

PREMIS Editorial Committee Conference Call Notes

14 May 2009

In attendance: Priscilla Caplan, Angela Dappert, Rebecca Guenther, Sally Vermaaten, Yair Brama, Olaf Brandt, Brian Lavoie, Bill Leonard (notes).

Regrets: Angela di Iorio, Rob Wolfe, Markus Enders.

iPres: PREMIS event

The committee discussed the possibility of holding a PREMIS Opening Day event in conjunction with iPres in San Francisco, Calif. (Oct. 5-6, 2009). Other organizations are scheduling meetings following iPres: Oct. 7, IIPC, International DOI Foundation and JHOVE2; Oct. 8, Sun PASIG.

Rebecca has found space for Thursday, October 8th at Stanford University, Palo Alto, Calif.

Issues discussed were:

- Name. The name "PREMIS Implementation Fair" was suggested.
- Charges. Charging a tuition fee requires an organization which is capable of receiving and dispersing funds.
- Lunch. Lunch will not be included, i.e. each attendee will be responsible for finding their own lunch
- Location. Getting to Palo Alto requires a train ride from S.F. but there are shuttle buses from the CalTrain station to the university. Alternate locations were discussed but no-one suggested a contact in SF, Oakland or Berkeley. The room at Stanford is available for a very good price. Nancy Hoebelheinrich is looking into other locations.
- Publicity. How and when to starting issuing publicity about the event.

The question was asked whether anyone is planning on presenting a PREMIS-related paper at iPres. Only Rebecca was able to confirm that she will definitely attend. Maybes were: Yair, Brian, Angela di Iorio, Angela Dappert, and Bill. The call for abstracts appears to have been issued according to the iPres web site.

ACTION: Brian will investigate the status of the iPres call for abstracts and papers. Rebecca will issue a tentative agenda for the day.

Questions from the Towards Interoperable Preservation Repositories (TIPR) Project

TIPR has encountered a circumstance which could warrant expanding the PREMIS data model to include intellectual entities. Repositories exchange packages called TEPs (TIPR Exchange Packages). Each package contains whatever that repository disseminates from its stored AIP for an Intellectual Entity. Sometimes that will be a single representation but sometimes that will be several representations. Within the TEP each representation is described by its

own set of PREMIS metadata, but the TEP as a whole also needs some metadata for package-level rights and for package-level provenance. TIPR would like to use PREMIS rights and events for this super-metadata, which really pertains to the Intellectual Entity, but at the moment that is out of scope for the Data Dictionary.

The British Library has a similar situation on ingest when they receive bundles of representations and objects from the same source, e.g. from the same e-publisher. They treat an intellectual entity as a preservation object.

The question was posed for consideration: Can we extend the PREMIS entity model to include intellectual entities in order to enable application of PREMIS rights information to intellectual entities?

Rebecca suggested that since the MARC 21 bibliographic format and/or MODS can be used to record the descriptive metadata for the intellectual entity they may also be able to record record preservation events. For example, MARC field 583 Action Note.

Conformance

Further to his email of Wednesday May 13, 2009, Brian outlined the plans for revisiting the conformance statement in the Data Dictionary.

The community has accumulated enough experience to be able to better inform the development of use cases featuring PREMIS conformance.

The details are outlined in Brian's summary "Re-conceiving PREMIS

Conformance: Action Plan" attached to the email:

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0905&L=premis-ec&T=0&X=6B18DF21CD197666C4&P=1081>

Brian proposes that the EC establishes a small working group to visit this issue over the spring and summer. The goal is to provide a more precise definition of PREMIS conformance and to develop a checklist which people may use to assess their own conformance. Once the checklist has been written, other tools may be developed, e.g. a self-audit tool.

Issues: What is the role of validation? How can the extent of implementation be measured? What is minimal? What is optimal?

Should there be several levels of detail in the checklist, and if so, how do we identify the conditions under which these levels apply?

ACTION: Brian will coordinate the Conformance Working Group. Members: Brian, Rebecca, Priscilla, Sally. Others who are interested may also take part by emailing Brian. Some external experts may also be called upon as necessary.

ALL: Read the document Brian circulated. Send comments to Brian.

Next Call

June 4, 2009

9:00 Eastern US and Canada

14:00 UK

15:00 Europe

16:00 Israel