PREMIS Editorial Committee Conference Call Notes

20 March 2008

<u>In attendance:</u> Rebecca Guenther, Priscilla Caplan, Zhiwu Xie, Markus Enders, Steve Bordwell,

Bill Leonard (notes).

<u>Regrets:</u> Olaf Brandt, Angela Dappert

<u>Object Characteristics Extension Option A or B</u>

```
Option A. Put objectCharacteristicsExtension at the same level as
objectCharacteristics:
 1.5  objectCharacteristics (M, R)
      1.5.1 compositionLevel (M, NR)
      1.5.2 fixity (O,R)
      1.5.3 size (O, NR)
      1.5.4 format (M, R)
      1.5.5   creatingApplication (O, R)
      1.5.6 inhibitors (O, R)
 1.6 objectCharacteristicsExtension
   (O, R)
could also be called otherObjectCharacteristics OR go back to:
additionalObjectCharacteristics
to make it clear that it is different from other extensions (since it
is
only intended to supplement for other types of information not in
PREMIS)
Advantage of this approach: it would be applicable to representations
if we want to keep that flexibility for externally defined extensions.


Option B. Nest objectCharacteristics Extension under
 objectCharacterisitcs:

 1.5     objectCharacteristics (M, R)
         1.5.1 compositionLevel (M, NR)
         1.5.2   fixity (O,R)
         1.5.3   size (O, NR)
         1.5.4   format (M, R)
         1.5.5   creatingApplication (O, R)
         1.5.6   inhibitors (O, R)
       1.5.7   objectCharacteristicsExtension (O, R)
```

The following questions were raised:

Is there a reason to take representation outside of objectCharacteristics? Are there any elements

in objectCharacteristics which would be used by representations.

It was also noted that other schemas do not have the concept of a representation. It was also noted that many EC members have changed their votes over the past few days. At this meeting, most favoured option B. Nobody spoke in favour of option A.

Decision: It was agreed to use Option B.

Name of Object Characteristics Extension

The question was whether to call the extension: objectCharacteristicsExtension, otherObjectCharacteristicsExtension or additionalObjectCharacteristics. Priscilla had also sent a message to the PEC list which suggested a new container, formatSpecificMetadata to make it clear that the extension is not a replacement for any mandatory PREMIS elements.

Rebecca did not see the need for both a container and an extension element. This situation is similar to keyInformation which is a container that takes anything.

Rebecca proposed calling the new element additionalObjectCharacteristics.

Zhiwu noted that extension containers should be at the child level while "additional" containers should be at the same level.

Most of the group supported the name objectCharacteristicsExtension as element 1.5.7.

Draft of date time format extended schema

Ray Denenburg from the Library of Congress sent a paper to the PEC explaining the background, reasoning and analysis leading to the definition of the date and time format schema.

http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0803&L=premis-ec&T=0&X=24886252A7F97DEFA9&P=10221

This schema is envisioned to be utilized in any schema which require dates and times to conform to ISO 8601. Priscilla suggested that LC decide on a name for the schema and publish it, so that the PREMIS Data Dictionary can be revised accordingly. LC plans to take this schema to the W3C.

Revision of Data Dictionary

The final version of the data dictionary will be available for a final review early next week.

The schema can probably be released in draft form very soon.

Notetaker's addition As of March 24, the final version is available at:

http://pec.lib.uchicago.edu:8888/pec/uploads/1/premis-vers2_Final_review_copy_20080324_wt_markup.doc

Other Business

Priscilla asked whether anyone has heard of the Producer Archive Interface Specification and considered its relevance to PREMIS.

Next Call

The date and time of the next call is to be determined.