

Metadata for Electronic Information Resources

Gail Hodge

Information International Associates, Inc.
312 Walnut Place, Havertown, Pennsylvania 19083
USA

gailhodge@aol.com

ABSTRACT

The rationale for cataloging and indexing of electronic information is much the same as for print materials. Cataloging and indexing provide a surrogate for the item, which facilitates resource discovery and access. But, what has changed in the electronic information environment is the terminology. In the Internet environment, the terms cataloging and indexing have been replaced with the term “metadata.” Metadata is often defined as “data about data” or “information about information.” The term, which originated with the data and computer science communities, is now in general use for the cataloging and indexing of electronic information sources.

Metadata serves three general purposes. It supports resource discovery and locates the actual digital resource by inclusion of a digital identifier. As the number of electronic resources grows, metadata is used to create aggregate sites, bringing similar resources together and distinguishing dissimilar resources.

There are a variety of metadata schemes that serve different purposes for different object types, subjects and audiences, including the Dublin Core, Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS), the Global Information Locator Service, the Text Encoding Initiative Header, the Encoded Archival Description, the Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata, the Data Documentation Initiative, and the draft Technical Standard for Still Images. A metadata scheme has three components – semantics, content and syntax. An extension adds elements to an existing scheme to describe a particular resource type, handle material on a particular subject, or address the needs of a particular user community. Profiles are subsets of a larger scheme that are implemented by a particular user community. Metadata can be embedded in an electronic resource or stored in a separate file.

A growing number of tools, both open source and commercial, are available to create and edit metadata. Creation may be done manually or by metadata generators that extract key information from the object. Metadata harvesters capture metadata records that have already been created using the “shared cataloging” model. While many projects aimed at having metadata created by the object’s author, this has proved to be difficult to implement. An alternative is to have a core set of metadata created by the author with editing and quality control performed by a librarian or editor who has a view of the whole collection.

With disparate metadata schemes, ensuring that information collected in a specific scheme by one organization for a particular purpose can be exchanged, transferred or used by another organization for a different purpose becomes an issue. Metadata frameworks, crosswalks, and registries are ways to achieve interoperability.

Use of controlled and uncontrolled vocabulary terms is encouraged, particularly within specific subject domains. However, most metadata schemes do not dictate the use of a particular controlled vocabulary but instead allow the vocabulary scheme to be defined within the syntax.

Paper presented at the RTO IMC Lecture Series on “Electronic Information Management”, held in Sofia, Bulgaria, 8-10 September 2004, and published in RTO-EN-IMC-002.

In order to increase the use of metadata, systems that support metadata creation and search engines that take better advantage of metadata must be developed. Communities of practice should develop content standards, along with other groups that share common interests. Stakeholder groups must be made aware of the importance of metadata for the short and long-term enhancement of the electronic environment.

1.0 THE PURPOSE OF METADATA

Similar to traditional cataloging and indexing, metadata performs three main functions. It facilitates discovery of relevant information, locates the specific resource, and organizes electronic resources into collections. In addition it provides information needed to administer and manage the collection. Technical metadata is needed to allow digital objects to be re-presented in new technical environments.

1.1 Resource Discovery

One of metadata's primary functions is to support resource discovery by describing aspects of the original electronic resource in which the designated user community may be interested. Metadata, such as titles, subject terms and abstracts or descriptions, are particularly important for electronic resources, such as datasets or photographs, that have little if any text content on which current text-based Web searching can be performed.

Metadata can describe the resource at any level of aggregation – a single resource; a part of a larger resource, for example, a photograph in an article; or a collection of resources, such as a digital library. The level at which metadata is applied depends on the type of data and the anticipated access needs. Datasets are generally cataloged at the file or collection level. Electronic journal articles may be cataloged individually, sometimes with no concern for metadata at the issue or journal title levels. Generally, the metadata for Web sites is applied to one or more pages that make up a cohesive resource with informational value.

1.2 Location of Electronic Resources

Once a resource has been discovered via the metadata, the resource must be located. Metadata supports the location of the actual digital resource on the network. Most metadata schemes include an element that is defined as the unique identifier needed to locate the resource.

In practice, most metadata schemes continue to use the URL, or the Uniform Resource Locator, as the unique identifier. The URL is the physical address, the server or domain name, directory and file name for the resource. This provides fast look-up but is problematic as the Web grows and information managers need to move the physical locations of the resources. In the case of electronic journals, URL changes may occur due to the merger or acquisition of one publisher by another. URLs that are not up-to-date or that have not been forwarded to a new URL result in the famous 404 message indicating that the Web page cannot be found.

In an effort to solve this problem, two major systems have been developed. First, OCLC developed the Persistent URL. This method continues to use the URL construct, but it sets up a resolver service. The PURL is used in the metadata record or in reference links that refer to the electronic resource. When a browser attempts to locate the PURL, it accesses the record in the PURL Resolver service at OCLC. The Resolver uses standard Internet redirection to access the actual URL of the resource's physical file location. If the location for the actual page changes, its owner must change the URL in the Resolver, but the PURL that has been published remains the same.

The PURL is structured as:

[http://purl.oclc.org/\[specific resource file name\]](http://purl.oclc.org/[specific resource file name])

The beginning of the PURL is the URL for the PURL Resolver Service (in the example above, the resolver at OCLC is used) and the file name in brackets is the file name for the specific resource.

The second method is the Handle System® developed by the Corporation for National Research Initiatives (CNRI) under contract to several U.S. government agencies. In the Handle, the prefix is a unique identifier assigned to the resource owner by the central Handle System. This prefix ensures that the identifier is unique. Following the slash is the suffix assigned to the item by the producer.

A Handle is structured as:

[unique prefix for the assigning agency]/[persistent, unique identifier for the resource]

The unique identifier in a Handle can be any item ID. Possibilities include the ISBN, the Standard Item Contribution Identifier (SICI), the Publisher Item Identifier (PII), or a local accession number.

The Handle also uses a resolver service, but it allows more flexibility in the structure and syntax of the identifier. Because it actually uses a database scheme, a single Handle can resolve to multiple locations for different versions of the same resource. Different versions of an electronic resource, for example one in HTML and another in pdf, can be uniquely identified even though they have the same Handle, because the database also contains the data type. The data types can be resolved based on a user's preference or an interface can be designed that offers the user a choice between the versions.

The Handle is the underlying technology for the Digital Object Identifier. The DOI, managed by the International DOI Foundation, establishes a specific syntax for the DOI under the Handle framework. The DOI is the basis for a system called CrossRef. CrossRef is a DOI Registration Agency formed by a consortium of electronic journal publishers. The members of CrossRef deposit their DOIs into a central repository maintained by CrossRef. The purpose of CrossRef is to facilitate linking between electronic journals, primarily from the references at the end of an article to the full text for those articles. The DOI in CrossRef is used to form the reference link from a reference to the full text article. The CrossRef service is particularly valuable when the references are to articles from a publisher other than that of the referring journal.

As mentioned earlier, CrossRef is a DOI Registration Agency, which maintains a central repository of DOIs in order to allow publishers to move their physical files, while maintaining a persistent link in previously published references. In addition to the DOI itself, CrossRef maintains a minimal set of metadata for each DOI. This limited metadata, consisting of the article title, the first author's last name, and journal citation information, allows a publisher or library to find the DOI for an article published by a member of the CrossRef system in order to embed the DOI in a reference or to implement linking services across resources which the library has licensed.

1.3 Organization of Resources into Collections

In addition to the discovery of specific resources, metadata brings similar resources together and distinguishes dissimilar resources. As the number of Web-based resources grows exponentially, aggregate sites, portals, or subject gateways are increasingly useful in organizing resources based on audience or topic. Originally,

these resources were built as static Web pages with the names and locations of the resources “hard coded” in the HTML. However, it is more efficient and increasingly more common to build these pages dynamically from metadata stored in databases.

Content management systems support the development of such portals by managing individual digital objects. Metadata created as part of the content creation process is used to select and organize individual digital objects into different portals by subject, business function (accounting versus manufacturing), or other organizing principle. Metadata information is also matched against user profiles to create customized (MyLibrary or MyPortal) Web sites.

Another method of organizing Web information is through channels. Channels are pre-selected Web sites that automatically “push” collections of information to a user’s browser. They are commonly used for continuously updated information such as stock quotes and news. The dominant metadata scheme for webcasting is the Channel Definition Format (CDF) developed by Microsoft and its partners. The CDF provides metadata elements such as the title of the channel, an abstract, the publication date, the last date the content was modified, the logo for the channel and the schedule on which the channel’s content is updated so the “pushing” can be scheduled.

1.4 Administration of the Collection

A fourth type of metadata is used to manage the digital object and its metadata. The elements that may be found here depend in part on the workflow for the creation, capture and long-term use of the digital object that is being archived and preserved. They include control elements such as the date created, the date captured, the operator, and the date last migrated.

1.5 Presenting Content in New Technical Environments

Technical metadata is the overall term used for metadata elements that describe the computer hardware and software needed to reproduce the digital object. This includes file formats such as pdf and video formats such as mpeg. These are connected to the readers or browsers that must be available for a user to be able to access the object. This set of elements is often considered part of the preservation metadata set because it is critical to rendering the digital object in new technical environments in the future or when using emulators of obsolete technologies. Technical metadata schemes are often quite large and detailed, since they are often intended for use by technicians or for computer to computer communication.

1.6 Other Metadata Functions

There are other applications for metadata that cut across the functions described above and often result in specific element sets. Digital rights elements indicate who owns the object and what rights various groups have to use or reuse that object. Rights elements may also include security classifications or distribution limitations. There are several schemes that have been developed particularly in the music and learning objects communities. In systems, the rights management elements must be matched against profile of the user (following proper authentication) in order to ensure that the material is being properly distributed and in some cases the proper payments are being made to the rights holders. The variety of systems, the potential economic impacts, and the variety of materials requiring rights management have led to the concept of a Digital Rights Expression Language (DREL) that is of broad applicability and that can be used by a variety of automated systems in e-commerce. IEEE, MPEG21 and others have been working on rights elements and expression languages.

Preservation metadata or metadata to support the provenance of an object and the preservation of the object is another cross-cutting function. Some of this information is also handled by technical metadata, metadata for discovery, rights management, etc. The current work in this area is discussed in the lecture paper on Preservation and Permanent Access.

2.0 BASIC METADATA STRUCTURE

This section describes the general structure of a metadata scheme, the modification of a scheme to increase its flexibility and usefulness by various communities of practice, and the storage of metadata.

2.1 Components of a Metadata Scheme

A metadata scheme (also called schema) is made up of three structural components – semantics, content and syntax. The definition or meaning of the elements is known as the semantics, and includes the tag set for the elements. For example, a scheme for a text resource may define the Title element with a tag of TI. Generally, the semantics of a metadata scheme are grouped into three types – descriptive, structural, and administrative. These types are complementary to the basic reasons for metadata described above. Descriptive metadata identifies a resource for purposes of discovery and identification. It includes elements such as title, abstract, author, and keywords. Administrative metadata provides information to help manage a resource, such as when and how it was created, its file type and other technical information. Structural metadata indicates how compound objects are put together or how this resource relates to others in the collection.

The set of preservation metadata currently being developed by the Research Libraries Group and OCLC includes elements from all three of these semantic types, but it adds elements specific to preservation activities such as the provenance of the item, the preservation strategies employed, its migration history, etc. (Preservation metadata is discussed in more detail in the session on “Preservation of and Permanent Access to Electronic Information Resources.”) Technical metadata is generally considered to be a subset of preservation metadata, because it provides information needed to successfully manage an object through a variety of technological changes and to render the object in new environments.

The scheme may also specify syntax rules for how the elements and their content should be encoded. Metadata can be encoded in MARC21, in “keyword=value” pairs, or in any other definable syntax. Many current metadata schemes use XML (Extensible Mark-up Language). A metadata scheme with no prescribed encoding syntax is called “syntax independent.”

The third structural component of a metadata scheme is the content, or the values used to complete the elements. A scheme may specify rules, also called a “content standard,” for the formulation of the content (for example, how to identify the title) or rules for the representation of the content (for example, capitalization, language or transliteration rules).

2.2 Extensions and Profiles

Specific implementations or the needs of a certain community can result in modifications to a metadata scheme. Since it is often difficult to anticipate the ways in which a scheme might be used, schemes that can easily be modified are preferred over those that are more restrictive. Modifications are of two types: extensions and profiles.

An extension is the addition of elements to an already developed scheme to support the description of a particular resource type, to handle material on a particular subject, or to address the needs of a particular user

community. Profiles are subsets of a larger scheme that are implemented by a particular user community. Extensions generally increase the number of elements that can be used; profiles constrain the number of elements, refine or narrow the definitions of certain elements, or specify the rules for completing the content of certain elements.

In practice, many applications use both extensions and profiles of base metadata schemes. The metadata scheme for the U.S. Department of Education's Gateway to Educational Materials (GEM) Project is based on the Dublin Core. However, GEM limits the elements to be used (for example, Contributor is not used). It also extends the Dublin Core element set by adding elements that are important to the educational community when describing and using educational resources. These fields include audience (teacher versus student), grade level, and relevant educational standards.

Similarly, the Visual Resources Association (VRA) has established core categories (or elements) to describe visual materials such as buildings, photographs, paintings and sculptures in visual resource collections of slides or photographs. Therefore, metadata for these materials must accommodate the description of the same resource in different media, for example, the original painting, a slide of the painting, and a digitized image of the slide. The VRA Core Category scheme, a profile and extension of the Dublin Core, consists of 17 optional metadata elements: record type, type, title, measurements, material, technique, creator, date, location, ID number, style/period, culture, subject, relation, description, source, and rights. The Dublin Core Relation field is used to relate the records for the same resource in different media. The VRA Core scheme does not specify any particular syntax or rules for representing content. Managers of visual resource collections hope that use of the VRA Core Categories will allow them to share descriptions of original works as well as to better describe materials in their own collections.

2.3 Metadata Storage

Metadata can be embedded in an electronic resource or stored separately. For example, metadata is often embedded in HTML documents as metatags or in the headers of image files. The use of HTML metatags specifically may make the content of the metadata accessible to Web search engines. Storing metadata with the resource ensures the metadata will not be lost, eliminates problems of broken links between the resource and its metadata, and facilitates updating of the metadata and the resource.

However, sometimes it is difficult to embed metadata in certain types of resources. In these cases, storing metadata separate from its electronic resource simplifies the management of the metadata. External metadata may also facilitate search, retrieval and exchange of metadata with other systems and organizations. External metadata is stored in a Web-accessible database system (often called a clearinghouse or catalog) and then linked to the electronic information it describes by a URL or other identifier in the metadata. Implementations that take advantage of the hierarchical nature of RDF and the expressiveness of XML, as opposed to more structured database technologies, may "wrap" the digital object with the metadata to more closely marry the metadata record with the actual object.

3.0 METADATA SCHEMES

Metadata schemes (also called "schema") have been developed and defined by a variety of communities, for different purposes, and for different types of electronic resources. This section describes some common metadata schemes. In addition, some lesser known schemes have been selected to show the range of electronic resources and purposes for which schemes have been developed. While the focus here is on electronic library

resources, it should be noted that many other metadata schemes have been developed in support of e-commerce and electronic data exchange.

3.1 Dublin Core

The Dublin Core is perhaps the most well known metadata element set. The original objective of the Dublin Core was to define a set of elements that could be used by authors to describe their own Web resources. A few relevant elements and simple rules were defined so that non-catalogers could provide basic information for resource discovery.

Dublin Core 1.0 consists of 15 elements: title, subject, description, source, language, relation, coverage, creator, publisher, contributor, rights, date, type, format, and identifier. Recently, the audience element was defined to support the broad needs of the educational and learning object communities. All Dublin Core elements are optional and all are repeatable. The elements may be presented in any order. Note that in the following example relation, contributor and source are not applicable and so they do not appear.

Dublin Core Elements For This Paper

Title: Metadata for Electronic Information Resources

Creator: Hodge, Gail

Subject: metadata

Description: Describes metadata standards and projects.

Publisher: NATO

Date: 20040601

Type: Text.Report

Format: text/html

Identifier: <http://www.....>

Language: English

Coverage.Spatial: International

Rights: Copyright 2004, Gail Hodge

Audience: Technical

While the Dublin Core description recommends the use of controlled values for fields where they are appropriate (for example, controlled terms from a thesaurus for the Subject field or the use of the ISO language names and abbreviations for the Language field), this is not required. The content rules are determined by the particular implementation, but the adoption of profiles that define domain-specific rules is encouraged.

The Dublin Core was developed to provide simple and concise descriptions specifically to support the resource discovery of Web-based documents. However, in part because of its simplicity, the Dublin Core has been used with other types of materials and for applications demanding increased complexity. The desire to be able to specify more detail resulted in unqualified (or simple) Dublin Core versus qualified Dublin Core. In qualified Dublin Core, qualifiers are used to refine the meaning of an element or to specify the domain

values or rules for representing an element. The element “Date”, for example, can be used with the qualifier “created” to narrow the meaning of the element to the date the resource was created. A qualifier can also be used in the element “Date” to specify the ISO 8601 standard as the required format for representing date.

There are perhaps thousands of projects worldwide that use the Dublin Core for cataloging or to collect data from the Internet. The subjects range from cultural heritage and art to math and physics. Dublin Core is the basis for the Connexion System which OCLC has developed as its web-based cataloging system for all resources. Dublin Core is also the minimum shareable metadata set in the Open Archive Initiative-Protocol for Metadata Harvesting. While other sets can be used based on mutual agreement between the data provider and the harvester, every OAI-compliant provider must provide unqualified Dublin Core metadata.

3.2 Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS)

MODS is a schema for a bibliographic element set that is intended to support the interoperability of MARC records (especially MARC 21) with other bibliographic metadata schemes. It was developed by the Library of Congress for a variety of applications, particularly those related to library catalogs. It includes a subset of MARC fields, but it uses language-based tags rather than the traditional numeric ones used by MARC. MODS includes 19 top level elements which in some cases regroup the MARC elements. MODS is expressed in XML and is often used in conjunction with METS (see section 4.1.1 below) as a transfer format. MODS 3.0 was released in March 2004.

3.3 Global Information Locator Service (GILS)

GILS was developed by the U.S. government as a tool for enhancing public access to government information. Originally called the “Government Information Locator Service”, GILS in various forms has been adopted by other governments and for international projects, leading to its current name, “Global Information Locator Service”. International implementers of GILS include Australia, Germany, Singapore, and Hong Kong. GILS is also widely used with spatial and environmental clearinghouses implemented by countries and international organizations.

GILS specifies a profile of the Z39.50 protocol for distributed search and retrieval which is a common standard used in online library catalogs. It specifies the attributes (or the elements) that must be able to be searched in order for a system to be GILS compliant. However, organizations have specifically defined GILS elements for their own communities.

Since the purpose of GILS is to act as a locator service, GILS elements emphasize availability and distribution rather than description. Therefore, a GILS record may have elements such as the name and address of the distributor and information on ordering.

A U.S. Federal GILS Core Record For This Paper

Title: Metadata for Electronic Information Resources

Originator: Gail Hodge

Local Subject Term: Metadata

Abstract: Describes metadata standards for electronic libraries and related projects.

Purpose: To serve as an educational aid to librarians, information center managers and others involved in the dissemination and creation of electronic resources.

Availability:**Distributor :**

Name: Information International Associates (IIa)

Street Address: 1009 Commerce Park Dr., Suite 150

City: Oak Ridge

State: TN

Country: USA

Zip Code: 37830

Telephone: 865-481-0388

Fax: 865-481-0390

Order Process: This paper is available without charge by writing to IIa at the address provided.

The original goal of GILS was to provide high-level locator records for government resources, both electronic and non-electronic. GILS records were intended to describe aggregates or collections such as catalogs, publishing services and databases. However, some organizations use GILS at the individual item (journal article or technical report) level.

3.4 Text Encoding Initiative (TEI) Header

The Text Encoding Initiative is an international project to develop guidelines for marking up electronic texts such as novels, plays, and poetry, primarily to support text analysis. As part of the mark-up a header portion has been defined, which includes metadata about the work. The TEI header, like the rest of the TEI, is defined as a Standard Generalized Mark-up Language Document Type Definition (SGML DTD).

The information in the TEI Header is similar to that captured in a library catalog. In fact, the TEI tag set can be mapped to and from MARC. In addition, elements are defined that record non-bibliographic information about the text itself, for example, how the text was transcribed or edited, what revisions have been made, and who performed the mark-up. All these metadata elements are important in text analysis and textual scholarship.

3.5 Encoded Archival Description (EAD)

Finding aids are important tools for resource description and discovery in archives and special collections of both physical and digital records. Finding aids differ from traditional library catalog records by being much longer, more narrative and explanatory, and hierarchical in their structure. The Encoded Archival Description (EAD) was developed as a way of marking up the data contained in a finding aid, so that it can be searched and displayed online. The EAD is particularly popular in academic libraries with large special collections and in archives. Users of EAD hope this scheme will encourage consistency and facilitate cross-archive searching. The EAD standard is maintained jointly by the Library of Congress and the Society of American Archivists.

Like the TEI Header, the EAD is defined as an SGML DTD. It begins with a header section that describes the finding aid itself (for example, who wrote it) which could be considered metadata about the metadata. It then describes the whole collection or record series and successively more detailed information about the contents of the collection. When the individual items being described exist in digital form, the EAD record can include pointers (digital identifiers) to the electronic information.

3.6 ONIX International

ONIX (Online Information Exchange) International is a metadata scheme developed by a number of book industry trade groups in the United States and Europe to support e-commerce. ONIX has elements for basic bibliographic, trade, evaluation and promotional information for books and e-books. This metadata standard is particularly valuable on Internet-based booksellers, such as Amazon.com. It supports the display of such online features as pictures of book covers, book review “snippets”, and links to author biographies. Although initially focused on books, ONIX has been adapted to serial publications.

3.7 Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata

Metadata schemes for datasets are particularly significant in disciplines where numeric and statistical data are primary resources. One of the most well developed element sets and content standards for data is the ISO Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (ISO 19115:2003). Geospatial datasets link data for a specific purpose to the latitude and longitude coordinates on the earth. These datasets are used in a wide variety of applications, including soil and land use studies, climatology and global change monitoring, remote sensing, and demographic and social science research.

The ISO Standard defines over 200 elements. The majority of these elements are optional in the standard, but they may be mandatory for specific implementations. Many national and local governments use the content standard, and it has become deeply embedded in Geospatial Information Systems (GIS). The standard forms the basis for the work of the Open GIS Consortium to provide for better interoperability among GIS applications.

3.8 Data Documentation Initiative (DDI)

The Data Documentation Initiative is a consortium of public and private sector organizations including major universities and the U.S. Bureau of the Census. The DDI’s goal is to establish metadata standards for describing social science data sets. Included are elements such as the collection method, relevant software, and units of measure. A similar initiative within the U.S. Bureau of the Census involves metadata to describe questionnaires and other survey instruments.

3.9 Technical Metadata for Digital Still Images

The National Information Standards Organization in the United States has developed a data dictionary of technical elements for digital still images (July 2000, draft released for comment, February 2001). NISO realized that the focus of most cultural institutions had been on descriptive metadata, without any emphasis on the technical aspects of digital images that would be needed to adequately store and preserve them. The purpose of the standard is to facilitate the “development of applications to validate, manage, migrate and process images of enduring value.” The emphasis is not only on current use of still images, but on the long-term provenance, preservation, and assessment for use and re-use.

The draft standard is quite extensive. The Basic Image Parameters section alone includes over 50 elements. For example, there are elements that describe the format, such as compression, MIMETYPE and photometric interpretation. Elements related to the image’s creation include the scanning agency and camera capture settings. The change history includes the processing agency and the processing software. There are additional elements such as spatial metrics, the colormap, the image width, and the image length.

4.0 METADATA INTEROPERABILITY

With so many metadata schemes, how will chaos be avoided? How can we ensure that systems that use different metadata schemes will be interoperable, in other words that information collected by one organization for a particular purpose can be exchanged, transferred or used by another organization for a different purpose. Practitioners cite metadata frameworks, crosswalks, and metadata registries as ways to achieve this interoperability. However, it should be noted that there has been little large scale testing of metadata interoperability.

4.1 Metadata Frameworks

A metadata framework is a reference model that provides a high-level, conceptual structure into which other metadata schemes can be placed. It also gives designers and developers a consistent, cross cutting terminology around which to discuss metadata for a particular purpose.

4.1.1 Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard

The Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS) was developed by the Digital Library Federation and the Library of Congress for the management of digital library objects. METS uses a framework, described earlier in this paper, which defines metadata as descriptive, administrative or structural. The most significant contribution of METS is its emphasis on structural metadata. METS also adds a fourth component, a list of the files in the digital library object. The structural component of the METS scheme indicates how these files work together to form the digital library object. This structure information supports the management of the object by a digital library, and it facilitates the exchange of these objects among digital libraries.

METS provides an XML DTD that can point to metadata in other schemes by declaring the scheme that is being used. For example within the METS framework, Dublin Core elements could be used to describe a digital still image for resource discovery, and the technical elements from NISO's Draft Standard for Digital Still Images could be used to document the structural aspects of the image.

4.1.2 <indecs>

The Interoperability of Data in E-Commerce Systems (<indecs>) Framework is an international collaborative effort originally supported by the European Commission. It has developed a metadata framework, or a reference model, that supports the sharing of information about intellectual property rights in electronic commerce. In the basic model, people make “stuff”, people use “stuff”, and people make deals about “stuff.”

Rather than develop a new metadata standard, <indecs> provides a framework for the various existing schemes to interact. For example, transactions related to music, journal articles or books could interchange information with one another. This framework has also been discussed as a way to allow the various groups (publishers, libraries and users) involved in access to electronic journal subscriptions to work within a consistent framework for interchange while maintaining the original metadata for their local applications.

In a significant move, the <indecs> framework has been adopted by the MP3 standards group working on standards for multimedia including intellectual property. In the MP3 context, the <indecs> framework is known as Contecs:DD.

4.1.3 Open Archive Initiative

The Open Archive Initiative (OAI) began as a project to provide consistent access across the numerous e-print services created by government and academia in the mid-1990s. However, the OAI has proven to be generally applicable for other types of electronic resources. The objective of the OAI is to create a low barrier to implementation, so OAI has only a few metadata elements based on the Dublin Core. Communities can extend the minimal set as needed.

To be OAI-compliant, the archive exposes the OAI metadata set by crosswalking its native metadata format to that of the OAI. This file is exposed and then harvested into a central repository. The software for implementing an OAI compliant archive is freely available. Recent developments include tools for searching OAI repositories, some of which focus on the needs of specific communities.

4.2 Metadata Crosswalks

Metadata crosswalks map the elements, semantics and syntax from one metadata scheme to those of another. A crosswalk allows metadata created by one community to be used by another community with a different metadata standard. The degree to which crosswalks are successful depends on the similarity of the two schemes. The mapping of schemes with fewer elements (less granular or atomic) to those with more elements (more granular or atomic) is problematic. Despite similarity at the semantic level, the crosswalk can be difficult if the content rules differ from the original scheme to the target scheme even if the definitions of the elements are similar.

While these crosswalks are key to interoperability, they are also labor intensive to develop and maintain. However, crosswalks are important for virtual libraries and subject gateways that collect or search resources from a variety of sources and treat them as a whole collection.

4.3 Metadata Registries

Registries are another tool for exchanging metadata. They provide information about the definition, origin, source, and location of the scheme, usage profile, element set, and/or authority files for element values. A registry maps one scheme to another so that both humans and computers can understand how they might integrate, and registries can also document rules for transforming content for an element in one system to the content required for an equivalent element in another. The DESIRE (Development of a European Service for Information on Research and Education) Project funded by the European Commission has developed a prototype of such a registry based on the ISO standard for defining data elements (ISO/IEC 11179). The Dublin Core Metadata Initiative has also developed a registry for the Dublin Core elements.

Registries are particularly useful in specific disciplines or industries such as health care, aeronautics, or environmental science, where they can be used to make the contents of resources more easily integrated. A good example is the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Data Registry which provides information about thousands of data elements used in current and legacy EPA databases. The EDR metadata registry provides an integrating resource for legacy data, acts as a look-up tool for designers of new databases, and documents each data element. The European Environment Agency has developed a similar registry which is available as open source software on the Web.

5.0 METADATA CREATION

Metadata is extremely important for the discovery and management of digital resources. However, there are major issues related to the cost and time involved in creating this metadata. A variety of methods are used for creating metadata ranging from manual creation to metadata creators/editors, metadata generators and metadata harvesters.

5.1 Manually Created Metadata

Who creates metadata? The answer to this question varies by discipline, the electronic information being described, the tools available, and the expected outcome. In the case of descriptive metadata, originators may provide some level of metadata creation. This is particularly true in the documentation of datasets where the originator has significant understanding of the rationale for the dataset, the way the data was collected, and the uses to which it could be put, and where there is little if any textual information that a cataloger could use. In other cases, projects have found that it is necessary to have metadata catalogers or librarians create the metadata or at least review the metadata created by the originators, because the originators do not have the time or the skills to create adequate metadata.

The cost of creating metadata for the burgeoning number of electronic resources has led to the development of two types of tools – metadata generators and metadata creators/editors. Creators/editors support the manual creation and editing of metadata. Metadata generators automatically create a metadata record based on the original source.

5.2 Metadata Creators/Editors

Metadata creators/editors, both commercial and proprietary, address the need for speed and quality. Many tools support validation rules and pick lists based on authority files or controlled domains, including controlled vocabularies and thesauri. Templates may be provided and customized to stream line the data entry process.

There are several metadata creators/editors for the Dublin Core. The Nordic Web provides metadata creation software and Dublin Core to MARC conversion software, which is free within the European Union. MetaWeb from Australia has developed a metadata editor called “Reggie.”

There are a number of FGDC-compliant metadata creation tools, including Metamaker, which was developed by the U.S. Geological Survey, Biological Resources Discipline. Some FGDC-compliant products have been developed by geographic information system (GIS) vendors to support the documentation of information created or stored within their products. While many of these systems are proprietary, the Open GIS Consortium has developed standards for open metadata tools.

5.3 Metadata Generators

The program DC.doc from the UK Online Library Network (UKOLN) analyzes a Web site (indicated by a URL that the user provides) and creates a Dublin Core record. The proposed content is displayed back to the user in a Dublin Core template. The user can modify the content. The DC fields can be returned to the Web site as metatags or stored in a separate file. Similar programs are available from The Nordic Web Project, OCLC’s Connexion system for shared cataloging of Web resources, and Australia’s MetaWeb.

Of course, the content of metadata generators is only as good as the content of the originating Web site. None of these tools provide 100% automatic metadata generation, particularly if high quality content is desired. Users often use the software simply for a handy Dublin Core template. However, efforts are underway at Syracuse University with funding from the National Science Foundation's National Science Digital Library to improve the results of automatic metadata generation.

5.4 Metadata Harvesters

Metadata harvesters are programs or scripts that capture metadata from other metadata sources. They are slightly different from metadata generators in that they access sets of metadata that are already created. The most well known example of a metadata harvester is the Open Archives Initiative-Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH). This script which is available as open source software is designed to identify repositories of OAI-compliant metadata. Using the OAI-PMH organizations can create aggregated repositories of metadata for distributed digital objects. This metadata can be merged with the organization's own metadata. Aggregations can be built around subjects, library consortia or regional collaborations. The minimum requirement is the exposure of the unqualified Dublin Core Metadata element set.

A similar approach is used by OCLC's Connexion system. Based on the principal of shared cataloging, this system allows libraries to share the Dublin Core-based metadata records that have been created by other libraries. As with other shared cataloging activities, the basic metadata structure is well controlled but content standards must be agreed upon and consistently implemented or levels of quality will vary.

6.0 CONTROLLED VOCABULARIES AND METADATA

The use of controlled vocabularies is becoming increasingly important as a tool for metadata creation and access. This is particularly true as more information managers realize the problems that arise from free text searching or the use of uncontrolled keywords.

Most metadata schemes do not dictate the use of a particular controlled vocabulary when entering the contents of elements that describe what the resource is about. However, use of controlled vocabularies is encouraged, particularly within a subject domain. Many metadata schemes allow controlled vocabularies to be defined within the syntax.

A variety of controlled vocabulary systems are being used for indexing electronic resources. These include traditional library schemes such as the Library of Congress Subject Headings and the Dewey Decimal Classification, specific domain-oriented thesauri or classification schemes, and locally created lists of frequently used or important terms. The tool suite required to use existing controlled vocabulary schemes in the Internet environment is a major research area for OCLC.

Individual projects may specify the controlled vocabularies to be used. For example, the National Biological Information Infrastructure, which uses the Biological Profile for the FGDC Geospatial Content Standard, specifies the controlled vocabulary to be used. Cambridge Scientific Abstracts, as a partner of the National Biological Information Infrastructure (NBII), has developed a Biocomplexity Thesaurus. The terms in the thesaurus will be used in the NBII metadata to tag electronic resources across the NBII subject and geographic nodes. The thesaurus will also be used to select terms for the more traditional bibliographic indexing in CSA's Biocomplexity Database, which is searchable through the NBII Web site. The NBII portal will use the terms to create collections of information based on a user's personal preferences. The NBII's Biological Profile of

the FGDC Metadata Content Standard also specifies the use of the Integrated Taxonomic Information System as the authority file for completing the biological taxonomic classification elements within the metadata record.

Controlled term lists have been developed by many of the U.S. states using the Global Information Locator Service. These include terms that describe the major services and products provided by states to their citizens, to state employees, or to other governments, whether state, local or national.

Unfortunately, the use of individual controlled vocabulary schemes does not significantly improve searching across the breadth of Internet resources or when the user is searching outside his or her area of expertise. A group called the Networked Knowledge Organization Systems/Services (NKOS), an ad hoc group from public and private sector organizations in ten countries, has been discussing the issues related to providing generally applicable knowledge organization services (KOS) via the Internet. The group defines KOSs to include authority files, thesauri, gazetteers, ontologies, topic maps, taxonomies, subject headings, and other types of schemes intended to organize digital objects. NKOS has been discussing protocols for the use of KOSs via the Internet, and has developed a set of metadata elements to describe KOSs and their characteristics and behavior. This metadata could be used as part of a registry of KOSs or as metatag information embedded in header information for a Web-based KOS.

Another approach to making controlled vocabularies more generally available as Internet tools is the development of terminology Web services. A Web service uses specific standardized protocols to create modules that can be used and re-used in a variety of applications over the Web. For example, the U.S. National Agricultural Library has developed its Web-enabled Agricultural Thesaurus as a Web service. Functionality includes locating a term, navigating the thesaurus, and selecting the term and various types of related terms. This functionality can then be incorporated by any other system wanting to use the Agricultural Thesaurus as the basis for searching or browsing its content.

In a similar initiative, a Z39.50 profile for thesauri has been developed. The profile provides a high level, abstract representation for navigating a thesaurus. In addition to providing thesaurus search capabilities within the realm of Z39.50 (which includes the GILS initiatives and many of the initiatives that use the FGDC content standard) an appendix to the profile provides an XML DTD for thesauri that could be used by other protocols.

Web services and other networked applications of controlled vocabularies help to support the development of a Semantic Web, a major activity of the World Wide Web Consortium. The goal of this initiative is to provide the Web with an “understanding” of concepts in order to result in better machine processing of text and provision of services. The basis for the Semantic Web is a knowledge representation that is much richer than that reflected in standard thesauri or classification schemes. These ontologies, semantic networks or topic maps encode more specific relationships between concepts. For example, instead of just labeling leg as a narrower term to body part, the relationship would be specifically identified as “whole-part”. In a knowledge organization system concerned with the environment and human health, the relationship between mosquito and West Nile Virus might be “carrier (or vector)- disease”. The same term, mosquito would have another relationship to the term Insect as its higher level biological taxonomy relationship. Having more explicit relationships allows for better disambiguation of results and the building of rules and assumptions into information retrieval systems.

The SWAD-E group in Europe has developed SKOS Core 1.0, an RDF schema for thesauri and other similar knowledge organization systems. It is intended to serve as the basis for moving traditional knowledge

organization systems into formats that are more appropriate for the Semantic Web even though the rich semantic relationships may need to be enhanced manually or through additional programming.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

Metadata schemes have been developed for a variety of purposes – resource discovery, location, collection organization and management, administration, rights management, technical reproducibility and preservation. However, because the needs of resource types and user communities differ, many schemes have been developed, along with specific extensions and profiles. Metadata standards and interoperability remain key issues. In order to increase the use of metadata, systems need to be developed that support metadata creation at the same time that the resource is created. Larger testbeds of metadata and search engines that take more advantage of metadata that has been created must be developed. Communities of practice need to develop content standards and to look for common areas of interest in order to support access to information across communities. Most importantly, creators of electronic resources must be made aware of the importance of metadata for the short as well as the long-term use of their contributions to the world of electronic information resources.

8.0 SELECTED RESOURCES ON METADATA, FRAMEWORKS AND RELATED STANDARDS¹

General Resources about Metadata

Distributed Systems Technology Centre. (2000). Metadata Schema Registry (Australia). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Metadata Schema Registry Web site: metadata.net/

Hodge, G. (2001). Metadata Made Simpler: A Guide for Libraries Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the National Information Standards Organization Web site: www.niso.org/news/Metadata_simpler.pdf

International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA). (2002). Digital Libraries: Metadata Resources. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions Web site: www.ifla.org/II/metadata.htm

Metadata Information Clearinghouse (Interactive). (1999). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Metadata Information Clearinghouse Web site: www.metadainformation.org/

Schwartz, C. (2002). Metadata Portals & Multi-standard Projects. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Simmons College Web site: web.simmons.edu/~schwartz/meta.html

UK Online Library Network (UKOLN). (2002). Metadata Resources. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the UK Online Library Network Web site: www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/resources

Selected Metadata Schemes and Frameworks

Data Documentation Initiative: DDI. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the University of Michigan Web site: www.icpsr.umich.edu/DDI/

¹ Inclusion in this list does not constitute endorsement by Information International Associates or the U.S. Geological Survey.

DESIRE (Development of a European Services for Information on Research and Education). (2002). Metadata Registry. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the UK Online Library Network Web site: desire.ukoln.ac.uk/registry/

Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the OCLC Web site: purl.oclc.org/metadata/dublin_core/

Ellerman, Castedo. (1997). Channel Definition Format (CDF). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the WWW Consortium Web site: www.w3.org/TR/NOTE-CDFsubmit.html

Encoded Archival Description (EAD). (2001). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Library of Congress Web site: lcweb.loc.gov/ead/

FGDC Content Standard for Digital Geospatial Metadata (CSDGM). (2001). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Federal Geographic Data Committee Web site: www.fgdc.gov/metadata/constan.html

GEM (Gateway to Educational Materials) Element Set & Profile(s) Workbench. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the GEM Web site: www.geminfo.org/Workbench/Metadata/index.html

Global Information Locator Service (GILS). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Global Information Locator Service Web site: www.gils.net

IMS Global Learning Consortium, Inc. (2002). Learning Resource Meta-data Specification. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the IMS Global Learning Consortium Web site: <http://www.imsproject.org/metadata/>

<indecs> interoperability of data in e-commerce systems. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the <indecs> Web site: www.indecs.org/

METS: Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard. (2001). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Library of Congress Web site: www.loc.gov/standards/mets/

MODS: Metadata Object Description Schema. (2004). Retrieved June 18, 2004 from the Library of Congress Web site: www.loc.gov/standards/mods/

OCLC/RLG Working Group on Preservation Metadata. (2001). Preservation Metadata and the OAIS Information Model: A Framework to Support the Preservation of Digital Objects. Retrieved June 4, 2004 PREMIS (Preservation Metadata: Implementation Strategies). Retrieved June 4, 2004 from the OCLC Web site: <http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/pmwg/>

ONIX (Online Information Exchange). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Editeur Web site: www.editeur.org/

PREMIS (Preservation Metadata: Implementation Strategies). Retrieved June 4, 2004 from the OCLC Web site: <http://www.oclc.org/research/projects/pmwg/>

Technical Metadata for Digital Still Images. (2001). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the National Information Standards Organization Web site: www.niso.org/committees/committee.au.html

TEI Consortium. Text Encoding Initiative. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the TEI Web site: www.tei-c.org/

Visual Resources Association Data Standards Committee. VRA Core Categories, Version 3.0. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the VRA Web site: www.vraweb.org/vracore3.htm

Metadata Crosswalks

Day, M. (2001). Metadata: Mapping between Metadata Formats (comprehensive list of mappings to and from all major formats including national versions of MARC). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the UK Online Library Network Web site: www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/interoperability/

St. Pierre, M. and W. La Plant. (1998) Issues in Crosswalking Content Metadata Standards. Retrieved June 4, 2002 from the National Information Standards Organization Web site: <http://www.niso.org/press/whitepapers/crswalk.html>

Metadata Tools

BlueAngel Technologies (MetaStar). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the BlueAngel Technologies Web site: www.blueangeltech.com/

Distributed Systems Technology Centre. (1999). MetaWeb Project (Australia). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Distributed Systems Technology Centre Web site: www.dstc.edu.au/RDU/MetaWeb

Dublin Core Metadata Initiative. (2002). Tools and Software. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Dublin Core Web site: dublincore.org/tools/

Federal Geographic Data Committee. Metadata Tools. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Federal Geographic Data Committee Web site: www.fgdc.gov/metadata/metatool.html

Intergraph Spatial Metadata Management System. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Intergraph Web site: www.intergraph.com/gis/smms//

Meta Matters. Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the National Library of Australia Web site: <http://dcanzorg.ozstaging.com/mb.aspx>

Metadata: UKOLN Software Tools (comprehensive list of tools for a variety of standards including Dublin Core, GILS and IMS). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the UK Online Library Network Web site: www.ukoln.ac.uk/metadata/software-tools/

MetaPackager. (2004). Retrieved June 3, 2004 from the HiSoftware Web site: <http://www.hisoftware.com/xmlp/metapackager.htm>

Nordic Metadata Projects. (2000). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the University of Helsinki Library Web site: www.lib.helsinki.fi/meta/

Related Initiatives

Australian Government Locator Service Metadata Standard. (2000). Retrieved June 4, 2004 from the National Archives of Australia Web site: <http://www.agls.gov.au/>

CORC (Cooperative Online Resource Catalog). (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the OCLC Web site: www.oclc.org/corc/about/

CrossRef. (2000). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the CrossRef Web site: www.crossref.org

National Biological Information Infrastructure (U.S.). (2001). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the NBII Web site: www.nbio.gov

National Spatial Data Infrastructure (U.S.) (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Federal Geographic Data Committee Web site: www.fgdc.gov/nsdi/nsdi.html

Networked Knowledge Organization Systems/Services (NKOS). (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the School of Library and Information Science, Kent State University Web site: nkos.slis.kent.edu/

Open Archives Initiative. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the OAI Web site: www.openarchives.org

W3C Technology and Society Domain: Semantic Web Activities. Retrieved June 4, 2004 from the WWW Consortium Web site: <http://www.w3.org/2001/sw/>

Related Standards and Best Practices

Corporation for National Research Initiatives. Handle System®. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Handle Web site: www.handle.net/

Extensible Markup Language (XML). (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the WWW Consortium Web site: www.w3.org/XML/

International DOI Foundation. DOI: Digital Object Identifier System. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the International DOI Foundation Web Site: www.doi.org/

PURL (Persistent URL). (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the PURL Web site: purl.org

Resource Description Framework. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the WWW Consortium Web site: www.w3.org/RDF/

Taylor, M. Zthes: a Z39.50 Profile for Thesaurus Navigation, Version 0.4. (2000). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Library of Congress Web site: lcweb.loc.gov/z3950/agency/profiles/zthes-04.html

W3C: World Wide Web Consortium. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the WWW Consortium Web site: www.w3.org/

Z39.50. (2002). Retrieved April 21, 2004 from the Library of Congress Web site: <http://www.loc.gov/z3950/agency/>

