PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

Welcome to this supplementary survey for the Public Broadcasting Metadata Dictionary Project's request for comments about the PBCore metadata descriptors. You've been invited to answer additional questions about the PBCore because you have been identified as an expert in metadata and conversant in its applications.

ABOUT THE PROJECT:

If you would like to review the history and progress of the project, visit this link -
PROJECT BACKGROUND

ABOUT THE PBCORE:

If you would like to review all the PBCore Elements and what they mean, visit these links -
QUICKSTART GUIDE TO THE PBCORE (highly recommended)
PBCORE WEBSITE
REGARDING DESCRIPTORS FOR EDUCATION & LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS (SPECIAL EXTENSIONS)

ABOUT THIS SUPPLEMENTARY SURVEY:

- **MULTIPLE SECTIONS**

This survey is divided into two sections:

SECTION 1: EXPERT'S COMMENTS
-A handful of questions seeking additional comments about the PBCore that metadata experts can address.

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
-There are 28 PBCore elements for which the development team had fundamental, unresolved issues they wished other metadata experts to address and share comments with us.

- **WHICH COMPUTER? WHICH BROWSER?**

  In order to take our survey, you must start and finish using the same web browser on the same computer throughout the response process. Unfortunately, you cannot start the survey at the office and finish it at home. Any recent version of a web browser on Windows-based or Macintosh computers will work. Your web browser's "cookies" must be enabled.

- **STARTING & STOPPING THE SURVEY**

  The survey allows you to pause at any time, then return later (same computer, same browser) to resume the survey at the last unanswered question. There is no need to complete the survey in one sitting. Simply close the survey's web browser window at any time. Later, use the same web link to the survey we e-mailed to you. An interrupt page will ask if you wish to Resume your unfinished survey. Click *Resume*

- **EMBEDDED WEB LINKS TO THE PBCORE ELEMENTS**

  Wherever the survey refers to a new PBCore metadata element, a web link is provided that opens a new browser window and displays information about that element.

- **TEXT ENTRY FIELDS**

  An open-ended text entry field is provided for many questions. It is fixed at a height of four lines with a scrollbar, but there is no limit to the length of your comment. You may find it easier to craft your response in a text or word processor first, then copy and paste your comment into the text field.

- **PROGRESS BAR**

  At the bottom of each page of the survey is displayed a progress bar indicating the percent of the survey you have completed so far.

To begin SECTION 1 of the survey, click the "Next Page" button below.

Next Page

Percent Complete **3%**

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 1: EXPERT'S COMMENTS

1.1 How successful is the Public Broadcasting Metadata Dictionary (PBCore) Application Profile in providing you with enough information to implement the Dictionary?

Visit these links for background information:

PBCore Element Attributes
PBCore Application Profile

○ **1** (low) ○ **2** (somewhat low) ○ **3** (medium) ○ **4** (somewhat high) ○ **5** (high)

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 5%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 1: EXPERT'S COMMENTS

1.2 Please suggest any data elements or other enhancements that you feel need to be added to the PBCore.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 8%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 1: EXPERT'S COMMENTS

1.3.1 Does the PBCore's fundamental reliance on the Dublin Core Element Set seem appropriate?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

1.3.2 Please explain any concerns.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 11%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 1: EXPERT'S COMMENTS

1.4.1 Does the PBCore appear to favor a particular type or size of media asset?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

1.4.2 Please explain any concerns.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 13%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 1: EXPERT'S COMMENTS

1.5.1 The PBCore currently follows the Dublin Core's design that applies a "1:1 relationship" between a single media item or asset and a single set of metadata descriptors for that item.

An example where this "1:1 relationship" poses a challenge occurs when all the Intellectual Content/Subject metadata and the Intellectual Property/Rights metadata are the same for different flavors of a single media item. An item may exist as an analog magnetic tape, a digital file for dial-up Internet users, and a digital file for broadband Internet users.

For this example, a "1:1 relationship" demands that three completely unique sets of metadata descriptors be created, one for each instantiation of the media item. A "1:Many relationship" would create a single set of metadata descriptors for a media item, but allow multiple instances of the format to be identified in that one set.

Does the "1:1 relationship" work for your organization?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

1.5.2 Please explain any concerns.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 16%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS

There are 30 PBCore elements for which the development team had fundamental, unresolved issues. They wished other metadata experts to address these concerns to determine if there was an industry consensus.

The next 30 questions present an unresolved question for a specific metadata element. A web link is provided that opens a new browser window and displays information about a specific element in the PBCore.

An open-ended text entry field is provided for each unresolved question. It is fixed at a height of four lines with a scrollbar, but there is no limit to the length of your comment. You may find it easier to craft your response in a text or word processor first, then copy and paste your comment into the text field.

To address the first Unresolved Question, click the "Next Page" button below.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 18%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.01 TITLE

Click to Review PBCore Element 01.00: Title

Public Broadcasting's programs and resources are often identified by a hierarchical naming structure. This can include a Collection Title, Series Title, Episode Title, Program Title, and Segment Title. Other titles may include Working Title, Project Title, as well as an overall Packaging Title used in community outreach or in product distribution and dissemination.

Metadata Initiatives, such as Dublin Core, do not accommodate a hierarchical naming system for the titles of resources and assets. They instead allow an agency to identify alternative or related titles by simply repeating the Title data field multiple times, but with each instance containing different title information. Another option is to retain the uniqueness of a data record for an asset and use the data field labeled "Relation" to express how an asset is related to titles of a parental, sibling or child hierarchy.

Should PBCore forego the Dublin Core approach, and instead promote the use of refinements or qualifiers for the "Title" element that accurately reflect a resource's title hierarchy?
For example:

Title.Packaging
Title.Project
Title.Collection
Title.Series
Title.Program
Title.Episode
Title.Segment
Title.Excerpt
Title.Working

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete  **21%**

This survey was created with WebSurveyor

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.02 TITLE.ALTERNATIVE

Click to Review PBCore Element 01.01: Title.Alternative

TITLE.ALTERNATIVE may need to be clarified for the Public Broadcasting community. Is it the working (pre-production) title or is it a commonly understood "aka" title? If we intend to exchange metadata about a program still in production, should the program title be tagged/flagged as a working title?

An Alternative Title is usually important to the workflows within a producing agency, but may not be something published out to the world via the PBCore for others to search and discover. Is the focus of the PBCore for metadata exchange of full programs or smaller segments or objects that are ready for sharing, ready for primetime, if you will? If so, these assets would always have proper or given titles for the public or others within the public broadcasting communities to search and view. That said, there is nothing to prevent a producing agency from creating metadata fields within their own database management system that separate out working titles or other non-permanent titles. These would just not be mapped to the PBCore exchange metadata.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 24%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.03 TITLE.SERIES

Click to Review PBCore Element 01.02: Title.Series

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.01 for the PBCore Element 01.00: Title. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element TITLE, simply type SEE TITLE COMMENTS in the response box.)

Public Broadcasting's programs and resources are often identified by a hierarchical naming structure. This can include a Collection Title, Series Title, Episode Title, Program Title, and Segment Title. Other titles may include Working Title, Project Title, as well as an overall Packaging Title used in community outreach or in product distribution and dissemination.

Metadata Initiatives, such as Dublin Core, do not accommodate a hierarchical naming system for the titles of resources and assets. They instead allow an agency to identify alternative or related titles by simply repeating the Title data field multiple times, but with each instance containing different title information. Another option is to retain the uniqueness of a data record for an asset and use the data field labeled "Relation" to express how an asset is related to titles of a parental, sibling or child hierarchy.

Should PBCore forego the Dublin Core approach, and instead promote the use of refinements or qualifiers for the "Title" element that accurately reflect a resource's title hierarchy?
For example:

Title.Packaging
Title.Project
Title.Collection
Title.Series
Title.Program
Title.Episode
Title.Segment
Title.Excerpt
Title.Working

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 26%

This survey was created with WebSurveyor

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.04 TITLE.PROGRAM

Click to Review PBCore Element 01.03: Title.Program

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.01 for the PBCore Element 01.00: Title. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element TITLE, simply type SEE TITLE COMMENTS in the response box.)

Public Broadcasting's programs and resources are often identified by a hierarchical naming structure. This can include a Collection Title, Series Title, Episode Title, Program Title, and Segment Title. Other titles may include Working Title, Project Title, as well as an overall Packaging Title used in community outreach or in product distribution and dissemination.

Metadata Initiatives, such as Dublin Core, do not accommodate a hierarchical naming system for the titles of resources and assets. They instead allow an agency to identify alternative or related titles by simply repeating the Title data field multiple times, but with each instance containing different title information. Another option is to retain the uniqueness of a data record for an asset and use the data field labeled "Relation" to express how an asset is related to titles of a parental, sibling or child hierarchy.

Should PBCore forego the Dublin Core approach, and instead promote the use of refinements or qualifiers for the "Title" element that accurately reflect a resource's title hierarchy?
For example:

- **Title.Packaging**
- **Title.Project**
- **Title.Collection**
- **Title.Series**
- **Title.Program**
- **Title.Episode**
- **Title.Segment**
- **Title.Excerpt**
- **Title.Working**

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 29%

This survey was created with WebSurveyor

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.05 TITLE.EPISODE

Click to Review PBCore Element 01.04: Title.Episode

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.01 for the PBCore Element 01.00: Title. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element TITLE, simply type SEE TITLE COMMENTS in the response box.)

Public Broadcasting's programs and resources are often identified by a hierarchical naming structure. This can include a Collection Title, Series Title, Episode Title, Program Title, and Segment Title. Other titles may include Working Title, Project Title, as well as an overall Packaging Title used in community outreach or in product distribution and dissemination.

Metadata Initiatives, such as Dublin Core, do not accommodate a hierarchical naming system for the titles of resources and assets. They instead allow an agency to identify alternative or related titles by simply repeating the Title data field multiple times, but with each instance containing different title information. Another option is to retain the uniqueness of a data record for an asset and use the data field labeled "Relation" to express how an asset is related to titles of a parental, sibling or child hierarchy.

Should PBCore forego the Dublin Core approach, and instead promote the use of refinements or qualifiers for the "Title" element that accurately reflect a resource's title hierarchy?
For example:

Title.Packaging
Title.Project
Title.Collection
Title.Series
Title.Program
Title.Episode
Title.Segment
Title.Excerpt
Title.Working

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 32%

This survey was created with WebSurveyor

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.06 SUBJECT

Click to Review PBCore Element 03.00: Subject

The Subject for a resource may be entered as free-form text. Alternatively, the Subject may follow the rules for a formal classification scheme using specific keywords or subject headings. If formal classification schemes are followed, then the scheme being employed must be noted in the metadata associated with a resource. Different agencies, stations, and producers will likely employ different subject classification schemes depending on the materials and media they are describing. Is this problematic? Should PBCore add a qualified element to the dictionary which will identify the specific subject classification scheme being used, .e.g, Subject.ClassificationSchemeUsed?

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 34%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.07 DESCRIPTION

Click to Review PBCore Element 04.00: Description

If the PBCore follows the rules associated with Dublin Core, we can qualify the element DESCRIPTION by using the more refined DESCRIPTION.ABSTRACT, DESCRIPTION.TABLEOFCONTENTS, and DESCRIPTION.PROGRAMRELATEDTEXT.

Alternatively, consideration has been given to placing all information in a single element called DESCRIPTION, but creating a companion element that qualifies it. This qualified element would be named DESCRIPTION.TYPE and would identify the "type" of information that is contained in the parent element DESCRIPTION. A picklist could be generated containing such values as TableOfContents, EditDecisionList, ContentFlags, CueSheet, ComposerList, Captions, Subtitles, etc.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 37%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.08 DESCRIPTION.ABSTRACT

Click to Review PBCore Element 04.01: Description.Abstract

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.07 for the PBCore Element 04.00: Description. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element DESCRIPTION, simply type SEE DESCRIPTION COMMENTS in the response box.)

If the PBCore follows the rules associated with Dublin Core, we can qualify the element DESCRIPTION by using the more refined DESCRIPTION.ABSTRACT, DESCRIPTION.TABLEOFCONTENTS, and DESCRIPTION.PROGRAMRELATEDTEXT.

Alternatively, consideration has been given to placing all information in a single element called DESCRIPTION, but creating a companion element that qualifies it. This qualified element would be named DESCRIPTION.TYPE and would identify the "type" of information that is contained in the parent element DESCRIPTION. A picklist could be generated containing such values as TableOfContents, EditDecisionList, ContentFlags, CueSheet, ComposerList, Captions, Subtitles, etc.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 39%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.09 DESCRIPTION.TABLEOFCONTENTS

Click to Review PBCore Element 04.02: Description.TableOfContents

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.07 for the PBCore Element 04.00: Description. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element DESCRIPTION, simply type SEE DESCRIPTION COMMENTS in the response box.)

If the PBCore follows the rules associated with Dublin Core, we can qualify the element DESCRIPTION by using the more refined DESCRIPTION.ABSTRACT, DESCRIPTION.TABLEOFCONTENTS, and DESCRIPTION.PROGRAMRELATEDTEXT.

Alternatively, consideration has been given to placing all information in a single element called DESCRIPTION, but creating a companion element that qualifies it. This qualified element would be named DESCRIPTION.TYPE and would identify the "type" of information that is contained in the parent element DESCRIPTION. A picklist could be generated containing such values as TableOfContents, EditDecisionList, ContentFlags, CueSheet, ComposerList, Captions, Subtitles, etc.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 42%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.10 DESCRIPTION.PROGRAMRELATEDTEXT

Click to Review PBCore Element 04.03: Description.ProgramRelatedText

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.07 for the PBCore Element 04.00: Description. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element DESCRIPTION, simply type SEE DESCRIPTION COMMENTS in the response box.)

If the PBCore follows the rules associated with Dublin Core, we can qualify the element DESCRIPTION by using the more refined DESCRIPTION.ABSTRACT, DESCRIPTION.TABLEOFCONTENTS, and DESCRIPTION.PROGRAMRELATEDTEXT.

Alternatively, consideration has been given to placing all information in a single element called DESCRIPTION, but creating a companion element that qualifies it. This qualified element would be named DESCRIPTION.TYPE and would identify the "type" of information that is contained in the parent element DESCRIPTION. A picklist could be generated containing such values as TableOfContents, EditDecisionList, ContentFlags, CueSheet, ComposerList, Captions, Subtitles, etc.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 45%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.11 CREATOR

Click to Review PBCore Element 02.00: Creator

Like the hierarchy of multiple Titles that can be associated with an individual resource or asset, there are levels of Creators who contribute to the existence of a program or asset. A Creator can be the more encompassing production agency or producer. A Creator could also be an individual responsible for actually generating a specific portion of a program or a particular media format in which the asset is stored or distributed through various play-outs and pipelines. How confusing will this be? Our current solution is to generate a more refined qualification to the "Creator" element. This accompanying element is called "Creator.Role" and specifies the role played by the individual or organization identified under "Creator."

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 47%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.12 CREATOR.ROLE

Click to Review PBCore Element 02.01: Creator.Role

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.11 for the PBCore Element 02.00: Creator. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element CREATOR, simply type SEE CREATOR COMMENTS in the response box.)

Like the hierarchy of multiple Titles that can be associated with an individual resource or asset, there are levels of Creators who contribute to the existence of a program or asset. A Creator can be the more encompassing production agency or producer. A Creator could also be an individual responsible for actually generating a specific portion of a program or a particular media format in which the asset is stored or distributed through various play-outs and pipelines. How confusing will this be? Our current solution is to generate a more refined qualification to the "Creator" element. This accompanying element is called "Creator.Role" and specifies the role played by the individual or organization identified under "Creator."

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 50%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.13 DATE.CREATED

Click to Review PBCore Element 07.01: Date.Created

It was determined that an unqualified element called "Date" made no sense. By its very nature and the variety of dates that are associated with a resource or asset, a Date must be qualified or refined with an indication of the meaning behind a date. Consequently, the PBCore provides only qualified date elements, including DATE.CREATED, DATE.ISSUED (or aired), DATE.AVAILABLESTART, DATE.AVAILABLEEND.

An alternative approach would be to use a repeatable data field called "Date," and associate it with another data field called "Date.Type" from which the type of date presented is identified.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 53%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.14 DATE.ISSUED

Click to Review PBCore Element 07.02: Date.Issued

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.13 for the PBCore Element 07.01: Date.Created. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element DATE.CREATED, simply type SEE DATE.CREATED COMMENTS in the response box.)

It was determined that an unqualified element called "Date" made no sense. By its very nature and the variety of dates that are associated with a resource or asset, a Date must be qualified or refined with an indication of the meaning behind a date. Consequently, the PBCore provides only qualified date elements, including DATE.CREATED, DATE.ISSUED (or aired), DATE.AVAILABLESTART, DATE.AVAILABLEEND.

An alternative approach would be to use a repeatable data field called "Date," and associate it with another data field called "Date.Type" from which the type of date presented is identified.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 55%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.15 DATE.AVAILABLESTART

Click to Review PBCore Element 07.03: Date.AvailableStart

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.13 for the PBCore Element 07.01: Date.Created. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element DATE.CREATED, simply type SEE DATE.CREATED COMMENTS in the response box.)

It was determined that an unqualified element called "Date" made no sense. By its very nature and the variety of dates that are associated with a resource or asset, a Date must be qualified or refined with an indication of the meaning behind a date. Consequently, the PBCore provides only qualified date elements, including DATE.CREATED, DATE.ISSUED (or aired), DATE.AVAILABLESTART, DATE.AVAILABLEEND.

An alternative approach would be to use a repeatable data field called "Date," and associate it with another data field called "Date.Type" from which the type of date presented is identified.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 58%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.16 DATE.AVAILABLEEND

Click to Review PBCore Element 07.04: Date.AvailableEnd

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.13 for the PBCore Element 07.01: Date.Created. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element DATE.CREATED, simply type SEE DATE.CREATED COMMENTS in the response box.)

It was determined that an unqualified element called "Date" made no sense. By its very nature and the variety of dates that are associated with a resource or asset, a Date must be qualified or refined with an indication of the meaning behind a date. Consequently, the PBCore provides only qualified date elements, including DATE.CREATED, DATE.ISSUED (or aired), DATE.AVAILABLESTART, DATE.AVAILABLEEND.

An alternative approach would be to use a repeatable data field called "Date," and associate it with another data field called "Date.Type" from which the type of date presented is identified.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 61%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.17 FORMAT.IDENTIFIER

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.03: Format.Identifier

When the PBCore has been tested against actual media resources and their descriptions in real-world implementations, it may become evident that the element 09.03 FORMAT.IDENTIFIER can be merged with the element 10.00 IDENTIFIER.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 63%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.18 IDENTIFIER

Click to Review PBCore Element 10.00: Identifier

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.17 for the PBCore Element 09.03: Format.Identifier. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element FORMAT.IDENTIFIER, simply type SEE FORMAT.IDENTIFIER COMMENTS in the response box.)

When the PBCore has been tested against actual media resources and their descriptions in real-world implementations, it may become evident that the element 09.03 FORMAT.IDENTIFIER can be merged with the element 10.00 IDENTIFIER.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 66%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.19 FORMAT.FILESIZE

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.04: Format.FileSize

This qualified element maps to the MPEG-7 descriptor MediaFormat.FileSize.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 68%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.20 FORMAT.TIMESTART

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.16: Format.TimeStart

The timecode stamp must be annotated in some way in order to indicate from what source the timecode is obtained, i.e., from a digital video/audio file or from a videotape/audiotape machine.

TIMESTART was created as a qualified FORMAT element for the PBCore. The original Dublin Core has the element called IDENTIFIER.TIMESTAMPS. The developers felt more comfortable placing the time stamps under Format. Do you agree?

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 71%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.21 FORMAT.DURATION

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.17: Format.Duration

This qualified element maps to the MPEG-7 descriptor MediaTime.MediaDuration.

The original Dublin Core has the element called FORMAT.EXTENT. The PBCore developers felt more comfortable formulating an element called FORMAT.DURATION to more closely match broadcasting and media producer's terminology.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 74%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.22 FORMAT.STANDARD

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.18: Format.Standard

Given that the PBCore is primarily designed as an exchange format for media resource information, are we introducing too much granularity and excessive metadata by having three separate elements that describe the basic type of media format for an asset, i.e., FORMAT.STANDARD, FORMAT.TYPE, and FORMAT.ENCODING? Can we exchange the metadata we need to share with three elements or fewer?

FORMAT.ENCODING is a placeholder element in the PBCore. If specific types of compressors and encoders are vital to understanding the nature of a media resource, especially in the rapidly evolving world of digital media, then should we more carefully define FORMAT.ENCODING and build controlled vocabularies?

Or should we collapse FORMAT.STANDARD, FORMAT.TYPE and FORMAT.ENCODING into a single metadata element?

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 76%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.23 FORMAT.TYPE

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.19: Format.Type

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.22 for the PBCore Element 09.18: Format.Standard. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element FORMAT.STANDARD, simply type SEE FORMAT.STANDARD COMMENTS in the response box.)

Given that the PBCore is primarily designed as an exchange format for media resource information, are we introducing too much granularity and excessive metadata by having three separate elements that describe the basic type of media format for an asset, i.e., FORMAT.STANDARD, FORMAT.TYPE, and FORMAT.ENCODING? Can we exchange the metadata we need to share with three elements or fewer?

FORMAT.ENCODING is a placeholder element in the PBCore. If specific types of compressors and encoders are vital to understanding the nature of a media resource, especially in the rapidly evolving world of digital media, then should we more carefully define FORMAT.ENCODING and build controlled vocabularies?

Or should we collapse FORMAT.STANDARD, FORMAT.TYPE and FORMAT.ENCODING into a single metadata element?

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 79%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.24 FORMAT.ENCODING

Click to Review PBCore Element 09.20: Format.Encoding

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.22 for the PBCore Element 09.18: Format.Standard. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element FORMAT.STANDARD, simply type SEE FORMAT.STANDARD COMMENTS in the response box.)

Given that the PBCore is primarily designed as an exchange format for media resource information, are we introducing too much granularity and excessive metadata by having three separate elements that describe the basic type of media format for an asset, i.e., FORMAT.STANDARD, FORMAT.TYPE, and FORMAT.ENCODING? Can we exchange the metadata we need to share with three elements or fewer?

FORMAT.ENCODING is a placeholder element in the PBCore. If specific types of compressors and encoders are vital to understanding the nature of a media resource, especially in the rapidly evolving world of digital media, then should we more carefully define FORMAT.ENCODING and build controlled vocabularies?

Or should we collapse FORMAT.STANDARD, FORMAT.TYPE and FORMAT.ENCODING into a single metadata element?

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 82%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.25 ANNOTATION

Click to Review PBCore Element 18.00: Annotation

During the development of the PBCore, there was much discussion about having a single element called ANNOTATION into which various, additional and unstructured notes about a media resource could be entered. Many preferred having annotation exist as sub-elements, as a qualifier for each of the other PBCore elements, e.g., TITLE.ANNOTATION, DESCRIPTION.ANNOTATION, FORMAT.ANNOTATION, PUBLISHER.ANNOTATION, etc. With this approach, ANNOTATION is bound to all other Elements, clarifying Element values and controlled vocabularies that are insufficient, on an Element by Element basis. Should the PBCore support individual Annotation Elements for each major element?

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 84%

PUBLIC BROADCASTING METADATA DICTIONARY PROJECT

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.26 LOCATION

Click to Review PBCore Element 19.00: Location

LOCATION as an Element should be considered as the Physical Location for physical objects or a File Location (URL, URI, etc.) for virtual assets. The application of the element LOCATION may vary between Public Broadcasting stations when used for internal tracking. The Dictionary Working Group intuitively felt that the use of LOCATION would also be beneficial as metadata is exchanged between Public Broadcasting communities. Actual case studies in populating the element LOCATION with metadata will likely prove useful in helping define and perfect the meaning and application of this Element. In particular, LOCATION may solve the problem of how to identify various manifestations of a media resource through a single metadata record rather than through multiple, often redundant records.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 87%

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.27 RIGHTS.USAGE

Click to Review PBCore Element 15.01: Rights.Usage

Presently, two of the three elements associated with RIGHTS are expected to store free-text values pertaining to how organizations can use and reproduce a media item and its related content. These elements are RIGHTS.USAGE and RIGHTS.REPRODUCTION

Public Broadcasting has some very specific rights issues, including such categories as:

School Rights
Broadcast Rights
Ancilliary Rights
Etc.

Further, for each of the above categories, there are specific types or groupings that detail the terms of the broader usage and reproduction rights, including these values:

In Perpetuity
From Original Broadcast
From First Broadcast
Fair Use
Etc.

If we don't use a hierarchy of rights categories to define these potential levels, the alternative is to combine all values into a rights statement placed into a single metadata element. An example would be:

Broadcast Rights: From First Broadcast: 5 plays in 6 years beginning 01/23/2004

The structure of such a statement, however, is difficult to standardize. A controlled vocabulary would need to be implemented in order to create those standards. Various producing agencies, stations, and distributers would have different constraints and negotiated limitations to usage and reproduction.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 89%

This survey was created with WebSurveyor

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.28 RIGHTS.REPRODUCTION

Click to Review PBCore Element 15.02: Rights.Reproduction

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.27 for the PBCore Element 15.01: Rights.Usage. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element RIGHTS.USAGE, simply type SEE RIGHTS.USAGE COMMENTS in the response box.)

Presently, two of the three elements associated with RIGHTS are expected to store free-text values pertaining to how organizations can use and reproduce a media item and its related content. These elements are RIGHTS.USAGE and RIGHTS.REPRODUCTION

Public Broadcasting has some very specific rights issues, including such categories as:

- **School Rights**
- **Broadcast Rights**
- **Ancilliary Rights**
- **Etc.**

Further, for each of the above categories, there are specific types or groupings that detail the terms of the broader usage and reproduction rights, including these values:

- **In Perpetuity**
- **From Original Broadcast**
- **From First Broadcast**
- **Fair Use**
- **Etc.**

If we don't use a hierarchy of rights categories to define these potential levels, the alternative is to combine all values into a rights statement placed into a single metadata element. An example would be:

Broadcast Rights: From First Broadcast: 5 plays in 6 years beginning 01/23/2004

The structure of such a statement, however, is difficult to standardize. A controlled vocabulary would need to be implemented in order to

create those standards. Various producing agencies, stations, and distributers would have different constraints and negotiated limitations to usage and reproduction.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete **92%**

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.29 RIGHTS.ACCESS

Click to Review PBCore Element 15.03: Rights.Access

(Note: this Unresolved Question is the same as Survey Question 2.27 for the PBCore Element 15.01: Rights.Usage. If your comments are the same as your original response for the element RIGHTS.USAGE, simply type SEE RIGHTS.USAGE COMMENTS in the response box.)

Presently, two of the three elements associated with RIGHTS are expected to store free-text values pertaining to how organizations can use and reproduce a media item and its related content. These elements are RIGHTS.USAGE and RIGHTS.REPRODUCTION

Public Broadcasting has some very specific rights issues, including such categories as:

- **School Rights**
- **Broadcast Rights**
- **Ancilliary Rights**
- **Etc.**

Further, for each of the above categories, there are specific types or groupings that detail the terms of the broader usage and reproduction rights, including these values:

- **In Perpetuity**
- **From Original Broadcast**
- **From First Broadcast**
- **Fair Use**
- **Etc.**

If we don't use a hierarchy of rights categories to define these potential levels, the alternative is to combine all values into a rights statement placed into a single metadata element. An example would be:

Broadcast Rights: From First Broadcast: 5 plays in 6 years beginning 01/23/2004

The structure of such a statement, however, is difficult to standardize. A controlled vocabulary would need to be implemented in order to

create those standards. Various producing agencies, stations, and distributers would have different constraints and negotiated limitations to usage and reproduction.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page Next Page

Percent Complete 95%

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

SECTION 2: UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS
2.30 SPECIAL EXTENSIONS

Click to Review PBCore Element 99.00: Special Extensions

With the presentation of version 1.0 of the PBCore, are we finished? Probably not. As the PBCore is refined and used by various communities, we will undoubtedly add extensions to the existing set of metadata elements to accommodate specials needs.

Extensions are additional descriptions for media resources that have been crafted by organizations outside of the PBCore development initiative. These extensions fulfill the metadata requirements for these outside groups as they identify and describe their own types of media with specialized, custom terminologies. To be perfectly honest, the PBCore could be considered as an extension to their metadata scheme...but that's all a matter of perspective.

For example, extensions that we know are important to Public Broadcasting are those related to the use of media resources in educational venues. The Dublin Core has a draft proposal for metadata elements being assembled by its *Education Working Group*. There are other applicable extensions from the *IEEE Learning Object Metadata (LOM)* initiative.

Audience (DC-Ed)
Audience.Mediator (DC-Ed)
Standard (DC-Ed)
Standard.Identifier (DC-Ed)
Standard.Version (DC-Ed)
InteractivityType (IEEE LOM)
InteractivityLevel (IEEE LOM)
TypicalLearningTime (IEEE LOM)

Also of importance are descriptions related to accessibility issues. Many of these are documented through the *IMS Project*.

Of course, there are metadata needs that public radio and public television share. Often their needs are unique to their own production workflows and distribution channels, requiring customized or industry-specific descriptors.

Likewise, when you consider the activities related to Digital

Interactive TV Guides, ATSC Digital Television System capabilities, and various playout systems for Public Broadcasting stations, the number of metadata extensions grows in order to service the unique needs of various Public Broadcasting users and communities.

The intent of the Public Broadcasting Metadata Initiative is to first spawn a core set of metadata descriptors that are applicable to most venues and scenarios. The PBMI is focused on the ability to exchange metadata between parties rather than trying to build a completely comprehensive, all encompassing, über metadata system that satisfies all user requirements. As extensions are evaluated and experts help the PBMI incorporate their metadata, the PBCore becomes more robust, but simple enough to be understood and usable by most of us.

Please share your thoughts.

Previous Page | Next Page

Percent Complete 97%

PBCore Supplementary Survey & Unresolved Questions

The Public Broadcasting Metadata Dictionary Project team thanks you for taking the time to complete this survey and to share your expert comments about the PBCore.

To end this survey and transmit your responses to our data collection server, simply click the SUBMIT button below.

Previous Page | Submit Survey

Percent Complete 100%