

Minutes: Metadata Working Group  
January 16, 2015

Present: Jane Otto, Rhonda Marker, Carla Zimmerman, Mary Beth Weber (co-chair), Yu-Hung Lin, Kalaivani Ananthan (co-chair), Isaiah Beard, Krista White (recorder)

Excused: Li Sun, Caryn Radick

1. Announcements

- a. Ananthan – no missed group meetings in 2014. Had all minutes posted online (except for 12/14). Kudos!
- b. Marker – Fulbright visitor will be giving presentation Friday, Feb. 13 in Pane Room, 10:00-11:00AM. Reception will follow. Videoconferencing to TSB available
- c. Lin – Working on Dark Archive. Is moving fast. If approved, will start to work on it right away. Research Data is beginning to talk about metadata for data management, and the Application Profile needs to be updated, so that will happen soon. Data Task Force submitted their proposal to Cabinet in December 2014. Within 6 months of approval it will begin to roll out.
- d. Monmouth County Historical Association will be coming 1/28 to learn to use the WMS for their NJDH project.
  - i. Ananthan – bugs on the WMS custom forms will be addressed in R7.6.

2. Digital Projects List

- a. Master List as of 1/9/15 MWG Sakai – Under Reports
- b. Reports are being organized by the status of the project – completed projects are eliminated from the list
- c. Rhonda and others have given overviews on the status of various projects. Missing metadata managers assigned to projects that needed them.

3. AP Review – Dark Archive – Lin

- a. Spreadsheet available in sakai project ->Application Profiles->DarkArchive\_AP\_OJS\_(date)
- b. Won't be accessible to the public, are for long-term preservation. RUcore chosen as server bcs. of other applications like the Open Journal System (OJS). Will have minimal descriptive metadata, since mostly will be accessed by OJS and RUcore administrators. When a file in OJS is corrupted, the information will be restorable. Will not be a public record.
- c. Open Journal System focus only. Must review other possible applications such as Eagleton Polls. For this reason, the Application Profile (SP) focuses on OJS.
- d. Preservation is taking place at the Issue level. Lower level metadata will be exported from the OJS to PDF and Base 64 XML files that will contain section titles and titles/page numbers of articles. This is all an “archival information package.”

Issues:

- i. Genre ‘digital preservation masters’ is problematic (this is technical metadata, not pertaining to intellectual content, the focus of descriptive metadata; also it is redundant to technical metadata (techMD: generation); thirdly, it is a misuse of the MODS element. Genre is defined as ‘A term or terms that designate a category characterizing a particular style, form, or content, such as artistic, musical, literary composition, etc.’ Unclear what purpose of this is. Decision: Remove genre term and change techMD generation from ‘born digital source’ to ‘Digital Preservation Master.’
  - ii. Abstract and DOI – must have DOI or there will be no persistent identifier, and DataCite requires an abstract (or if no abstract they will add “No abstract provided”; someone could somehow get to the record via a constructed DOI or something, so they will be redirected, via the abstract, to the URL of the publicly accessible version.
  - iii. Author details will be helpful in future for contacting responsible party.
  - iv. If creator is a person, put in personal name. If creator is a corporate body, put it in corporate name. (Do not add to corporate name a corporate body serving exclusively as a publisher.) If neither is available, leave it blank, and DataCite export will supply the value “No creator supplied.”
  - v. Move place and date related to preservation files from mods:originInfo to the appropriate technical metadata elements. As written in the draft, one originInfo chunk is mixing technical file creation data with intellectual work (the journal) creation data. We don’t want the system to be checking preservation file creation date in one place for this collection and another place for every other RUcore collection.
  - vi. Remove descriptive event. This is all metadata that properly belongs in technical metadata. Add a note to use this descriptive Event (with type=“version creation”) only when a new version is created by the editor, i.e. when there is a change to the intellectual content of the journal on the OJS platform. Add note to descriptive event “Do not use descriptive event for creation of the preservation master; record that information in technical metadata.” There is no purpose served by this descriptive event as written in the draft.
4. DOI date issues – Ananthan
- a. Two metadata issues related to DOIs. Problems with some of the roles that are not mapped from the datasets. Discussion of a session to correct DOI date issues during MWG was discussed. Mary Beth Weber will run this plan by Grace to get it approved.
  - b. There is also a DOI date issue to discuss
  - c. Will be done over email.