

METS Board Teleconference Summary

October 2, 2014

Attending: Karin Bredenberg, Tom Habing, Jean-Philippe Moreux, Andreas Nef, Betsy Post (recording), Tobias Steinke, Brian Tingle, Nate Trail, Robin Wendler

Workshop/London Meeting Admin Wrap Up

- Most of the PowerPoints have been posted on the [wiki](#). They will be posted on the LC site as soon as permissions are received for all of them.
- In addition, there is an abbreviated transcript of the METS 2.0 "[Reactions and Open Discussion](#)" which will be abstracted and distilled after it has been reviewed.
- Tom has received positive comments on the workshop from people considering submitting articles to the special IJDL issue.

Communication Action Item

Post a message to listserv indicating that whilst we are working on METS 2.0, we are actively maintaining version 1 and are still accepting change requests.

Profiles and Change Requests

We have one request to register a profile pending. Tom reviewed the profile, provided some feedback on validation issues and has not heard anything more from the requesting organization.

November Meeting

- Tom may re-do his METS 2.0 presentation for the entire board.
- Betsy will abstract core principles/goals from panel discussion (note esp the following point: relationship to other schemas should be well defined)

Next Year's Face-to-Face Meeting/PREMIS

- We like the idea of alternating annual meetings locations between Europe and North America.
- We would also like members of the PREMIS board and preservation community to participate in the shaping of METS 2.0
- Betsy will contact the iPRES organizers about doing a workshop and meeting at their [November 2-6, 2015 conference](#) in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- We may want to do a joint call with PREMIS in the spring. Karin reports that the work on finalizing PREMIS 3.0 should be finished by the end of next month.

METS 2.0 and Review of Workshop Feedback

We reviewed the reactions and suggestions received during the open discussion section part of the feedback.

How do we get to METS 2.0?

- Briefly step back from data modeling and clearly define our goals/vision for METS 2.0
 - What are our goals?
 - What is the essence of METS? Container/package and documenting complex structures?
 - Is the primary goal transmission or consumption within a repository or both?
 - Remember our history, goal was to stop building isolated digital libraries that don't adhere to standards; ability to migrate from repository to repository is a form of transmission; the structMap is core.
 - What is the role of METS in the broader landscape and do relationships with other schema maintenance groups need to be strengthened/formalized?
 - We want a data model for 2.0 but also want to re-use parts of other models; how do we handle this practically given that other schemas may change their models

- Review use cases, including registered profiles and unregistered uses by organizations including our panel presenters.
- Additional points/actions
 - Commitment to maintain METS 1.x
- Next steps with draft data model
 - Transform the rdf object model Tom presented into a scaled down xml schema similar to the existing METS schema
 - Result: We have an object model that is also useable as an internal archiving format and, on the other hand, we have a simple xml schema for transmission and the container task.
 - Restated: Tom's presentation was very rdf/semantic web ontology focused. It would be interesting to explore options for doing the exact same examples in his presentation as xml or JSON-LD. For example: model (directed graphs) →rdf triples→[JSON-LD](#). Tom is thinking about doing something like this for an IJDL journal article. Anyone who is interested could experiment with this.