

## METS Editorial Board Meeting London, England

September 12, 2014

**Attending:** Karin Bredenberg, Markus Enders, Tom Habing, Nancy Hoebelheinrich, Jukka Kervinen, Jean-Philippe Moreux, Andreas Nef, Betsy Post (recording), Tobias Steinke, Nate Trail

The Editorial Board wrapped up its work at DL2014 by summarizing the workshop feedback and METS 2.0 as follows:

1. Decide what we want the rationale to be for using METS: how to decide?

- Think about uses – from points of strength and what we want to do
- Document uses from points of strength and write up use cases:
  - Digitization – Joachim
  - Transmission package
  - Submission package/METS Lite
  - AIP – aggregation entity
  - Research data
  - ALTO
  - Registered METS profiles provide more
- Compare & evaluate the ORE resource map in terms of how it packages and describes relationships within and among the components in the aggregation
- Allow for a METS LITE approach to those who want simpler packaging
- Evaluate the concept of new METS as a container and/or as an aggregation entity
  - (e.g., glass for water = container; water in the glass = aggregation entity)
  - As a complement to PREMIS 3.0 where people will be describing the intellectual entity, but not standing alone -- the job METS would be doing
- Need to put out a call to the METS list and others we know are using the behaviorSec to see if it can be deprecated as it seems to be little used
- Would need to see whether / what an rdf serialization would buy us vs. an xml schema.  
May need to express in both

2. To proceed from here, Tom will continue to work with the data model that he has developed with feedback from the workshop incorporated (including described use cases).

- We'll need to make sure that we think of how best to transition from the older versions to the new version
- We'll want to make sure that people know we will continue to maintain version 1.x, and are still accepting change requests for that version.