Dublin Core 2006, Manzanillo, Colima, Mexico
DC Tools WG Meeting, Thursday, October 5, 2006

The DC Tools WG met Thursday, October, 5th, during the Dublin Core 2006 Conference in Manzanillo, Colima, Mexico.

There were 27 attendees at the Tools WG meeting. Participants included both tool developers and users.

The meeting began with a welcome from Tools WG Co-Chair, Jane Greenberg, and brief introductions from all the participants (both Tools WG members and guests) via round-robin style. The Tools WG's charter was reviewed and discussed in relation to the Dublin Core's new framework of "communities" and "task forces". Participants were unanimous in their support of the Tools WG as a community for both tool developers and users.

The Tools WG activities for the past year were reviewed. Key accomplishments include:
1. A draft application profile for describing tools (and potentially application-related services).
2. A draft vocabulary that supports part of the tools application profiles.
3. A metadata tools workshop at JCDL (The workshop homepage is at: http://www.ils.unc.edu/mrc/jcdl2006/tools_workshop.html, and a summary report can be found at: http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july06/greenberg/07greenberg.html).

Four brief presentations were given to highlight aspects of metadata tool development and use, and promote discussion of metadata tools issues. Presentation topics and presenters included:

1. A Tiny Retrieval Protocol: THUMP and Kernel Metadata by John Kunze, Preservation Technologist for the California Digital.
2. Roles for Semantic Technologies and Tools by Gershom Rogers, Sr. Business Analyst, Instructional Information Systems, School of Public Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Doctoral Student, SILS Metadata Research Center.
3. Tools Used in Ontology Design by Sam Oh, Professor, Sungkyunkwan University
4. Metadata and Ontology Tools at FAO by Margherita Sini, Information Management Specialist, Food and Agriculture Organization, United Nations.

Slides for these presentations can be found at: http://www.physnet.net/dctools2006/, and they will be linked to the DC 2006 program Website.

The presentations led to a group discussion of the Tools WG's current focus. Participants agreed that the Tools WG needs to address metadata tools beyond those designed exclusively or primarily for Dublin Core metadata. Participants voiced an interest in ontology and taxonomy tools, tools for topic maps, and tools that interoperate with Dublin Core tools. Participants also expressed the need for the Dublin Core's Tools Webpage to be revised and standardized. A brief discussion was held about metadata tool frameworks in response to the FAO presentation. What is the best means for

integrating metadata tools? The FAO presentation identified a variety of metadata applications that are connected and used for a range of metadata activities.

The draft application profile for describing tools and potentially services was shared with participants along with a list of vocabulary terms important to describing or evaluation metadata applications. These documents are linked from the DC Tools WG agenda meeting at: http://www.physnet.net/dctools2006/.

John Kunze recommended that the application profile for representing tools be kept simple and not stand in the way of the work the Tools WG intends to do. Participants agreed with this comment and that the application profile would be useful for consistent description of tools.

The application profile discussion led to a brief discussion of the relationship between metadata tools and services. Ann Apps identified the IESR application profile as something the Tools WG should review. The IESR application profile is at: http://iesr.ac.uk/profile/. Ann has shared in a subsequent email that the IESR includes descriptions of 3 entities: Collections, Services and Agents. The Service description follows the Collection description in the profile (see Contents list). More details of IESR are available via its home page: http://iesr.ac.uk/. She has also let us know that the IESR metadata is being used within a growing number of other projects, including the OCKHAM Initiative (http://ockham.org/) in the US (e-mail to DC Tools WG list, Oct. 18, 2006).

The other issue highlighted was the Tools WG need to address issues relevant to both tool developers and users. Corey Harper voiced his interest in the WG as a developer and his interest in the Tools WG as a venue for communicating with other people writing code for metadata applications and functions. He shared with participants his involvement and enthusiasm for was Code4Lib. This is a group that has grown from a fairly high traffic mailing list and an IRC channel to include a combined RSS feeds from blogs, flickr photos, and most recently a conference. Information about all Code4Lib activities can be found at: http://www.code4lib.org/ (email correspondence with Corey, Oct. 29, 2006). The Tools WG briefly discussed Code4lib and indicated a high interest in contacting them to see how the DC Tools WG might share interests and foster dialog among our communities.

General Tools WG communication was discussed. Only a quarter of the meeting participants are members of the Tools WG's mailing list. It was agreed that tools WG information needs to be disseminated via the DC General list and the Tools WG lists. The meeting concluded with a brief discussion on the scope of the charter and the need to revise it so it can include metadata applications beyond Dublin Core tools.

Action items.
1. Complete the Tools Application Profile (Task force members include: Jane Greenberg, Thomas Severiens, Tessa Sullivan, Margherita Sini, and Charles McCathieNevile.
2. Revise and reduce the Tools WG vocabulary (Tessa Sullivan)

3. Make contact with Code4Lib (Thomas Severiens and Corey Harper)
4. Consider a Tools Workshop at an upcoming conference this year in Europe (Thomas Severiens)
5. Revise Tools Charter to reflect tools beyond DC focused tools.

Submitted by Jane Greenberg
Oct. 29, 2006