

## METS Board Teleconference Summary October 2, 2014

**Attending:** Karin Bredenberg, Tom Habing, Jean-Philippe Moreux, Andreas Nef, Betsy Post (recording), Tobias Steinke, Brian Tingle, Nate Trail, Robin Wendler

### Workshop/London Meeting Admin Wrap Up

- Most of the PowerPoints have been posted on the [wiki](#). They will be posted on the LC site as soon as permissions are received for all of them.
- In addition, there is an abbreviated transcript of the METS 2.0 "[Reactions and Open Discussion](#)" which will be abstracted and distilled after it has been reviewed.
- Tom has received positive comments on the workshop from people considering submitting articles to the special IJDL issue.

### Communication Action Item

Post a message to listserv indicating that whilst we are working on METS 2.0, we are actively maintaining version 1 and are still accepting change requests.

### Profiles and Change Requests

We have one request to register a profile pending. Tom reviewed the profile, provided some feedback on validation issues and has not heard anything more from the requesting organization.

### November Meeting

- Tom may re-do his METS 2.0 presentation for the entire board.
- Betsy will abstract core principles/goals from panel discussion (note esp the following point: relationship to other schemas should be well defined)

### Next Year's Face-to-Face Meeting/PREMIS

- We like the idea of alternating annual meetings locations between Europe and North America.
- We would also like members of the PREMIS board and preservation community to participate in the shaping of METS 2.0
- Betsy will contact the iPRES organizers about doing a workshop and meeting at their [November 2-6, 2015 conference](#) in Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- We may want to do a joint call with PREMIS in the spring. Karin reports that the work on finalizing PREMIS 3.0 should be finished by the end of next month.

### METS 2.0 and Review of Workshop Feedback

We reviewed the reactions and suggestions received during the open discussion section part of the feedback.

How do we get to METS 2.0?

- Briefly step back from data modeling and clearly define our goals/vision for METS 2.0
  - What are our goals?
  - What is the essence of METS? Container/package and documenting complex structures?
  - Is the primary goal transmission or consumption within a repository or both?
  - Remember our history, goal was to stop building isolated digital libraries that don't adhere to standards; ability to migrate from repository to repository is a form of transmission; the structMap is core.
  - What is the role of METS in the broader landscape and do relationships with other schema maintenance groups need to be strengthened/formalized?
  - We want a data model for 2.0 but also want to re-use parts of other models; how do we handle this practically given that other schemas may change their models

- Review use cases, including registered profiles and unregistered uses by organizations including our panel presenters.
- Additional points/actions
  - Commitment to maintain METS 1.x
- Next steps with draft data model
  - Transform the rdf object model Tom presented into a scaled down xml schema similar to the existing METS schema
  - Result: We have an object model that is also useable as an internal archiving format and, on the other hand, we have a simple xml schema for transmission and the container task.
  - Restated: Tom's presentation was very rdf/semantic web ontology focused. It would be interesting to explore options for doing the exact same examples in his presentation as xml or JSON-LD. For example: model (directed graphs) →rdf triples→[JSON-LD](#). Tom is thinking about doing something like this for an IJDL journal article. Anyone who is interested could experiment with this.