RDF in Hydra Summit

NOTE: This work has been carried forward by the Hydra RDF Working Group.

“RDF in Hydra” Summit
October 21-22, 2013
Stanford University

Logistics

Sunday, October 20, 2013
Optional dinner & pre-meeting discussion: 6:30 PM, Palo Alto (@ Darbar, 129 Lytton Ave in Palo Alto)

Monday, October 21, 2013
Working session: 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, 182 Meyer Library
Working dinner: 6:30 PM, Meyer Library

Tuesday, October 22, 2013
Working session: 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, 182 Meyer Library

Objectives

Participation will be limited to 12 attendees given space constraints (first come, first served!); all discussions will be captured via notes and shared with the community for further vetting and development.

Leveraging RDF within repositories to express both metadata and object structures is an emerging pattern, and one of common interest to growing number of institutions. Within the Hydra community in particular, there is substantial interest in identifying and converging on common best practices—both to learn from each other, and also to create shared methods, models, software and infrastructure that benefits the community as a whole. Because of the relative immaturity of the space, though, much of the discussion around leveraging RDF can be frustrated by differences in conceptual approaches, terminology, and lack of common references.

On October 21-22, a small group of interested parties from the Hydra community will meet in order to compare notes on Hydra & RDF, with these specific objectives:

1. Compare current work in leveraging RDF in Hydra-based repositories and examine practical approaches for expressing descriptive metadata as RDF within repositories (85%)
2. Examine the implications, opportunities, limitations, and requirements for leveraging Fedora 4 as a repository engine and frame the issues and opportunities around leveraging RDF within Hydra repositories for future discussions (15%)

By focusing the bulk of time on a single issue (RDF-based management of descriptive metadata) with some precedent and reference implementations in the community, the group will hopefully achieve the twin objectives of identifying and advancing common practice in one small but significant area (objective #1), and lay the groundwork for future, broader working group sessions on more complex topics (objective #2).

Deliverables
1. A Descriptions of current RDF practice, vocabularies, and RDF-related tools used in repositories.
2. A document that articulates the rationale for managing metadata as RDF in repositories. (STARTED, NEEDS SYNTHESIS AND POLISH)
3. A diagram or document that describes the emergent architectural pattern(s) for managing metadata as RDF in Hydra-related repositories. (STARTED, EXTREMELY ROUGH DRAFT)
4. A list of items that need work in order to enable widespread adoption of RDF-based metadata management in repositories, which may include (but not be limited to) vocabulary definition, crosswalks, tools, infrastructure, and reference implementations. (STARTED)
5. A document describing the opportunities and implications around Fedora 4 as the Hydra RDF store. This will include any requirements or implementation considerations that may inform Fedora 4 development.
6. Published notes (and a framing document(s) on the Hydra wiki) on other issues and opportunities around leveraging RDF in repositories, such as:
   a. terminology (STARTED, NEAR COMPLETE)
   b. guiding principles (Rough draft complete)
   c. modelling repository objects (not just metadata) with RDF (vs. FOXML) (BATTED AROUND A BIT -- WHAT ARE WE LOOKING TO SHARE HERE?)
   d. RDF-based rights Metadata for access control (a straw-person proposal that was whipped together way too late) (NEEDS DISCUSSION)

Agenda

Sunday

Evening/Dinner (optional): Review/tweaking of the agenda
Darbar Indian Cuisine
129 Lytton Ave
Palo Alto, CA 94301
Google Map

Monday

Pre-Lunch (1 hour): Discuss Fedora 4.
Lunch: On campus, 1-2 PM
Afternoon: Sketch variety of current patterns and ideal pattern (if possible) for using RDF for metadata management in Hydra-based repositories.
Evening: Working session to make continued progress on afternoon issues, and to finalize Tuesday’s agenda based on the day’s discussions

Tuesday

Morning: Establish common model, vocab, tools for using RDF for metadata (see above for progress against deliverables)
Post-Lunch (1 hour): Discuss other RDF in repository issues: object models, common object interface, etc.
Afternoon: Generate list of open needs around RDF-based metadata management; discuss next steps.

Registration

1. Declan Fleming, UCSD
2. Matt Critchlow, UCSD
3. Tom Cramer, Stanford
4. Lynn McRae, Stanford
5. Chris Beer, Stanford
6. Mark Bussey, DCE
7. Mike Giarlo, Penn State
8. Tom Johnson, Oregon State
9. Karen Estlund, University of Oregon
10. Jon Stroop, Princeton University
11. Jeremy Friesen, Notre Dame
12. James Van Mil, University of Cincinnati