

WP3 AP Documentation 1

Joseph T. Tennis

Questions:

1. Are the purpose and scope of the AP clearly stated?
2. Is the introductory material complete and adequate?
3. Are the terms well described – what descriptive elements are present?

1. Are the purpose and scope of the AP clearly stated?

The DCCAP Guidelines do not provide guidance on describing purpose or scope of APs.

Assessment

In this AP the authors have not explicitly identified “Purpose”. We do see what the AP “enables” (disclosure, discovery, location, selection, comparisons, access, use, interpretation), and how it “functions” (discovery, identification [three types of identification], selection, and sometimes management).

We also see the context in which these two actions (enabling and functioning) are carried out: in a modified Analytical Model of Collections and Catalogues [AMCC] (which has as its context ISAD(G), FRBR, Objectives of the Catalogue [implicit], etc. – some only in part) and the Dublin Core Abstract Model.

We are told as well, that this AP is for two things: Collections and Collection Descriptions. These would be the scope of the AP.

Recommendations

A. It would be nice to see these sections labeled and numbered in a systematic way: (1) Introduction, (2) Purpose and Functions, (3) Scope, (4) Context, or the something similar. This would allow a clear presentation.

Like so:

Structure the AP:

1. Introduction
2. Purpose
3. Scope
4. Context

B. It would be nice to see parallel construction in Purpose (“functions” and what it “enables”).

C. It would also be nice to see how these purposes relate to AMCC, and in turn to the Objectives of the Catalogue or FRBR. These influence purpose, scope, and context, but are implied and not made explicit here.

D. It states that DCCDAP uses a modified AMCC, but does not list a complete set of modifications made in the DCCDAP.

E. It would be nice to see the words from the DC AP Guidelines used: Constraints, Encodings, and Interpretations (if these are formal categories) as headings – numbered

as well. It seems to me that the *types of resources* (collections and collection descriptions) are constraints on terms – not terms themselves. This caused me some confusion for a while, since there is a basic requirement that all DCAPs do one thing and one thing only: “identify the source of metadata terms used” – and constraining those terms is optional. From this I think there are two types of APs – basic and robust (or some such term). I believe these three (and perhaps more) concepts make APs meaningful, useful, and should be made explicit in APs. For example, Interpretation may very well be a section where the DCCDAP can talk about all its data models and how they influence the interpretation of properties in the AP. They will have to justify how a property in a Collection Description can be an Item (the concrete realization of Content) and therefore has subject attributes (or not) [see AMCC for definition of Item and Content].

Questions

A. Is the DCCDAP two things? Is it both an AP of Collection Descriptions and an AP of Collection Descriptions of Collection Descriptions? Do they both follow (to the letter) the AMCC? Is the AMCC consistent in its discussion of Descriptions of Collection Descriptions? Do we need a more robust model (like the DCAM) of what is being described? We get a table at the beginning of the list of terms, but is it enough, when neither has to conform to DCAM? Where and how do we model what is being described in an AP? And how does that relate to purpose and scope of DCAPs?

B. We see that the DCCDAP is for “collection-level description” which is likened to AMCC’s “unitary finding aid” but then we see in the property collectionDescription the comment that it can be analytic, hierarchic, or indexing finding aid. This seems to be a contradiction of purpose... are we describing the parts or only the whole, as defined by the AMCC?

Conclusion

It seems that the ultimate purpose of this DCCDAP is to make metadata from a modified version of the AMCC. If that's the purpose, then a clear explication of the AMCC is required, as well as a clear statement about what is modified from the AMCC for this AP.

2. Is the introductory material complete and adequate?

The DCAP Guidelines do not provide guidance on introductory material.

Assessment

Over all much of the introductory material is presented, but could be reorganized to allow for better reading. It would be nice to see structure and parallel construction in section headings, content covered in sections, and definitions. Examples would also be nice. The nods to AMCC are incomplete, and sometimes confusing for someone only looking at the DCCDAP. Since there seems to be a strong binding relationship between the AMCC and the DCCDAP more time should be given to an exposition of the salient points of AMCC, including a discussion of what is included and excluded from the AMCC in the DCCDAP.

It's not entirely clear to me that we get adequate introductory material on Collection Description Descriptions. These seem to be a tag on or a by-the-by inclusion here. See assessment on Purpose and Scope statements above.

The reader would appreciate more context and examples as a way of introducing the need and utility of this AP. It also seems to be useful for archival collections as well as library collections etc. This seems to require more than the AMCC to justify properties for archival collections. There is a strong body of conceptual models for collections in archives and recordkeeping literature.

Recommendation

Separate out introductory material for Collection Descriptions and Descriptions of Collection Descriptions.

Rewrite providing a clear structure.

Conclusion

It seems that the introductory material is a hotch potch of necessary and incidental components. And there are bits missing. Many things are present, but not well presented. Some things are left out. A reworking would help.

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

3.1. Conform with DCMI Naming Terms Policy?

<http://dublincore.org/documents/naming-policy/>

3.2. Follow advice from DCMI DC Application Profiles Guidelines?

<http://dublincore.org/usage/documents/profile-guidelines/>

'Terms' are assessed here exist on different levels. First there are terms as understood in the DCAM, and second, there are terms used in the description and explication of the AP (in definitions, introductory material, statements of purpose and scope etc.). The second set of terms (metadata vocabulary, entity, etc.) is neither defined in the DCAM, nor in the DCCDAP. They remain undefined and ambiguous. How do they relate to scheme, schema, and resource, as defined in the DCMI Glossary or the DCAM for example?

Assessment

The term Content is not defined, but is used in a definition.

The attributes of properties are not explicated in a consistent manner. Rich Representation is not defined, but Defined By is – we have a lack of parallel structure in the “How to Read the Tables in this Document” section (which could be numbered for easy reference).

Terms derived from the AMCC or other data models are not adequately described in the DCCDAP.

See #1 above for some discussion of terms, as they related to purpose.

Some aspects of term descriptions were covered by Diane Hillmann. In WP5.

Recommendation

Use parallel structure to define terms, especially those appearing in lists.

Cite definitions.

Define all terms in prose – even those that are citable.