

Ballot Comments and Committee Response
For: Z39.85-200X, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
Ballot Ending 2007-03-08
DRAFT (2007-03-DD)

Note: Responses to the ballot comments are provided by the Maintenance Agency (MA), Dublin Core Management Initiative.

Acronyms used for Voting Members:

CDL = California Digital Library

NARA = U.S. National Archives and Records Administration

NLM = National Library of Medicine

Voting Member	Section	Comment	MA Response	Change Type*
NLM	General	The underlying reason for the No vote is that the revision does not resolve the fundamental issues that caused NLM to vote No on the original ballot for the standard. Therefore, we believe that the consistent position is to vote No on the revision. Although the most important issue in NLM's No vote in the 2001 standard was that none of the elements in Dublin Core are essential or required, other reasons included issues related to the definition for the Title element and the relationship between the Source and Relation elements (which are also addressed in our comments below regarding the current revision).		
NLM	General	Regarding the specific semantic revisions that are presented on the current ballot, the NLM review group found that these are minor revisions with the goal of clarifying intended semantics and to bring the wording of the definitions and usage comments into line with the language of the DCMl Abstract Model. In general, the review group felt that the changes proposed have succeeded in achieving this goal. We do, however, offer some specific comments about a few of the proposed changes.	N/A – see responses to specific comments.	N/A

Ballot Comments and Committee Response
For: Z39.85-200X, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
Ballot Ending 2007-03-08
DRAFT (2007-03-DD)

Voting Member	Section	Comment	MA Response	Change Type*
CDL	1, 3	RFC 2396 (URI Syntax) is clearly obsoleted by RFC 3986. References to it should be changed to RFC 3986. This also affects a sentence in the Purpose and Scope section: "A resource is defined here to be anything which has identity, as in the definitions used in Internet RFC 2396, Uniform Resource Identifiers (URI): Generic Syntax, by Tim Berners-Lee et al., and in the DCMI Abstract Model, by Andy Powell et al." This sentence would be better worded consistent with RFC 3986 (which backs away from defining resource) along the lines of the recently revised RFC 2413 (for Dublin Core), which reads: "As in Internet RFC 3986 [RFC3986], "Uniform Resource Identifier (URI): Generic Syntax," this specification does not limit the scope of what might be a resource.		
CDL	2 5 (language)	RFC 3066 (Language Tags) is clearly obsolete. References to RFC 3066 should all be changed to RFC 4646.		
NARA	5 (coverage)	The 'Definition' section of the term 'Coverage' includes the new term 'spatial applicability', which is not further explained (as are 'spatial topic', 'temporal topic' and 'jurisdiction') in the 'Comments' section. The definition of 'spatial applicability' is addressed in 'Editorial changes to terms in the Dublin Core Metadata Element Set (DCMES) - response to comments', so it is unusual that a clarification was not incorporated in this draft standard.		

Ballot Comments and Committee Response
For: Z39.85-200X, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
Ballot Ending 2007-03-08
DRAFT (2007-03-DD)

Voting Member	Section	Comment	MA Response	Change Type*
NLM	5 (format)	We question the use of dimensions in format, as dimensions are not a format but rather an attribute of format. Also, we question the removal of the sentence "Format may be used to identify the software, hardware, or other equipment needed to display or operate the resource." Deleting this sentence could cause confusion among users of the standard who wish to record this type of information.		
CDL	5 (source)	A minor issue has to do with the initial word "The" in the definition of the Source element. The closest parallel definition is Relation (Source being a special kind of Relation), which begins with the non-parallel word "A", suggesting that there is only one Source. The confusion is minor because the element set does not restrict the number of occurrences of the Source element.		
NLM	5 (source)	We find the definition and comment still extremely confusing and question the use of "related resource" to describe the source. We understand that "source" is a special type of "related resource" but this is not made clear in the revisions. We recommend restating the definition to "The resource from which the described resource is derived in whole or in part. " The comment would then read, "The described resource may be derived from the related resource. Recommended best practice is to identify the source by means of a string conforming to a formal identification system."		

Ballot Comments and Committee Response
For: Z39.85-200X, The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
Ballot Ending 2007-03-08
DRAFT (2007-03-DD)

Voting Member	Section	Comment	MA Response	Change Type*
NLM	5 (subject)	We question why the comment contains the phrase "the topic will be represented...." rather than "the subject will be represented...." as is the case in many of the other elements in which the element name is repeated in the comment field. Repeating the element name in the comment field would help provide consistency among the elements.		
NLM	5 (title)	We recommend removing the term "formally" from the comment field. This term is ambiguous and may have a different meaning in different communities.		
NLM	5 (type)	We question the deletion of the sentence "Type includes terms describing general categories, functions, genres, or aggregation levels for content." We feel that by removing this sentence it has taken away the guidance that was previously present and resulted in a less user-friendly comment. If one of the objectives of this revision is to define elements at a high-level without much implementation guidance, by only providing a definition and recommended best practices, then the standard should be consistent among all of the elements.		