the Application Profile itself.

1.2.2. New terms deemed in compliance with the DC AM may be registered in DC-hosted namespaces as 'conforming'

1.3. Proposals for endorsement of terms {{e.g., LOC relators}}in other namespaces for use within Application Profiles

1.3.1. Existing terms housed in other namespaces to be used within Application Profiles seeking review must be evaluated for compliance with the DC Abstract Model prior to evaluation of the Application Profile itself.

1.3.2. Existing terms deemed in compliance with the DC AM may be noted as 'endorsed' within the registered Application Profile.

1.4. Proposals for registration of application profiles

1.4.1. Sources of proposals

1.4.1.1. Existing working groups or working groups established for the purpose of developing proposals

1.4.1.1.1. Designation of application profile as DCMI 'strategic activity'

1.4.1.2. Metadata implementers (established projects, communities or research groups)

1.4.1.3. UB itself

1.4.2. For the purposes of reviewReview by the Usage Board:

1.4.2.1. The Usage Board is interested in reviewing application profiles that make substantial use of Dublin Core elements. The review of application profiles by the Usage Board serves to:

1.4.2.1.1. analyze the usage of Dublin Core within significant implementations;

1.4.2.1.2. assign a DCMI status of "stamp of approvalconforming;"

1.4.2.1.3. promote the sharing of application profiles between

communities; and

> **1.4.2.1.4.** identify new terms as candidates for inclusion in DCMI-hosted namespaces.

1.4.2.2. Application profiles must provide, for each term, an identifier of the element set where it is defined, ideally in the form of URIs for individual terms.

1.4.2.3. If the terms in an application profile describe anything other than generic "resources" (the typical domain of Dublin Core), the application profile must make this clear. This is particularly important if an application profile is based on a data model that describes multiple classes of resources, such as agents or collections.

1.4.2.4. It is recommended that application profiles be prepared using the Dublin Core Application Profile guidelines published by CEN [http://www.cenorm.be/cenorm/businessdomains/ businessdomains/isss/cwa/cwa14855.asp].

1.4.2.5. Each application profile must provide, or point to, a short text that describes:

> **1.4.2.5.1.** The context and purposes in which the application profile is used or is likely to be used.

> **1.4.2.5.2.** The organizations or individuals involved in its development and a capsule history thereof.

> **1.4.2.5.3.** Any arrangements, policies, or intentions regarding the future development and maintenance of the application profile.

1.4.3. Results of review of Application Profiles by the Usage Board

> **1.4.3.1.** An application profile is "well-formed"- if it is presented in accordance with the broad and flexible requirements outlined above. These presentation requirements may become more specific as "good practice" emerges over time.

> **1.4.3.2.** The Usage Board will evaluate terms to determine their conformance with the DCMI Abstract Model.

> **1.4.3.3.** The use of terms related to Dublin Core (such as refinements of Dublin Core elements, or Dublin Core elements that have been constrained for particular contexts) will be evaluated from the standpoint of semantic conformance, grammatical principle (eg, "dumb-down"), clarity, and good practice.

1.4.4. Publication and use of Usage Board Reviews

1.4.4.1. An application profiles that "pass" review will be assigned the status of 'conforming'.

1.4.4.1.1. The status of 'conforming' indicates a Usage Board assessment of the application profile as of the date of its submission for review.

1.4.4.1.2. Changes to already 'conforming' application profiles require further Usage Board review of the application profile in whole or in part according to the processes and criteria outlined in sections 6.1through 6.3.

1.4.4.2. For application profiles that "pass" review, the Usage Board will publish a Review on a Web page for application profiles.

1.4.4.3. Each Review will include, at a minimum:

1.4.4.3.1. Any comments from the Usage Board on the application profile.

1.4.4.3.2. Pointers to locally archived copies of the application profile as originally submitted and (if necessary) as subsequently amended in light of Usage Board comments.

1.4.4.3.3. A pointer to the "latest version" of an application profile held by its maintainers.

1.4.5. Review represents a form of recognition, and its URL will be persistent for purposes of citation.

1.4.6. Registration of 'conforming' application profiles

1.5. Proposals for term revisions

1.5.1. DCMI namespace terms
1.5.1.1. General process for term changes
1.5.1.1.1. Requests to change terms in this namespace may originate within the Usage Board or externally.
1.5.1.1.2. A Usage Board member will be assigned to draft a proposal for a change
1.5.1.1.3. Changes provisionally approved by the Usage Board will be circulated for general comment on the DC-General discussion list for one month before final approval.
1.5.1.1.4. Final approval for term changes without significant opposition may be approved by email or teleconference vote.
1.5.1.2. Terms from namespace: http://purl.org/elements/1.1/ require changes to the relevant standards: ISO Standard 15836-2003 (February 2003) and NISO

Standard Z39.85-2001 (September 2001)
    1.5.1.3. Terms from DCMI hosted namespaces (to be added)

1.5.2. Application profile terms
    1.5.2.1. Application profile terms residing on DCMI hosted namespaces
will be subject to the same changes processes as other DCMI terms, but managed
by the entities responsible for the terms.
    1.5.2.2. Application profile terms residing on non-DCMI namespaces will
be subject to term policies of the host entity.

 1.6. Proposals for application profile revisions

1.6.1. Changes to already 'conforming' application profiles require further Usage
Board review of the application profile in whole or in part according to the
processes and criteria outlined in sections @@@ and @@@
1.6.2. Changes to DCMI-registered 'conforming' application profiles will be
versioned according to DCMI namespace policies.

Part III—Usage Board: Internal Processes

1. Changes to Usage Board Procedures