

**Metadata Working Group  
Minutes  
July 2, 2014**

Present: Grace Agnew, Kalaivani Ananthan (co-chair/recorder), Isaiah Beard, Rhonda Marker, Jane Otto, Caryn Radick, Li Sun, Carla Zimmerman

Guests: Manuel Jusino, Janice Pilch

Excused: Melissa DeFino, Yu-Hung Lin, Mary Beth Weber (co-chair), Krista White

Agenda:

- 1) Announcements/updates
- 2) Use of RUcore metadata for commercial purposes (RM/GA/JP)
- 3) Proposal to implement projection metadata (CZ)
- 4) Application profiles (All)
- 5) Tasks in software.libraries

2. Use of RUcore metadata for commercial purposes- G. Agnew, J. Pilch, R. Marker (GA/JP/RM)

R. Marker received an inquiry about using the RUcore metadata for commercial purposes (not clear to us how they plan to use it) from a Chinese vendor. This prompted a discussion about copyrighting the RUcore metadata. The discussion was recorded, and it's available on T:\MetadataWG\AudioRecording folder for future reference.

G. Agnew: Recommended creating a Creative Commons license to protect our metadata. Metadata is creative work; it's organized data, so it can be copyrighted. We haven't had people outside of our organization creating metadata except for NJDH partners. In these cases, people often send basic Dublin Core metadata. Our metadata is considered "work made for hire," and as an institution we hold the rights to our metadata. We put considerably more effort into our metadata than most other institutions. Additionally, our metadata is not quick to produce. It is designed and intended to provide context for the long-term. We occasionally make our metadata freely available to organizations such as Datacite, which increases resource discoverability, but we need a statement or policy about re-using our metadata.

She noted that Digital Library for Earth Science Education (DLESE) was advised by legal authorities that metadata belongs to the people who created it. They crafted a Creative Commons license that enables people to use metadata openly.

J. Pilch: Generally speaking, there is no consensus that metadata is copyrightable. The Digital Public Library of America (DPLA) believes that the vast majority of metadata isn't copyright protected. It's arguable, and people often use copyright to protect their business assets. Some

people believe that metadata is copyrighted and others argue to the contrary. The level of creativity and compilation of data elements may warrant rights.

We need to understand how the vendor is planning to use our metadata. We don't know what the commercial use would be without the actual files. Some questions were raised:

- Why would someone want our metadata?
- What's the use of metadata without files?
- Will they be using the actual objects to which that metadata is attached?
- Are they taking our files and attaching our metadata to them?

R. Marker: OCLC declared copyright for the bibliographic records in its database a while ago. The Library of Congress is the originator of most of the catalog records in OCLC, and there was a question about whether those could be copyrighted. OCLC clarified what they meant by copyrighting the OCLC database. Libraries were free to use the records that they have contributed and under terms of the agreement with OCLC. She believes OCLC still copyrights their database.

***Action Item: Agnew and Marker will draft a copyright statement using the Creative Commons 4.0 license and Pilch will review it. Once the policy is finalized, it'll be linked in RUcore.***

3. Use of Descriptive Event and Related Item policy and the new policy for secondary objects- J. Otto

There was a long discussion about use of Descriptive Event and Related Item at the April MDWG meeting.. J. Otto drafted and distributed the new policy to the group. Subsequently, a question about cataloging secondary objects was raised, and Agnew and Otto drafted a policy for cataloging secondary objects. Otto proposed that these two policies be merged, which was approved by Agnew.

***Action Item: Otto will updated the policy and distribute to the group.***

4. Proposal to implement projection metadata- C. Zimmerman

C. Zimmerman drafted a proposal to add two new attributes in the Projection sub-element. The ability to record projection value, with its Authority and Type, in the metadata will greatly benefit maps description.

Otto reviewed the MODS guidelines and verified that the "Authority" attribute can be specified for a sub-element, and therefore, there isn't a need to implement it as an extension. See <http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/userguide/subject.html> for more information.

Agnew approved the proposal to add “Authority” attribute, but she recommended adding it to all MODS elements. She requested that a WMS release be dedicated to a MODS upgrade and requests that all changes to WMS database be made at once.

***Action Item: Review all MODS elements and compile a list of elements for MODS upgrades.***

5. Application Profiles- K. Ananthan

MDWG has reviewed the Digital Exhibitions and China Boom application profiles (AP), but they have not been posted to Sakai. Marker suggested reviewing the Journal Articles and Faculty Deposit APs at the next meeting. She will update the Digital Exhibitions AP after the next meeting. The group will review Equine Science and Conference Proceedings in September.

Ananthan will review the China Boom AP in Sakai and email it to the group for final review.

6. Tasks in software.libraries-K. Ananthan

There are 16 tasks in software.libraries that need attention. Ananthan urged the group to review tasks that are assigned to Mary Beth Weber.

Next meeting: July 21, 2014