

## PREMIS Editorial Committee Conference Call Notes

14 Dec 2006

In attendance: Rebecca Guenther, Priscilla Caplan, Brian Lavoie, Olaf Brandt, Steve Bordwell, Gerard Clifton (notes).

Apologies: Bill Leonard, Yaniv Levi, Zhiwu Xie, Rory McLeod.

### 1. *Significant Properties and Preservation Level*

Gerard gave an overview of proposals for re-arrangement of significantProperties and preservationLevel (see <http://pec.lib.uchicago.edu:8888/pec/5>):

1. Divide 'preservation level' into sub-elements 'capability' and 'intention', and sit 'significant properties' as an independent element at the same level as 'preservation level'
2. Have paired elements for 'preservation capability' and 'preservation intention', with 'significant properties' as a sub-element of intention.
3. Separate both 'preservation level' and 'significant properties' semantic units into an additional Entity – 'BusinessRule'.

Discussion covered a number of points:

- That business rules will be implementation specific, so creating a new entity with linking rules may be going too far. It would be simpler to leave these elements as attributes of the Object, perhaps within a container element for 'business rule' (or other designation).
- Whether, fundamentally, we are creating more ambiguity in dividing preservationLevel into 'capability' and 'intention'. Discussion showed that some members expect to use preservationLevel to express the intended level of preservation – the 'ideal preservation state', although this may not be stable over time – and others express the current preservation situation ('capability?'), sometimes with the intention stated or implicit in deposit agreements. Splitting preservation could either increase or decrease ambiguity for this semantic unit. If it were to be split, capability and intention units could be optional (in case either were not relevant in a particular repository implementation or situation) or used as a type attribute to the preservationLevel unit.
- Whether preservationLevel could be eliminated altogether. For backwards compatibility, however, it could be made optional.
- Whether preservationLevel could instead be a sub-element of significantProperties. Archival practice approaches significant properties in a faceted way (content, context, appearance, behaviours, etc.). Significant property elements could be repeatable (one for each facet), and a sub-element

preservationLevel could indicate the intended or available level of preservation for each facet. (It may be approached this way in the NARA ERA implementation.)

- Options should be presented to the PIG list for discussion, but without bias.

Outcomes of the discussion were:

- That Option 3, creating a separate entity, be dropped.
- That Option 2, paired elements with significantProperties as a sub-element, be dropped.
- That options be laid out for presentation to PIG for discussion:
  1. Eliminate preservationLevel (or make optional), leaving significantProperties
  2. Divide 'preservation level' into sub-elements 'capability' and 'intention', and sit 'significant properties' as an independent element at the same level as 'preservation level' (as per previous Option 1)
  3. As per 2, but inside a container element (to be named).
  4. [Make preservationLevel a sub-element of significantProperties. significantProperties could be repeatable to allow faceting.]

**ACTION:** Gerard Clifton to revise options for significant properties and run by the Committee, ready for early January.

- That significantProperties requires development of more structure.

## *2. Date conventions*

Recent discussion on the PIG list has raised the issue of how to express dates that are not covered by the W3C specification for xs:date and xs:dateTime, (e.g. how to express open-ended permissions), as additional values are causing validation errors. See list discussions:

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0612&L=pig&T=0&X=31CBBA629D2C7DE202&P=491>

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0612&L=pig&T=0&X=31CBBA629D2C7DE202&P=754>

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0612&L=pig&T=0&X=31CBBA629D2C7DE202&P=838>

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0612&L=pig&T=0&X=31CBBA629D2C7DE202&P=927>

The current profile (based on ISO 8601) is too limited. Although we still want to restrict the ways dates can be expressed, we also want to extend the range of allowable values to suit requirements (such as allowing 'none' to express 'no expiry'). It was suggested that we stop recommending ISO 8601 and recommend some other profile that accommodates the additional values. Alternatively, as similar issues have arisen within Dublin Core and Z39.50 deliberations, a new profile could be proposed to W3C, perhaps through the Library of Congress or via John Kunze at CDL, although at present it is not clear what should be in the profile or how long this would take.

**ACTION:** Rebecca Guenther volunteered to:

- Review discussions from the original Data Dictionary list.

- Review the proposal for date formats put forward by John Kunze
- Review what has been problematic for other groups on this issue (e.g. discuss with Ray [Denenberg?] re: DC, Z39.50)

### *3. Involving the PIG in revision:*

There was discussion on how to involve the Implementer's Group in the revision, with the following decisions:

- Send a post to the PIG list describing the mechanism for involvement of PIG in the revision process. **ACTION:** Brian Lavoie to draft this message in consultation with EC for posting to the PIG list in early January.
- Set up an area of the PIG-pen for posting:
  - 'Recommendations' for changes – for outcomes of EC deliberations
  - 'Suggestions' for changes – for additional discussion and suggestions from PIG.
- Post the numbering scheme change on the 'Recommendations' page and send a message to the PIG list about the recommendation. **ACTION:** [Brian Lavoie?]
- Redraft the significant properties options (as per item 1), post on the 'Suggestions' page and invite PIG to comment on significant properties. **ACTION:** Gerard Clifton
- All postings – wait until January.

### *4. Revision Progress*

**XML schema revision:** Zhiwu Xie has sent an initial message about proposed schema changes, as well as suggestions on redundancy related to PREMIS in METS, but there has been little progress so far.

Regarding the use of PREMIS in METS, Rebecca reported that there had been good feedback from the DLF Birds of a Feather (BoF) session, including a suggested group of people who were interested in working on PREMIS in METS and could be tasked with thinking about issues and METS implementation. An open invitation could also be extended to the PIG list to participate.

**ACTION:** Rebecca Guenther to summarise what was said at the DLF BoF session, post an invitation to the PIG list and set up a separate group for working on PREMIS in METS.

**Rights sub-group:** There has so far been no success in contacting experts to assist with PREMIS rights. It was agreed to put this issue in abeyance for the time being.

The paper by Karen Coyle on Rights in PREMIS will be released shortly. This can be announced on the PIG list, among others, to aid in attracting those with relevant expertise.

**ACTION:** Once the Coyle paper is released, Brian Lavoie to send a message via his 'list of lists' to invite feedback and participation in revision of PREMIS Rights.

**De-duplication of the changes lists:** Brian has put the list of Data Dictionary changes from the PIG list on the PREMIS EC Wiki, and has been conservative in removing things from that list. Zhiwu is

reviewing schema changes. Olaf has also suggested several changes via the PIG list – the list should be checked to ensure that these are included. Prioritisation of the lists was agreed to be the next step.

**ACTION:** Brian Lavoie to prioritise the list of changes for the Data Dictionary.

As we progress through the revision and open things up to the PIG list, additional changes are likely to surface. These should be folded into the list of changes as they arise.

Some edits to Deb Woodyard's paper remain, which are to be followed up with Deb Woodyard. Additional changes for the list are likely to arise from the paper.

We will need more frequent calls to work through the list. It was agreed that on the next call the Committee needs to come up with a plan for working through the changes. **ACTION:** All

### *5. Tutorials*

**Boston Nov 2006 (recap):** This was a successful tutorial, gaining good evaluations, and seems to be a good model for the tutorials. It generated a lot of interest, including calls to hold additional tutorials in various locations.

**Sweden, March 7-8, Stockholm:** This 1.5 day tutorial will go ahead. Those involved will get together beforehand to see what changes might need to be made from the Boston tutorial, but will largely work with those materials.

There have been requests for tutorials in a range of sizes. It would be helpful to package them as half-day, 1 day, and 1.5 day tutorials. Upcoming tutorials may furnish these:

- Sweden – 1.5 days
- Albuquerque – TICFIA – April [Rebecca & Zhiwu]: 1 day (10am -5pm)
- IS&T – May – 4 hours (will be at a higher level)

There has also been a request for a session at the ALA conference in June.

### *6. Other events.*

DigCCurr 2007, an international symposium in digital curation, is in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, April 18-20. Abstracts close 10 January.

**Next call:** 4 Jan. 2007. Call times as per option 1:

9:00am Eastern US

7:00am Mountain time US

14:00 UK

15:00 Europe

16:00 Israel

01.00 Canberra AU (5 Jan)