November 2-3, 2011 Mets Board Meeting
DLF Fall Forum
Baltimore, MD USA

Attending Board Members: Brian Tingle, Clay Redding, Betsy McKelvey (recording), Jenn Riley, Jukka Kervinen (by phone), Leah Prescott, Nancy Hoebelheinrich (by phone), Richard Gartner (by phone), Robin Wendler, Terry Catapano (by phone), Thomas Habing

Additional Attendees: Daniel Lanz (Managing Director of CCS), Tip Ros Chantrabot (System Engineer CCS)

Teleconference schedule
All calls are on Thursdays at 11 am EST. The interval between calls is usually six weeks. However, due to daylights savings, there is a **seven week interval** between the February and March calls.

- Thursday, December 1
- Thursday, January 5
- Thursday, February 9
    - Note: Sunday, March 11 (Daylight Savings Time Begins U.S.)
    - Note: Sunday, March 25 (Daylight Savings Time Begins Europe)
- Thursday, March 29 (7 weeks after Feb 9.)
- Thursday, May 3
- Thursday, June 14

Vacant board seats
Nancy sent Betsy the language used in past calls for Board members, Betsy will send out a call for new board members.

METS Profile 2.0 Stylesheet
Tom proposed that we use as the starting point an XSLT that we developed for the two UIUC registered profiles: http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets/profiles/00000015.xml and http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets/profiles/00000016.xml. This XSLT is currently invoked in the client when you go to either of the above two URLs. The consensus was that we should use some variation of this stylesheet for both the old and new profiles. There was some discussion as to whether we should just rely on client-side processing to invoke the stylesheet, and there was also some discussion as to how much attention needs to be paid to conforming to LoC's web site visual appearance.

Swedish National Archives METS 1.10 Change Requests
The Swedish National Archives recently submitted four change requests. Tom presented a brief powerpoint describing each of the requests.

One of the requests was approved:
1. [Add EAC-CPF in the value list for MDTYPE](#)

Next steps for approved request: Tom will follow up with the Archives requesting use cases, testing, etc.

Three requests were tabled until February because they are significant and hinge on a broader METS 2.0 discussion:
1. [Add repeatable element altRecordType in metsHdr](#)
2. [Add format attributes to mdRef and file elements](#)
3. [Add status attribute to fileGrp, file, Flocat and Fcontent elements](#)

Member/Guest Updates

Illinois Use of Premis in Medusa Repository (Tom)

Tom reported that at Illinois they are starting to gravitate towards PREMIS, rather than METS. They are currently using PREMIS for [Medusa](#), a preservation repository they are building based on Hydra and Fedora. The access repository is ContentDM; ContentDM objects are exported to Medusa.

- Modeling with PREMIS is more web like – because PREMIS is not hierarchical, relationships are more web like
- What would normally be a structMap is handled with PREMIS linking objects.

Two documents ([PREMIS Controlled Vocabulary](#) and [PREMIS Package Layout](#)) include further information about Illinois'use of PREMIS in the Medusa project. In particular look at how PREMIS is being used for representing relationships between objects. Some sample SIPs that use our PREMIS-based model are in these zip files: [http://lugh.grainger.uiuc.edu/africanmaps.zip](#) and [http://lugh.grainger.uiuc.edu/HistoricalMapsOnline.zip](#). The first is about 400 MB and the second about 2 GB.

Jenn noted that this makes sense, she prefers METS for exchange, rather than for internal storage.

Jenn also wondered how metadata is kept in sync between ContentDM and the Medusa repository.

Jukka wondered if there were more complex objects than the ones shown in the examples.

Tom indicated that with PREMIS you can model very complex objects using linking. Tom is using linked lists for sequence. Medusa uses the DLF Aquifer Assets.

The Highest Level Reason for the Illinois approach is as follows: it's simplifying to have a single base model which is PREMIS in this case.

Medusa was compared to BagIt.

Brian sees a need to really be able to plug and play access systems.

Tom has felt embedding PREMIS in METS is a bit kludgy – pick one or the other – in this case, PREMIS for a preservation repository. You'd want to be able to do a round trip to access systems.

RAMLET Work – Nancy
Nancy gave a [presentation](#) on the work she has been doing with RAMLET.

[RAMLET](#) is an initiative of the IEEE Learning Technology Standards committee. Its goal was to create a language to translate one aggregation format into another. Nancy compared the key RAMLET classes/subclasses to their corresponding METS elements and attributes.

RAMLET may provide a useful data model for our discussions on the future of METS.

PREMIS RDF Ontology Sébastien
Clay presented a [powerpoint](#) created by Sébastien on PREMIS OWL key decisions and possible relationship with the future of METS.

METS/ALTO Use Cases Daniel Lanz and Tip Ros Chantrabot
Daniel and Tip presented a [survey](#) on the size and scope of CCS client projects. The survey was initially undertaken as a result of the ALTO board's effort to identify where ALTO is being used and to outline use cases.

As the standard docWORKS application output includes both METS and ALTO, the survey affects both boards.

What METS needs to worry about

Jenn's sense of where repositories and digital libraries are going:
* Small apps loosely joined
* **Data moves between them**

Brian: **structMap is where METS has a niche**

Terry: wouldn't overlook the fileSec. It's weakness is in semantics of use, type values. It's unclear what use and type really mean.

Brainstorm on the Future of METS

Ideas from past teleconferences were reviewed.
- Formal Vocabulary
- Endorsed Profile
- Data Model

A brainstorming session followed around the question "what needs improvement in METS?" The suggestions were recorded on sticky notes and arranged into an affinity diagram that can be viewed at: http://linoit.com/groups/METS%20Board/canvases/METS%20Board

Alternatively, the diagram can be reviewed from https://wfs.bc.edu/mckelvee/METS%20Board.html

The affinity items will be discussed at the next teleconference.

Teleconference Evaluation

Plus
- Convenience
- Screen sharing
- Even participation
- Meetings end on time (75 minutes scheduled)

Minus
- More prep is needed ahead of time
- Conferencing system:
    - Replace ready talk with skype?
    - Try adobe connect pro (offer from Jukka) Screensharing?
    - Try LC conference bridgy?
- Round robin update not usually useful
- Frequency – change to every 4 weeks?
- Use lists better
- Use wiki better