

Thursday, January 5, 2012 Mets Board Teleconference

Attending Board Members: Brian Tingle, Betsy McKelvey (recording), Jenn Riley, Markus Enders, Robin Wendler, Terry Catapano, Thomas Habing,

Where do we go next with METS?

Affinity Diagram

Look at [affinity diagram](#).

Q: Should we start with big picture or knock off some of the easy stuff?

A: The Big Picture -- it would be a shame to do easy stuff first and risk having it change because of big picture stuff done later.

Interoperability vs. Exchange

Tom noted that some of the items on the affinity diagram relate to the interoperability vs. exchange question and referred to the continuum described in Syd Baumann's [Interchange vs. Interoperability](#) paper.

The continuum is characterized by the level of human involvement required:

- Negotiated Interchange: requires human communication + human intervention
- Blind Interchange: No human communication, but human intervention
- Interoperability: No human communication/intervention

Traditionally, METS has been closer to negotiated interchange end of the spectrum; you transform someone else's data to support your processes or vice-versa.

It would help to make an explicit decision about where we want to be on the continuum. The advantage of METS vs. arbitrary xml is that it leads one up the continuum. Baumann's paper notes that what often starts off as just an exchange protocol turns into an interoperability profile as more people come on board and make agreements with each other.

There was general agreement that **METS is on the Negotiated Interchange end of the spectrum and that's probably where it should stay.** With the addition of profiles, it can move closer blind interchange. However, it is infeasible that a schema with as wide a scope as METS could enable blind interchange.

Consideration of Why People Write Profiles

- Some are likely writing with the intent to support exchange and become part of an exchange community
- Likely others are writing for internal use with no expectation for exchange and are publishing to be "good citizens."
- Some of the early profiles were designed to be generic so that people would

adopt them.

METS 2.0 Revolution vs. Evolution?

There was agreement around developing METS 2.0 using an evolutionary approach. This would mean (1) modernizing the xml schema and (2) taking the implicit data model and making it more explicit (it's an enhancement to have a data model). The focus should be on delivering a 'next stage' schema.

METS 1.9.1 – End of February

We just have one change – an additional controlled vocabulary value suggested by the Swedish Nation Archives. However, the cost of bumping the version is low and **we're aiming to get the release of 1.9.1 out by the end of February.**

Next Call

- Return to the affinity diagram – some top-level things may be thrown out because of our decision to take an evolutionary, rather than an revolutionary, approach.
- **Before the next meeting**, go thru the columns and pick out what is relevant to the 2.0 approach we discussed. There are a lot of columns, so focus on the first four or five on the left-hand side
- At the next meeting we'll go through what we'd consider for METS 2.0