Report of the Meeting of the DCMI Libraries Community and the DC-Libraries Application Profile Task Group at DC-2009, Seoul

Tuesday, 14 October 2009, 14:00 – 15:30 and 16:00 – 17:00

The DC Libraries Community met for two sessions with 10 people attending each. The agenda was:

1) Welcome and introduction into DCMI work structure and DC Libraries Community (C. Frodl)

2) Report of the DCMI/RDA Task Group (C. Frodl)

3) RDA and the Semantic Web (A. Haffner)

4) Short report of DCMI Libraries Application Profile Task Group (S. Rühle)

5) DC-Libraries Application Profile – Report and discussion (S. Rühle)

1) Welcome and introduction into DCMI work structure and DC Libraries Community

After welcome and introduction into the meeting, Christine Frodl gave a short introduction into the DCMI work structure and the DCMI Libraries Community. The DCMI work structure consists mainly of communities and task groups. Goal of a community is the exchange of information and a general discussion, goal of a task group is the work on a concrete task with defined deliverables. Related to the DCMI Libraries Community is the DCMI Libraries Application Profile Task Group, which was established in December 2006. There is also a DCMI/RDA Task Group which does not belong to the DCMI Libraries Community, but is also of interest for the community.

The DCMI Libraries Community has its own mailinglist [log in to unmask] and a Website at http://www.dublincore.org/groups/libraries. The DCMI Libraries Application Profile Task Group has its own Wiki at http://dublincore.org/librarieswiki/

2) Report of the DCMI/RDA Task Group

The DCMI/RDA Task Group is working on the draft constituency review version of RDA. RDA references elements of the entity-relationship model of FRBR, the object-oriented model of FRBR, and Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD). Delays in RDF registration of FRBR(er) elements, and lack of schedule for FRBR(oo) and FRAD, have forced the registration of "FRBR in RDA" schema. This will be linked to (or replaced by) the URIs for the FR– family when registered and published. A major issue has been reconciling RDA "elements" which are aggregated from sub-elements and expressed as string statements. Task Group members are preparing an article about these issues and their resolution.

The Task Group will finalise registration of the element schema and value vocabularies when the final version of the RDA content is received. The current schedule for publication of RDA is the end of 2009. Non-English versions of preferred labels, definitions, etc. are being coordinated. Work is continuing on developing DC application profiles based on RDA. This includes determining whether a single profile is feasible, or whether several community-specific profiles are a better approach.

The Vocabulary Mapping Framework has RDA and DC as source standards (as well as FRBR/FRAD, MARC 21, ONIX and DDEX). Diane Hillmann, co-Chair of the Task Group, represents DCMI on the project advisory board. Gordon Dunsire, co-Chair of the Task Group, is a consultant for the project. Project outputs will be discussed at a seminar at the British Library, London, 9 Nov 2009. Gordon Dunsire is chairing a task group to advise IFLA on namespace requirements and options, to report by April 2010 at the latest. RDF representation of FRBR elements is now expected by the end of 2009.

The Vocabulary Mapping Framework project is extending the RDA/ONIX framework for resource categorization, which is the basis of RDA's content and carrier type value vocabularies. It will take the same approach as RDA/ONIX, developing an underlying ontology to which specific vocabularies can be mapped. The ontology will cover relationships and roles between resources (FRBR Group 1) and agents or parties (FRBR Group 2), and between different Group 1 resources (derivation, translation, version, etc.). The ontology and mappings from project source standards will be expressed in RDF and made openly available.

Relevant sections of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) agreed at the 2009 annual conference in Milan, Italy, to create a small task group to discuss requirements for namespaces for IFLA bibliographic standards. The group will prepare a requirements and options paper for consideration by IFLA's Professional Committee. The issue of a base domain for all IFLA namespaces and associated URIs was resolved at the 2009 conference. The Multlingual Dictionary of Cataloguing (MulDiCat) is in the process of being represented in SKOS. A "sandbox" registration of FRBR (entity-relationship) elements has been checked by the FRBR Review Group, so all that remains to be done is

porting that work to a production registry (NSDL Metadata Registry is being used) using the new base domain.

The ISBD Review Group has established a task group to investigate an XML expression of the metadata elements of International Standard Bibliographic Description, which underpins MARC 21 and the record formats of many national cataloguing agencies. The task group has decided to focus on RDF/XML representations. The first stage of work concerns feasibility, etc. developing a representation will occur later. The "Functional Requirements" family of models will be consolidated in due course by the FRBR Review Group, including the forthcoming Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data.

3) RDA and the Semantic Web

Alexander Haffner, computer scientist and research fellow at the German National Library in the project Competence Centre for Interoperable Metadata, spoke about RDA and its relation to the Semantic Web. Because RDA is also designed to take advantage of the Semantic Web, it can help to support interoperability of information and library systems and internationalisation in descriptive and subject cataloguing. With the possibility to link associate resources and related data in the web and the use of RDF and URIs as generic means which help to identify entities and concepts, this standard can help to raise awareness in librarians for the next era in information distribution.

But how does the Semantic Web community know that a dataset is reliable and trustworthy? That is where the libraries come in. Bibliographic and authority data in libraries will receive the status of reliable and trustworthy data in the Web. This data then can be re-used by a variety of service providers and can lead to new applications for the users.

4) Short Report of DCMI Libraries Application Profile Task Group

Stefanie Rühle gave a short introduction to the DCMI Libraries Application Profile Task Group. The Group started in 2006 and has the task to finalize the DCMI Libraries Application Profile. In the last year the group worked on a proposal for three new terms – captured, version and holding location. The group also decided to do an essential revision of the Profile based on Singapore Framework and Dublin Core Abstract Model. A first draft of this revision was the basis for the next topic.

5) DC-Libraries Application Profile – Report and discussion

Stefanie Rühle presented the criteria of a revised DC-Lib AP. Issued in 2004 the current version of the profile is not conform with Singapore Framework and DCAM. And the revised version of the DC-Lib AP has also to consider the "Criteria for the Review of Application Profiles" issued in March 2009. According to this the new AP has to describe the following constituents of an Application Profile:

- objectives and scope of the profile
- functional requirements
- entity-relationship model of the entities that will be described
- description set profile – that is the description of the terms, that can/must be used

Questions that have to be discussed in this context:

- What is the scope of the Application Profile, who is the target group?
- Why do we need a DC-Lib AP when a DC/RDA AP soon is on the way?
- Which use cases are relevant for a DC-Lib AP?
- Does it make sense to base the entity-relationship model of the DC-Lib AP on FRBR?
- Are the terms listed in the current DC-Lib AP adequate to fulfill the functional requirements of the revised AP?
- Do all these terms have proper URIs?

During the session there was only time to discuss the first four of these questions. First the participants discussed the objectives and scope plus the target user groups of the AP. Why does the Libraries Community need a Libraries Application Profile and how will the libraries use it? Most held that the Lib AP will be used as an interchange format, used for the exchange of Dublin Core based Metadata between libraries and non-librarian metadata providers. It seems unlikely that non-librarian providers will use RDA-based profiles so a simpler profile is necessary to share metadata with these communities. According to that the target groups are libraries that want to exchange their data with data providers not

only from other libraries but also from different areas (museums, archives, etc.) who have metadata based on Dublin Core and vice versa. In addition, numerous profiles based on the current version of the DC Lib AP already exist. The user of these profiles are another important target group that should be beared in mind while working on the revision. To fit these requirements of these groups a simple profile with a flat structure will be necessary.

The participants also discussed the functional requirements of the DC-Lib AP and the usage scenarios – that is how the terms of the AP would be used. They agreed that they do not know enough about current usage scenarios and that it would be useful to start a short survey asking how Dublin Core based profiles are used in libraries. This survey should not only be addressed to librarians but also to software engineers whose task it is to implement the profiles. Concerning the use of FRBR as the domain model of the DC-Lib AP all participants agreed that this model is too complex to fit the demand of simplicity that was expressed before. So the data model of the revised DC-Lib AP will not be based on FRBR. This makes it possible to map FRBR-based Metadata as well as non-FRBR based Metadata to this profile and fits well will the idea of the DC-Lib AP as an interchange format. How simple the model will be should be further discussed in the community. Corey Harper suggested to use a model that exists of two entities: CONTENT for the description of work, expression and manifestation and INSTANCE for the items the different libraries have. Such it is possible to show the holding informations of journals and other serials in a broader context. There were votes pro and against and the community will discuss this further.

The slides from all presentations will be available at http://dublincore.org/groups/libraries/ in the following weeks.

Respectfully submitted,
Christine Frodl
Stefanie Rühle
Co-Moderators, DCMI Libraries Community