

PREMIS Editorial Committee Conference Call Notes

15 November 2007

In attendance: Rebecca Guenther, Priscilla Caplan, Angela Dappert, Olaf Brandt, Brian Lavoie, Zhiwu Xie, Bill Leonard (notes).

Apologies: Steve Bordwell, Gerard Clifton, Markus Enders.

1. Information -- PREMIS METS discussion group at the DLF Fall Forum

Rebecca will write up notes from the PREMIS METS discussion group at the Digital Library Federation Fall Forum.

2. Rights

The issues highlighted in the 14 November 2007 version of rightsStatement revision were discussed.

<http://pec.lib.uchicago.edu:8888/pec/uploads/rightsStatement.4.doc>

Issue: Presentation of end dates.

ISO 8601 does not allow recording of open-ended dates so the use of the value "OPEN" was proposed. The value "???" was proposed when it is not known whether an ending date has been established, and for when the ending date is unknown.

Decision: The proposed entry for endDate will be revised to make the endDate optional. A usage note will be added to explain when to use "OPEN" and when to omit the endDate.

Issue: Should linkingAgentIdentifier container in the rights entity have the same components as linkingAgentIdentifier in the Event entity?

Decision: Yes. It doesn't have to match the other identifiers where there is a container for identifier with only type and a value, but that these may include the role in the container and not have to bind type and value alone with the identifier container.

Issue: Should ISO 3166 country codes be used in copyrightJurisdiction, in statuteJurisdiction?

Decision: Country codes are used where applicable, i.e. when the jurisdiction is a country. This would be the case for copyrightJurisdiction but may or may not be the case for statuteJurisdiction. Use the mechanism for controlled vocabularies to specify the source of the country code.

Issue: Should act (within rightsGranted container) be repeatable?

Decision: Yes -- to allow grouping of acts with the same terms and restrictions.

3. Renaming "representation"

Issue: There is confusion about the definition of representation in relation to the intellectual entity, and in possible parallels with the FRBR manifestation. Representation, in PREMIS usage, is not defined the same as "representation information" in the OAIS model. It was proposed to float the idea of changing the term used on the PIG list.

Decision: There was not an overwhelming response on the PIG list, and indeed there was some support for retaining the term representation. It was decided to continue to use the term "representation" and possibly to add a better description and clarification of the definition in relation to OAIS and FRBR terminology.

Notes: Manifestations can encompass all instances of that class of object; Representations are always particular instances. There is emphasis on the whole-part relationship as representations include all of the pieces needed to *represent* the object in its entirety, e.g. a web page.

4. Extensibility

Rebecca presented the Oct. 22, 2007 proposal on extensibility.

<http://pec.lib.uchicago.edu:8888/pec/31>

Substituting elements from a different schema, in place of PREMIS elements is problematic because PREMIS has required elements which might not be mandatory in the extension schema. The 'substituted' section might not include the element which is equivalent to the mandatory PREMIS element. Note: PREMIS defines a mandatory set of elements needed for exchange of preservation information. Would such a description be acceptable for exchange? Would it still conform to PREMIS?

Issues: We are not saying that it is mandatory to export all elements as PREMIS elements, i.e. it is acceptable to substitute some PREMIS elements with extensions. We are questioning whether it is acceptable to export a PREMIS description which is lacking mandatory elements. If it is acceptable to replace mandatory PREMIS elements with extensions, which extensions are allowable?

Resolution of this would require:

- development of an approval process within the PREMIS governance;
- development of rules and criteria which proposed extension schemas must meet;
- a strict examination and mapping of elements within proposed extension schemas,

Is this a process that PREMIS EC can and should assume?

Zhiwu suggested this could be framed simply as a schema issue, not as a data dictionary issue.

Can we allow, or dis-allow, mandatory PREMIS units to be extensible?

Decision: PREMIS EC will examine the breadth of the issue by detailing exactly where in the schemas extensions can be used, excluding the mandatory elements. The Data Dictionary may be changed to simply state where extensions are allowed, and the schema will be adjusted appropriately.

Action: The EC needs to determine the extent of this situation. A volunteer will develop a table of the mandatory elements which could potentially be substituted by extensions.

5. objectcharacteristics at the representation level

Olaf presented the discussion regarding recording objectCharacteristics at the representation level, as mentioned in this email:

<http://listserv.loc.gov/cgi-bin/wa?A2=ind0711&L=premis-ec&T=0&X=3419F84222D47401E9&P=2048>

Olaf proposes making all semantic units in objectCharacteristics applicable to representations.

It was also mentioned that it is preferable to record all information about one object together. Angela said they prefer to keep the technical metadata for the format together with the other properties relevant to an object, i.e. to store the technical metadata with the object.

Angela's insight is also relevant to the significantProperties discussion. A key point is that a significant property might be useful for one object, but not another.

Olaf mentioned that a significant property may be a more abstract property, and not always machine interpretable.

Decision: It was agreed to take the approach of changing the schema.

Next call: 29 November 2007.