

Metadata crosswalks / mapping meeting, 4th March 2009

Stella Dextre Clarke, Angela Murphy, Harriet Bridgeman, Lucy Geering

Overall aim

It is understood that at the end of the MILE project – October 2009 - there should be a report with some recommendations for the EC, as agreed by the project partners, and it was envisaged that this report should include a set of "core fields".

SDC suggested that the report should set out, inter alia:

- The purpose of the recommendations and the core fields, including use cases and a definition of the community to be served by them;
- Some principles for metadata management, including the relationship between the internal schemas operated by each partner and the core fields; also the need for distinguishing between metadata of the image and metadata of the work(s) depicted in the image; also the acceptance of each users' internal schema; also how to both map out from the users' internal schema to various key schemas, and how to import back from these schemas; finally these should also contain clear guidelines on the initial setting-up of these internal or 'in-house' schemas, to use existing definitions and not invented ones;
- Each of the core fields should have a clear definition;
- Each of the core fields should have an unambiguous name;
- As much as possible, each field should be based on a corresponding field in one of the standard metadata schemas, e.g. IPTC, VRA or CDWA, and this should be explicitly recognised. The core fields could then be legitimately described as an "application profile";
- As a starting point it would be good to select which of the standard schemas is the closest match, and build on that one, but we should not have to adopt the WHOLE of that schema - we could leave out bits we don't want and lift some fields from other schemas. (The eGMS and the AGMES Application Profiles do this, and SDC left a printout illustrating these);
- the report should also include mappings from the core fields to each of the standard schemas (those above, plus Dublin core, IEEE-LOM, etc);
- "Use cases", or case studies, to illustrate these points where possible – perhaps Richard Butterworth's work for BAL or SPRI – a current project - would be a good examples of this;

- Mapping is not static – there needs to be a maintenance agency which updates and disseminates the mapping to the community on a regular basis;
- Consider adding the IEEE schema to those already chosen for a fuller mapping.

The consensus regarding the first draft of the mapping needs to be redrafted, using an agreed standard as a starting point for mapping from, rather than generic field names. The mapping exercise in the MILE conference usefully demonstrated the difficulties of mapping, the importance of agreed definitions, the difference between the original artwork and the digital image, and also deciding which direction to map in.

AM suggested involving David Riecks, and that IPTC would be a useful schema to map to and from.

SDC proposed CDWA Lite as a starting scheme.

SDC suggested looking at the e-Government's metadata standard, v3.1. She also suggested discussing the proposed core fields at the forthcoming Dublin conference, and perhaps showing the partners 3 mapping options - Small, Medium and Large?