

Qualifier Proposal

Element: Language

Type of proposal: Fast-track

Type of qualifier: Encoding scheme

Shepherd: Rebecca Guenther

Originator: Usage Board

Date of Submission: 31 July 2001

Encoding Scheme: RFC 3066

Name: RFC3066

Label: RFC 3066

Definition: Internet RFC 3066 'Tags for the Identification of Languages' specifies a primary subtag which is a two-letter code taken from ISO 639 part 1 or a three-letter code taken from ISO 639 part 2, followed optionally by a two-letter country code taken from ISO **3166**. When a language in ISO 639 has both a two-letter and three-letter code, use the two-letter code; when it has only a three-letter code, use the three-letter code. This RFC replaces RFC 1766.

See Also: <http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc3066.txt>

DC-Government Application Profile

Title	Government Application Profile
Creator	Maewyn Cumming
Contributor	Palle Aargaard; Makx Dekkers; Paul Murphy; Peter Pappamikail, John Borrás, DC-Gov
Date Issued	2001-09-17
Identifier	
Replaces	Not applicable
IsReplacedBy	Not applicable
Status of document	This is a DCMI Working draft
Description	This proposal is for an application profile that clarifies the use of Dublin Core in a public administration context. It was prepared by the Managing Information for e-Government (MIReG) group in conjunction with the DC-Gov Working Group.

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Namespaces and Format of entries
- 3 DC-Extensions and additions
4. DC-Government Application Profile

1. Introduction

This document proposes a possible application profile to clarify the use of the Dublin Core Metadata Element set by public administrations and in public sector-related applications and projects. The proposal is submitted by the Dublin Core Government Working Group to the Dublin Core Usage Board. The content of this document is intended to reflect the consensus reached within DCGov for a minimal extension set.

Metadata in the public sector

Dublin Core is already being used by practically all public administrations that want to use metadata to improve access to their information.

However, though seen as the ideal starting point, Dublin Core is not sufficient for our varied and specialised needs. It doesn't cater for data security, or the requirements of data protection or freedom of information legislation, nor the need for information audit trails, or the complex legislative processes.

It is therefore necessary to advance on two inter-connected fronts:

- the development of an extension to DC to create an element set comprehensive enough to cope with the job in hand;
- the development of an appropriate metadata framework , including application profiles, encoding schemes and indications of best practice, that administrations can subsequently use to support the proposed extended metadata set.

The DC-Gov working group has therefore joined forces with the MIReG Advisory Board to advance the extension; MIReG is part of the European Union IDA

Programme (Interchange of Data between Administrations) for 2001, charged with producing an EC metadata framework. The MIREG Advisory Board consists of

- * John Borrás - UK Office of the e-Envoy
- * Peter Pappamikail, European Parliament, ParlML project
- * Palle Aagaard, Danish State Information Service
- * Makx Dekkers, Luxembourg, Managing Director, DCMI
- * Paul Murphy, European Commission, IDA Programme
- * Maewyn Cumming, UK Office of the e-Envoy.

MIREG also works with CEN (European Standards Organisation) to help its Metadata for MultiMedia Information - Dublin Core (MMI-DC) Workshop. The Dublin Core Government working group will likewise continue to work over the next year with other interested parties to clarify and quantify the various issues and develop further proposals as necessary.

The extension to DC is the subject of the present submission; The metadata framework is exclusively the concern and remit of MIREG and will develop in consequence of the first.

2. Namespaces and Format of entries

The DC-Government Application Profile consists of several namespaces:

- Dublin Core Metadata Element Set, Version 1.1 [[DCMES version 1.1](#)]
- Dublin Core Qualifiers [[DCMES Qualifiers \(2000-07-11\)](#)]
- DC-Gov Metadata Element Set (DC-GOVMES)
- DC-Gov Metadata Element Set Qualifiers (DC-GOVMES Qualifiers)

Format of entries:

Name	The unique token assigned to the qualifier
Label	The human-readable label assigned to the qualifier.
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1, or DCMES Qualifiers (2000-07-11)
DC Refinement(s)	DC Element Refinements: These qualifiers make the meaning of an element narrower or more specific. A refined element shares the meaning of the unqualified element, but with a more restricted scope.
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	These are domain-specific refinements for DC-Gov.
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	These qualifiers identify schemes that aid in the interpretation of an element value. These schemes include controlled vocabularies and formal notations or parsing rules. A value expressed using an encoding scheme will thus be a token selected from a controlled vocabulary (e.g., a term from a classification system or set of subject headings) or a string formatted in accordance with a formal notation (e.g., "2000-01-01" as the standard expression of a date). If an encoding scheme is not understood by a client or agent, the value may still be useful to a human reader.
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	These are domain-specific encoding schemes for DC-Gov.

Form of Obligation	In the DC-Gov data model the obligation can be: Mandatory, Mandatory if applicable, Recommended or Optional. "Mandatory" ensures that some of the elements are always supported and "Mandatory if applicable" means that this element must be supported if the information is available. An element with a Mandatory obligation must have a value. The "Recommended" and "Optional" elements should be filled with a value if the information is appropriate to the given resource but if not, they can be left blank.
DC Definition	Dublin Core definition of this metadata field
DC Comment	Dublin Core comments on this metadata field
DC-Gov Definition	DC-Gov definition of this metadata field, if different from the DC definition
DC-Gov Comment	DC-Gov comments on this metadata field
Best practice	Recommendations of best use of this element for DC-Gov
Open questions	Problems, notes, open questions regarding this field

3 DC-Extensions and additions

A summary of the extensions, additions and other changes proposed to the Dublin Core Elements Set

A. Additional Element

1. Audience

A class of entity for whom the resource is intended or useful

B. Additional refinements to existing DC elements

1. Date

acquired	Date on which the resource was received into the organisation
----------	---

2. Relation

isBasedOn	The described resource is a translation, derivation or interpretation of another resource
isBasisFor	The described resource is translated, derived or interpreted by another resource

3. Rights

access marking	Item or notation regulating access to the resource.
previousAccessMarking	Item or notation of immediately preceding marking, if any, at time of change.
accessMarkingChangeDate	Date that the access marking allocated previously to the current accessMarking was changed.
accessRights	Constraints or obligation governing the release of the resource.
copyright	Identifier or statement indicating the legal ownership and rights regarding use of the resource

4. Subject

category	A broad or top level subject categorisation or classification of subject areas.
keyword	Term describing the specific subject of the resource.

5. Type

aggregationLevel	A resource type may be an aggregation of instances of another resource type:
dossierType	Classification of the dossier or collection of items
itemType	Classification of the item, file or document

4. DC-Government Application Profile

Audience

Name	audience
Label	Audience
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Optional
DC-Gov Definition	A class of entity for whom the resource is intended or useful.
DC-Gov Comment	This element describes the people for whom the resource is aimed, e.g. the educational level, profession etc. It does not indicate rights of access.
Best practice	This element should be left blank unless a specific audience is intended; i.e. there is little to be gained in terms of retrieval by putting 'general public' or 'everyone'.
Open questions	An encoding scheme is needed and will be developed as part of the MIREG project

Contributor

Name	contributor
Label	Contributor
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	An entity responsible for making contributions to the content of the resource.
DC Comment	Examples of a Contributor include a person, an organisation, or a service. Typically, the name of a Contributor should be used to indicate the entity.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	Examples of a Contributor include a person or organisation. Typically, the name of a Contributor should be used to indicate the entity.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Coverage

Name	coverage spatial
Label	Coverage Spatial
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	DCMI Point, ISO 3166, DCMI Box, TGN

DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	ISO 191115 Other schemes as appropriate
Form of Obligation	Recommended or Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	Spatial characteristics of the intellectual content of the resource.
DC Comment	Coverage will typically include spatial location. Recommended best practice is to select a value from a controlled vocabulary.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	Use Coverage with qualifier Spatial or Temporal.
Open questions	Is there a suitable encoding scheme that meets the level of detail and variety of regions that government information resources cover? Should there be a separate Jurisdiction refinement? Is this really a sub-refinement of Coverage.spatial? Can we have Jurisdiction as a refinement of Creator and Coverage?

Name	coverage temporal
Label	Coverage Temporal
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	DCMI Period, W3C-DTF
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	DCMI Period, W3C-DTF
Form of Obligation	Recommended or Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	Temporal characteristics of the intellectual content of the resource.
DC Comment	Coverage will typically include temporal period.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	Level of obligation

Creator

Name	creator
Label	Creator
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Mandatory
DC Definition	An entity primarily responsible for making the content of the resource.
DC Comment	Examples of a Creator include a person, an organisation, or a service. Typically, the name of a Creator should be used to indicate the entity.
DC-Gov Definition	-

DC-Gov Comment	Examples of a Creator include a person or organisation. Typically, the name of a Creator should be used to indicate the entity. This Agent often has legal responsibilities and obligations, and personal names may be needed for audit trails.
Best practice	Indicate the Creator as specifically as possible, e.g. include not only the organisation but also the section, department or team and individual as applicable.
Open questions	Do we need qualifiers for the Jurisdiction and Function of the Creator?

Date

Name	date
Label	Date
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	Created, Valid, Available, Issued, Modified
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	Acquired, Created, Valid, Available, Issued, Modified,
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF, DCMI Period
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF, DCMI Period
Form of Obligation	Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	A date associated with an event in the life cycle of the resource.
DC Comment	Typically, date will be associated with the creation or availability of the resource. Recommended best practice for encoding the date value is defined in a profile of ISO 8601 [W3CDTF] and follows the YYYY-MM-DD format.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	A refinement should always be used.
Open questions	Do we accept the Date element without refinement? How to deal with inadequacies of the possible encoding schemes? There are limitations in conveying: 1) BCE dates; 2) non-Gregorian calendar dates; 3) ambiguity, approximation (e.g., about, near, flourished, assumed); 4) partially known dates (e.g., 19??); 5) date is unknown/unavailable; 6) open-ended intervals (e.g., 1999-); 7) complex, multi-instance/period intervals. Are there conventions (e.g. bracket, slash, etc.) or other encoding schemes we want to specify to allow for these limitations?

Date

Name	date acquired
Label	Date Acquired
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF

DC Definition	Date on which the resource was received into the organisation.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	The nature of a resource can change when it is submitted by one authority to another, (e.g. in legislative procedures) without necessarily any change being made to the content of that resource. EXAMPLE: The date that a legislative text is tabled for consideration (=date of acquisition by the House) is not the same as the date the resource is adopted (by the submitting or receiving authority).
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Date

Name	date created
Label	Date Created
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers (2000-07-11)
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC Definition	Date of creation of the resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Date

Name	date valid
Label	Date Valid
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers (2000-07-11)
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF, DCMI Period
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF, DCMI Period
DC Definition	Date (often a range) of validity of the resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	?
Open questions	-

Date

Name	date available
Label	Date Available

Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers (2000-07-11)
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF, DCMI Period
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF, DCMI Period
DC Definition	Date (often a range) that the resource will be or did become available.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Date

Name	date issued
Label	Date Issued
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers (2000-07-11)
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC Definition	Date of formal issuance (e.g. publication) of the resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	A unique date, rather than a range, on which a resource was published or otherwise made available. Includes date resource was put onto a web site. The Time of issue may also be needed e.g. where the item was subject to a press embargo.
Best practice	
Open questions	

Date

Name	date modified
Label	Date Modified
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers (2000-07-11)
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC Definition	Date on which the resource was changed.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Description

Name	description
Label	Description
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	Table of contents ; Abstract
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	Table of contents ; Abstract
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	An account of the content of the resource.
DC Comment	Description may include but is not limited to: an abstract, table of contents, reference to a graphical representation of content or a free-text account of the content.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	The description could cover approach to subject (e.g. critique, explanation, beginners guide), reason for production of resource, (e.g. to inform, invite discussion, record events), groups and organisations referred to, events covered, list of key fields (database) or chapters, any other useful information
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Format

Name	format
Label	Format
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	Extent; Medium
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	Extent; Medium
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	IMT
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	IMT Other schemes as appropriate
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	The physical or digital manifestation of the resource.
DC Comment	Typically, Format may include the media-type or dimensions of the resource. Format may be used to determine the software, hardware or other equipment needed to display or operate the resource. Examples of dimensions include size and duration. Recommended best practice is to select a value from a controlled vocabulary (for example, the list of Internet Media Types [MIME] defining computer media formats).
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Identifier

Name	identifier
Label	Identifier
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI, ISBN, ISSN Other schemes as appropriate
Form of Obligation	Mandatory
DC Definition	An unambiguous reference to the resource within a given context.
DC Comment	Recommended best practice is to identify the resource by means of a string or number conforming to a formal identification system. Example formal identification systems include the Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) (including the Uniform Resource Locator (URL)), the Digital Object Identifier (DOI) and the International Standard Book Number (ISBN).
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	Other possible identifiers are the ISO 8879 FPI (Formal Public Identifier) -
Best practice	Use best practice statement as above.
Open questions	Should ISBN, ISSN be used as encoding schemes? How to deal with internal identifiers – we could build on EC work developing a hierarchical scheme for identifiers, adding identifiers for country/organisation/item to create a unique identifier. How to indicate sub-sections of documents and serials, e.g. specific chapters or clauses of Acts?

Language

Name	language
Label	Language
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	ISO 639-2/B, RFC3066
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	ISO 639-2/T, ISO 639-2/B
Form of Obligation	Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	A language of the intellectual content of the resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	Use codes rather than text. Use ISO 639-2/T for preference.
Open questions	-

Publisher

Name	publisher
Label	Publisher
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	An entity responsible for making the resource available.
DC Comment	Examples of a Publisher include a person, an organisation, or a service. Typically, the name of a Publisher should be used to indicate the entity.
DC-Gov Definition	The publisher is the entity to whom one should go to obtain copies of a resource, be they printed versions of an on-line resource or printed copies of an off-line resource. The publisher is also the entity one should approach for permission to reuse or republish the resource.
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	A publisher has certain legal responsibilities regarding the information, so should always be named.
Open questions	-

Relation

NOTE – qualifiers appear here in pairs, to save space

Name	relation
Label	Relation
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinements	Is Version Of, Has Version, Is Replaced By, Replaces, Is Required By, Requires, Is Part Of, Has Part, Is Referenced By, References, Is Format Of, Has Format
DC-Gov Refinements	Is Version Of, Has Version, Is Basis for, Is Based On, Is Replaced By, Replaces, Is Required By, Requires, Is Part Of, Has Part, Is Referenced By, References, Is Format Of, Has Format,
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
Form of Obligation	Optional
DC Definition	A reference to a related resource.
DC Comment	Recommended best practice is to reference the resource by means of a string or number conforming to a formal identification system.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	If using qualifiers, use the most specific one that is applicable. Relation can be used to allow cascading retrieval of interrelated

	objects, especially if used in conjunction with the Type.aggregationLevel element.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Relation

Name	relation isVersionOf / hasVersion
Label	Relation Is Version Of / Has Version
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	The described resource is a version, edition, or adaptation of the referenced resource. Changes in version implies substantive changes in content rather than differences in format.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	relation isBasedOn / isBasisFor
Label	Relation Is Based On / Is Basis For
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	
DC Comment	
DC-Gov Definition	The described resource is a translation, derivation or interpretation of another resource.
DC-Gov Comment	Whereas isVersionOf indicates a ‘linear’ evolution of a content from one stage to another, isBasedOn indicates a ‘transversal’ relationship with another resource, either of a similar or same nature in another language or of a completely separate resource that nonetheless has inspired or been used in the creation or evolution of the resource. EXAMPLES. A legal act that ‘isBasedOn’ a draft legislative proposal and a European Union directive. A press release that IsBasedOn the published research paper.
Best practice	Some confusion has been known between isBasedOn and Source. isBasedOn/isBasisFor allows two-way resource linking, and should be used for preference.
Open questions	Need some good examples here, and perhaps a better definition.

Name	relation isFormatOf / hasFormat
Label	Relation Is Format Of / Has Format
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	The described resource is the same intellectual content of the referenced resource, but presented in another format.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	The described resource is the same intellectual content of the referenced resource, but presented in different physical or digital format.
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	relation isReplacedBy / replaces
Label	Relation Is Replaced By / Replaces
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	The described resource is supplanted, displaced, or superseded by the referenced resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	relation isPartOf / hasPart
Label	Relation Is Part Of / Has Part
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	The described resource is a physical or logical part of the referenced resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	Can be used in conjunction with Type Aggregation level to give a clear description of dossiers and collections.

Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	relation isRequiredBy / requires
Label	Relation Is Required By / Requires
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	The described resource requires the referenced resource to support its function, delivery, or coherence of content.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	relation isReferencedBy / references
Label	Relation Is Referenced By / References
Choice of Namespace	DCMES Qualifiers
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	The described resource is referenced, cited, or otherwise pointed to by the referenced resource.
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Rights

Name	rights
Label	Rights
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	Access Marking, Previous Access Marking, Previous Access Marking Change Date, Access Rights, Copyright
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	Information about rights held in and over the resource.
DC Comment	Typically, a Rights element will contain a rights management

	statement for the resource, or reference a service providing such information. Rights information often encompasses Intellectual Property Rights (IPR), Copyright, and various Property Rights.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	The rights element is used to indicate security markings, as well as legal and other obligations and restrictions on access to the resource.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Rights

Name	rights accessMarking
Label	Rights Access Marking
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Item or notation regulating access to the resource.
DC-Gov Comment	The security or access classification of the resource EXAMPLES: Secret, Confidential-within-administration, Public
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	rights previousAccessMarking
Label	Rights Previous Access Marking
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Item or notation of immediately preceding marking, if any, at time of change.
DC-Gov Comment	Repeated use of this refinement and the Previous Access Marking Change Date provide an access status history of the resource.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Rights

Name	rights previousAccessMarkingChangeDate
Label	Rights Previous Access Marking Change Date
Choice of Namespace:	?

DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	W3CDTF
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Date that the access marking allocated previously to the current AccessMarking was changed .
DC-Gov Comment	Date of the change indicated in the preceding refinement.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Rights

Name	rights accessRights
Label	Rights Access Rights
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Constraints or obligation governing the release of the resource.
DC-Gov Comment	Indicates the legal or other basis which governs public access to the resource. EXAMPLE: Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents (http://europa.eu.int/eur-lex/en/lif/dat/2001/en_301R1049.html)
Best practice	-
Open questions	Do we need an encoding scheme?

Name	rights copyright
Label	Rights Copyright
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Identifier or statement indicating the legal ownership and rights regarding use of the resource.
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	Link to a standard description of rights such as the Crown copyright notice at www.hms.gov.uk/docs/copynote.htm
Open questions	Does this clash with the DC-Lib proposal to have a Date Copyright refinement? Would it be better to put the Copyright statement <i>and</i> date together in this refinement?

Source

Name	source
Label	Source
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	URI
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	URI Other schemes as appropriate
Form of Obligation	O
DC Definition	A reference to a resource from which the present resource is derived.
DC Comment	The present resource may be derived from the Source resource in whole or in part. Recommended best practice is to reference the resource by means of a string or number conforming to a formal identification system.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	Use Relation for preference
Best practice	Reference by means of an identifier
Open questions	

Subject

Name	subject
Label	Subject
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinements	Category, Keyword
DC Encoding Schemes	LCSH ; MeSH ; DDC ; LCC ; UDC
DC-Gov Encoding Schemes	
Form of Obligation	Mandatory if applicable
DC Definition	The topic of the content of the resource.
DC Comment	Typically, a Subject will be expressed as keywords, key phrases or classification codes that describe a topic of the resource. Recommended best practice is to select a value from a controlled vocabulary or formal classification scheme.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	Use Subject if no encoding scheme is used. An encoding scheme should always be used for either of the refinements.
Open questions	-

Subject

Name	subject category
------	---------------------------

Label	Subject Category
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	UK Government Category List Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	A broad or top level subject categorisation or classification of subject areas.
DC-Gov Comment	Differs from Subject Keyword in that it requires a broad heading not a specific subject descriptor. This will be used for browsing systems (Yahoo-type categories) and other circumstances where only a broad heading is needed. It should be possible to use Keyword and Category in conjunction, e.g. to search all items in a given category with given keywords.
Best practice	Value to be taken from either framework-specific or organisation specific taxonomy.
Open questions	Coincides with the proposed DC-Lib Subject Classification refinement. Prefer 'Category' as 'Classification' implies an alphanumeric code.

Subject

Name	subject keyword
Label	Subject Keyword
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	LCSH ; MeSH ; DDC ; LCC ; UDC Other schemes as appropriate
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Term describing the specific subject of the resource
DC-Gov Comment	Entry would contain the subject to be found at the lowest level of granularity available in a controlled vocabulary or thesaurus and descriptive of the subject matter of the resource.
Best practice	Term from a thesaurus or similar controlled vocabulary.
Open questions	Coincides with the proposed DC-Lib Subject Keyword. Requires a specific subject descriptor rather than broad heading. Will be used to aid the mapping of multiple thesauri.

Title

Name	title
Label	Title
Choice of Namespace:	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	Alternative
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	Alternative

DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Mandatory
DC Definition	A name given to the resource.
DC Comment	Typically, a title will be a name by which the resource is formally known.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	For alternative title add any form of the title used as a substitute or alternative to the formal title of the resource, including abbreviations.
Best practice	Drop initial articles if present
Open questions	-

Type

Name	type
Label	Resource Type
Choice of Namespace	DCMES version 1.1
DC Refinement(s)	-
DC-Gov Refinement(s)	-
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	DCMI Type
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	DCMI Type Other schemes as appropriate
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	The nature or genre of the content of the resource.
DC Comment	Type includes terms describing general categories, functions, genres, or aggregation levels for content. Recommended best practice is to select a value from a controlled vocabulary. To describe the physical or digital manifestation of the resource, use the Format element.
DC-Gov Definition	-
DC-Gov Comment	-
Best practice	Use a controlled list and identify the source with encoding scheme.
Open questions	Do we accept the Type element in a unqualified (unencoded) form?

Name	type aggregationLevel
Label	Type Aggregation Level
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	Collection; Dossier; Item
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	A resource type may be an aggregation of instances of another resource type.

DC-Gov Comment	<p>This element allows searches to be restricted to records at a particular level of aggregation. It also controls the management actions which may be taken on the record(s).</p> <p>It should be worked in conjunction with Relation HasPart. This refinement describes where in the collection hierarchy, if anywhere, a resource sits; the relation indicates what, if any other resources also belong in that hierarchy.</p> <p>Note that it is possible for a 'Folder' or 'collection' level description to exist for a resource which is empty, i.e. it contains no parts. In this instance the hasPart relation would not indicate the level. Nor is it possible to limit a search by Level by using hasPart.</p> <p>The entry indicates the level of aggregation.</p>
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	type dossierType
Label	Type Dossier Type
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	A number of items gathered together into one container or folder.
DC-Gov Definition	Classification of the dossier or collection.
DC-Gov Comment	An example encoding scheme (as used by UK) is Policy; Case; Parliamentary Question; Minister's Case.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Name	type itemType
Label	Type Item Type
Choice of Namespace:	?
DC Encoding Scheme(s)	-
DC-Gov Encoding Scheme(s)	-
Form of Obligation	Recommended
DC Definition	-
DC Comment	-
DC-Gov Definition	Classification of the item, file or document.
DC-Gov Comment	An encoding scheme for government item types will be developed by the MIREG project.
Best practice	-
Open questions	-

Proposed Section 3.3. Criteria for Evaluation of Proposals

3.3.1. Clarity

3.3.1.1. Can the term be clearly defined?

3.3.1.2. Can the semantics of the proposed element or element qualifier be expressed precisely, unambiguously, and briefly?

3.3.2. Practicality

3.3.2.1. Is the term practical?

3.3.2.2. How difficult would it be for people creating metadata to comprehend the semantics of the proposed element or element qualifier and to apply it reasonably in the description of resources?

3.3.3. Placement

3.3.3.1. Does the term refine an existing element?

3.3.3.2. If the proposed term is an element, can it reasonably be handled as effectively as an element or value qualifier for an existing element?

3.3.3.3. Are there alternative ways of implementing the term? Within the conceptual framework of the Dublin Core Element Set (i.e., element/element qualifiers and value/value qualifiers), are there alternative ways to achieve the ends sought?

3.3.4. Needs

3.3.4.1. Is there a clear requirement in existing implementations for the term in support of resource discovery?

3.3.4.2. Is there a demonstrated need for the proposed element, element qualifier, or value qualifier?

3.3.4.3. Are there existing implementations or controlled vocabularies, etc., supporting the term?

TO: DCMI Usage Board

From: Diane

Re: Where are we on the subject of AGENTS?

Date: October 15, 2001

Tom recently outlined three sets of issues related to Agents:

- 1) Element refinements of Creator/Contributor/Publisher -- things like "Illustrator". We have been discussing a way to give approval to a sub-set of the MARC relator terms (see Rebecca Guenther's posting of June 22) -- an idea that was originally proposed in (I think) 1999. Other working groups could put forward other such refinements, but I think this Usage Board would prefer that we point to other namespaces for really specialized terms and limit the refinements in the DCMI namespace to a minimum number of particularly useful or salient terms.
- 2) Types of agents, such as Person or Organization.
We would welcome a proposal.
- 3) Properties of persons and organizations, including contact information. I don't believe anybody on the UB wants us to reinvent vCard as a DCMI vocabulary. If Person or Organization were recognized as DCMI types, however (signaling a broadening of our implicit scope), then this would make other properties of agents into candidates for DCMI terms.

All of these issues make clear that we have, to some extent, internalized, at least within the Dublin Core "cognoscenti" the idea that the three agent elements--Creator, Contributor, and Publisher--must be considered as a unit for the purposes of qualification, lest we bring unnecessary horror upon our heads in future.

We have done much of the thinking on this issue outside the public forums, and before we proceed further in discussing either qualifiers for the agent elements or additional attributes to describe agents (within or outside of DCMES), we should attempt to formalize our thinking on this issue and consider how far we want to take the question at this juncture. Given how closely tied together all these "agent" issues are, HOW we do this, in what order we bring the issues forward, and our strategies for presenting them will be critical.

An added advantage to trying to resolve this problem soon is that the Agents WG may be able to focus their task a bit better and clarify how their work relates to other, related tasks taken up in other areas.

The top level issues:

1. Are we ready to confront “agents” now?

Recent discussion has revealed several possible options for us that might not be as draconian as those in the first “secret agent” proposals some years ago. It’s likely that we all agree at this point that one absolutely essential piece of any proposal must be that it preserves the integrity of applications that were designed to use the three separate elements, while allowing us to move forward with a strategy that recognizes:

- a. our experience with trying to make rational distinctions between the three elements (particularly creator and contributor) in diverse domains where such distinctions are not easy or necessarily relevant
- b. our recognition that our current setup does not easily incorporate agents that are neither persons nor organizations
- c. that the process of introducing qualifiers to this mix makes the difficulties with three separate elements increase exponentially.

Under these circumstances, biting the bullet now looks positively attractive, and continuing to bury the issue more and more unattractive.

Someone (I think it was Andy), suggested that we proceed by “elevating” one of the three--Contributor--and making it the universal “dumb down” for all three elements, rather than introduce another element called “Agent.” This has some advantages, as it leaves us with the most generic of the three, much easier to qualify with relator terms, for instance.

Probably the best way we could approach such a transition is to allow qualification only for contributor, and add creator and publisher as relator terms for role under contributor. This would have the effect of “softly” deprecating creator and publisher, by suggesting that a qualified contributor element may be much more useful in a complex environment, while still leaving unchanged the use of Creator and Publisher in unqualified, simpler applications.

If we can agree that the general strategy is to move forward on qualification of Contributor only, this simplifies the approach to Tom’s other issues. Taken in order, they are:

ROLES

Proposal for including Roles for Creator/Contributor/Publisher in Dublin Core

The Agent Working Group has discussed the elements Creator, Contributor and Publisher and how to allow for expressing attributes of agents associated with a resource. In addition it has in its charge looking at element refinements for these elements. It seems unlikely that this group will make substantial progress both on the Agent Core (the main topic of their agenda at DC-9) and element refinements, particularly for roles.

There is general consensus (particularly among members of the Usage Board as well as in previous discussions within the DCMI) that agent roles are attributes of the agent in relation to the resource described, so thus they should be expressed as element refinements of the agent elements. In addition, the Usage Board has discussed the possible deprecation of Creator and Publisher in favor of using Contributor for all agents associated with a resource.

This proposal suggests that element refinements be approved for Contributor to indicate the role of the contributor in relation to the resource. The following roles and definitions come from the MARC Code List for Relators (with some minor revisions to make the definitions more generally applicable). Role terms would be approved for use with the element, although applications could use the appropriate code if preferred (some, such as Open Ebook are already using relator codes with DCMES). Note that Creator and Publisher are already defined as roles; these would be used with Contributor and would be equivalent to using the element Creator or Publisher, respectively.

The following is essentially what was proposed to DCMI as element refinements in early 2000 (with a few changes), but was not approved because of the perceived need to consider all aspects of CCP element refinements and structured values separately. Other element refinements indicating roles could be approved if needed; they should be taken from the MARC list with the official semantics.

It is proposed that the Library of Congress maintain this list in conjunction with the larger MARC Code List of Relators. Thus, LC would define a subset of the larger list and maintain that documentation on the Web. These role terms would also be registered as element refinements of Contributor in the DCMI registry. This would enable LC to be able to maintain consistency with the complete list. If users require a role not on the LC list, they can apply for a new code/term; if approved, it would be included both on the officially maintained list at LC and in the DCMI registry.

An alternative is to allow for any of the role terms on the list to be used, but that would require all to be defined as element refinement for

Contributor. Since the list includes many codes designed for use with very specific types of applications, this does not seem appropriate for a cross domain element set such as Dublin Core.

Proposed Relators list for general applications (Dublin Core)

Principles for inclusion:

1. The term is not specific to a material type.
2. Only general creator/author terms are used, rather than specific ones.
3. Usage is for general application only; the broadest terms are included.

Term	Code	Comment
Adapter	adp	
Contributor	ctb	Probably not necessary to use
Creator	cre	Used with Contributor
Distributor	dst	
Editor	edt	
Illustrator	ill	
Performer	prf	
Publisher	pbl	Used with Contributor
Sponsor	spn	
Translator	trl	

Terms with definitions:

Adapter [adp]

Use for a person who 1) reworks a musical composition, usually for a different medium, or 2) rewrites novels or stories for motion pictures or other audiovisual medium.

Contributor [ctb]

Use for one whose work has been contributed to a larger work, such as an anthology, serial publication, or other compilation of individual works.

Creator [cre]

Use for a person or corporate body responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of a work.

Distributor [dst]

Use for an agent or agency that has exclusive or shared marketing rights for an item.

Editor [edt]

Use for a person who prepares for publication a work not primarily his/her own, such as by elucidating text, adding introductory or other critical matter, or technically directing an editorial staff.

Illustrator [ill]

Use for the person who conceives, and perhaps also implements, a design or illustration.

Performer [prf]

Use for a person who exhibits musical or acting skills in a musical or dramatic presentation or entertainment.

Publisher [pbl]

Use for an entity responsible for making the resource available
(Note: the definition of publisher is not given in MARC Relators list)

Sponsor [spn]

Use for the person or agency that issued a contract or under the auspices of which a work has been written, printed, published, etc.

Translator [trl]

Use for a person who renders a text from one language into another, or from an older form of a language into the modern form.

The complete list is at:

<http://lcweb.loc.gov/marc/relators/re0001.html>

Rebecca Guenther
October 15, 2001

TYPES and ATTRIBUTES

I wonder why we're separating TYPES from other attributes? It seems to me essential that we clarify that point before accepting any proposals for types based on a library-centric view of the landscape. John Kunze's background document for the breakout session on agents in Tokyo (<http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/wa.exe?A2=ind0110&L=dc-agents&F=&S=&P=739>) illustrates that the issue of types comes up with almost every domain, but in slightly different ways. This indicates that we might want to pursue a strategy that allows the agent work to move forward a bit before assuming that our concept of types should be pursued separately.

