To:	Core Working Group – Metadata Dictionary for Public Broadcasting
From:	Bill Keens
Date:	September 30, 2002
Re:	*Facilitator's Memo – Second Working Group Meeting*

This memo describes the areas of agreement and key outcomes achieved in the second meeting of the Core Working Group for the Metadata Dictionary for Public Broadcasting, which took place on September 12-13, 2002, in Arlington, Virginia.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12

The initial session described the first two "design" phases of the metadata dictionary development project and began to anticipate the work ahead. The next session placed the dictionary initiative in the context of other related projects and activities presently underway.

Now & Later: Phase 2 and Subsequent Phases

Alison White thanked all for their work over the summer. She recalled that the work plan coming out of the spring meeting called for assembling two teams – user requirements and dictionary review – and tackling the tasks assigned to each. That time also allowed everyone to "mature in our understanding" of the metadata dictionary project, the time required for it, and its implications for CPB and others. CPB is also aware that no ready infrastructure exists to take over the maintenance of the dictionary, operationally – something CPB cannot do – and this issue will need to be resolved in the course of the work ahead.

Putting Our Work in Context

The PowerPoint presentation narrated by Dave MacCarn provided a comprehensive overview of other standards activities and digital archives initiatives (see the attachment to this memo), so that the Working Group could see its efforts in the context of others. MacCarn emphasized that his catalogue of these initiatives is only the tip of the iceberg. But the fact that so much groundwork has been accomplished in the field is "enormously encouraging" for the development of a public broadcasting metadata dictionary – yielding results that the public broadcasting field can employ as appropriate.

Following these orientation sessions, the Working Group heard reports from the two teams that were tasked over the summer with identifying key user requirements for the metadata dictionary and, subsequently, proposing the preliminary content of that dictionary.

Report from the User Requirements Team

Tim Olson referenced the issues and recommendations reflected in the "User Requirements Committee Report" (attached). Discussion focused especially on the "Issues and Recommendations" identified by the team, which Olson described not as a complete list, but rather as a starting point for further discussion, whether in the team format or in the Working Group as a whole.

Report from the Dictionary Review Team

Reporting on the work accomplished by the Dictionary Review Team, Paul Burrows presented both a handout (see *Preliminary PB Core Metadata*) and a PowerPoint summary (attached). Having simplified the task of creating and defining key terms by identifying practical areas of agreement and overlap among a set of institutions, the team proposed 249 entries (a tenth of the number originally suggested) to describe and define the metadata components associated with moving and still images, text, and audio. His presentation concluded with several observations, some identified for ongoing work by the dictionary review team, and others more appropriate for the Working Group as a whole or for others in the field.

As the meeting shifted into the afternoon of the first day, the focus of discussion also moved from reports on work completed, to identifying what remained to be resolved and beginning to grapple with those issues.

Discussion and Breakout Group Assignments

Working Group members were asked to confer with colleagues over lunch and, at each lunch table, identify three priorities for breakout discussion. The combined list of priority topics was assembled, discussed, winnowed, modified, and assigned to three breakout groups, as follows:

<u>Group One</u>: Alan Baker, Marty Bloss, Judy Brown, Paul Burrows, Efthimis Efthimiadis, Dave MacCarn, Marilyn Pierce, and Cate Twohill.

- ❑ Comprised entirely of members of the Dictionary Review Team, Group One focused on "collapsing the fields" from the 249 achieved to date, to a smaller number. In addition to describing how simplification might be achieved, the group was asked to illustrate its approach. Group One was also tasked with identifying issues that needed the guidance of the full Working Group, so that it could raise those issues the following day.

<u>Group Two</u>: Michael Connet, Tim Olson, Brent Trinacty, Steven Vedro, and Tracy Vosburgh.

- ❑ Group Two's charge was to focus on the constituents for the metadata dictionary, and to propose how possible users might be prioritized, so that the dictionary can be designed for utility with key users in mind. The group was also asked to illustrate its approach to the extent possible.

<u>Group Three</u>: Marcia Brooks, Dennis Haarsager, Bea Morse, Amy Rantanen, and Alison White.

- ❑ The third breakout group was asked to think about "life after the metadata dictionary is published," focusing on how to ensure compliance, provide incentives, practice enforcement, and anticipate the need for a long-term structure capable of carrying out these and other implementation functions.

Each breakout group was tasked with preparing a final report on behalf of his or her group and "rehearsing" that report the following morning, before presenting it to the Working Group as a whole.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13

After reviewing and refining their respective presentations with their breakout group members, the three spokespeople delivered their reports, with PowerPoint accompaniment, to the full Working Group. Based on the specific comments of their colleagues, these presentations were revised and are included among the attachments to this memorandum.

The consensus achieved in the Working Group around these three plans of action and related recommendations set the stage for the final session of the day, devoted to describing and agreeing on the work ahead.

The Work Ahead

With May 2003 as the deadline for unveiling the Public Broadcasting Metadata Dictionary in a more public fashion, the Working Group identified two stages of activity leading up to, and following, that key date.

Stage One (September – December)
The work in this period will be organized along the lines of the breakout group topics from the day before:

- *The User Group* will confer by the end of September in order to produce a more polished, general version of the user/field interface matrix illustrated in the group's PowerPoint presentation. This preliminary matrix will be shared with the Dictionary Group. The User Group will also incorporate an expanded matrix that maps to the reduced number of fields recommended by the Dictionary Group. This completed draft – the revised and simplified dictionary including the expanded interface matrix – will be circulated for comment to a) all members of the Working Group and b) the Adjunct members, who were initially consulted for the development of use-case scenarios.
- *The Dictionary Group* will meet in person by the end of October to revise and refine the draft dictionary based on the counsel received to date. This draft will be shared back with the User Group.
- *The Education & Communication Group* – whose membership is still to be finalized – will develop a context-setting introduction to cover the dictionary when it is circulated for comment. This group will also develop a plan for the ongoing education of, and communication with, the primary users and others who need to know about the metadata dictionary project.

Among the tasks for this group will be to anticipate what the test process in the next stage should entail, and to make recommendations along these lines when the Working Group meets again. This group will also review the list of Adjunct members and recommend some who might be asked to assist in its efforts or those of the User Group.

Note that discussion has ensued, but not been concluded, as to whether there should be a Compliance and Policy Group as well. This issue is likely to arise in further deliberations of the Working Group.

Stage Two (January – April)
In this period, the focus will be on refining, testing, and refining again the evolving draft public broadcasting metadata dictionary. The work will begin with a meeting of the full Working Group early in the new year – perhaps with the addition of any Adjunct members involved in Stage One – to accomplish the following tasks:

- ❑ Review the feedback from the Working Group and Adjunct members to the draft metadata dictionary circulated at the end of the previous stage;
- ❑ Decide how to revise the dictionary in light of those comments (the Dictionary Group will be given adequate time to meet and work during this retreat);
- ❑ Agree on the scope and process for testing the revised metadata dictionary, both through review by those who have already seen it, and perhaps by "putting it out there" for comment by Dublin Core users, broadcasters, vendors, and others;
- ❑ Determine how to evaluate and incorporate comments received from the test process; and
- ❑ Discuss and affirm the "follow-through" plan drafted by the Education and Communication Group.

The Working Group adjourned after expressing its commitment to these tasks and timeline, and after being thanked once again for the superior work that members continue to deliver in the course of this critical, ambitious project.