

**PREMIS Editorial Committee Call Notes**  
**June 16, 2011**

PRESENT: Rebecca Guenther (chair), Yair Brama, Karin Bredenberg, Priscilla Caplan (recorder), Angela Di Iorio, Karsten Huth, David Lake, Sébastien Peyrard, Robert Sharpe, Sally Vermaaten, Kate Zwaard

REGRETS: Brian Lavoie, Marcus Enders, Rob Wolfe, Angela Dappert, Noreen Hill

1. Brief report on Archiving 2011

Kate, Priscilla and David participated in a Short Course on PREMIS at IS&T Archiving 2011. Kate reported that most attendees were implementing, planning to implement, or teaching PREMIS. For the first time we had some iSchool faculty. We got a lot of good questions but not anything that needed to be brought back to the EC. The case studies were the best part, showing a lot of variety; however, the same parts of PREMIS (rights, environment) were not used by any of them.

2. Brief report on PREMIS OWL ontology

Rebecca reported that a subgroup working on OWL consisting of Sébastien, Sam Coppens (Ghent University), Rebecca, Tom Creighton (Family Search) and Kevin Ford (LC) has been holding conference calls for a while. They plan to release a draft version in a couple of weeks. There will be an introductory document with the purpose of the ontology and how it differs from the Data Dictionary (for example, RDF identifiers are different). It also brings in controlled vocabularies at id.loc.gov. There are lots of proponents of RDF so this will give us an opportunity to see how they like it.

Sébastien noted that it would be easier to get feedback if people know what they want to do with PREMIS and RDF, and if they want to try different modeling options. Rebecca noted that PRONOM is coming out with an RDF version soon and we could link from PREMIS descriptions directly into the PRONOM registry.

3. Changes for webarchives; previous message on list:

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind1105&L=premis-ec&T=0&X=4D99E528621927AF99&P=708>

Although this is third on the agenda, it was discussed last and the group ran out of time before getting to the second of the two proposals. That will be made the first agenda item for our next meeting.

The first proposal is to add a semantic unit for “version of application” in Agent information for software agents.

Should this be a separate semantic unit or part of agentName? It would be more consistent with formatDesignation and creatingApplication to have a dedicated unit. However, since one would need a different Agent for each version of a software application, it could be part of the name, part of a larger agent description that is linked to, or part of an agentNote. Either there needs to be a separate unit, or there need to be good guidelines for what to do.

Sébastien said they include the version in agentIdentifierValue for software that creates or modifies a file, but not for software that does not. Priscilla said that the DAITSS description service does the same thing, but also puts more detailed version information in agentNote and gave the example:

```
<agentIdentifierValue>info:fda/daitss/description/v0.2.1</agentIdentifierValue>
<agentNote>built with JHOVE 1.6 (built on January 24, 2001), DROID 3.0 with DROID
signature file version 34.</agentNote>
```

Karin, Kate (GPO) and David put version in the agentName separated by a semicolon. They noted that some systems may not allow you to use meaningful identifiers, so using agentName was more universally applicable. That argues for an agentVersion parallel to agentName. Yair said they recently added a separate field for version in Rosetta because they felt a need for it.

So just on the EC we have at least three ways of doing the same thing, which cries out for guidelines. Maybe we should create a new entity for software which could be used by environment, agent, and object (creatingApplication).

Sébastien noted that adding agentVersion would not be a real problem for backwards compatibility, because one could derive the version from the name if that was how you were doing it. Priscilla noted if so, it should be O, NR.

Action item: Sébastien will draft a set of Data Dictionary entries and post it to the PIG.

### 3. Rights change proposal (from Robin Wendler)

See:

[http://pec.lib.uchicago.edu:8888/pec/uploads/72/PREMIS\\_Rights\\_Change\\_Requests.doc](http://pec.lib.uchicago.edu:8888/pec/uploads/72/PREMIS_Rights_Change_Requests.doc)

Priscilla noted that the Rights entity changes nearly every Data Dictionary revision because as people start using it, they find things they need. There are no objections to the proposal, but some issues about the details.

Should rightsBasis be inside or outside the rightsBasisInformation container? It would be more consistent to put it inside, but leaving it outside would be backwards-compatible.

startDate and endDate should both be O,NR, and termOfGrant should be optional.

The ending date in termOfRestrictions needs a value for “unknown”. Rebecca will see if the Extended Date/Time Format has “unknown” in it.

Suggested changes need to be put into Data Dictionary form and run by the PIG. Nobody volunteered to do this on the call, so Rebecca will ask for a volunteer by email.

#### 4. Where are we on intellectual entities?

Everyone should look at Sally’s email on IEs.

#### 5. Next meeting

The 14<sup>th</sup> is a holiday in Europe, so we might want to reschedule the next meeting. Rebecca will put out an email.