**Time:** 10:00 am PDT / 1:00 pm EDT  
**Call-In Info:** 1-530-881-1400, access code 651025  
**Moderator:** Esmé Cowles (UC San Diego)  
**Notetaker:** Carolyn Hansen (U of Cincinnati)  

**Attendees:**
- Nick Ruest (York U.)  
- Sharon Farnel (U of Alberta)  
- Danny Pucci (Boston Public Lib)  
- Steven Anderson (Boston Public Lib)  
- Unknown User (acoburn) (Amherst)  
- Carolyn Hansen (U of Cincinnati)  
- Trey Pendragon (Oregon State)  
- Chrissy Rissmeyer (UC Santa Barbara)  
- Arwen Hutt (UC San Diego)  
- Unknown User (escowles@ucsd.edu) (UC San Diego)  
- Mark A. Matienzo (DPLA)  
- Julie Hardesty (Indiana University)  

**Agenda:**
1. Subgroup Reports  
   a. Technical Metadata Subgroup  
   l. Finalize deliverables  
   b. Applied Linked Data Subgroup  
   c. Rights Metadata Subgroup  
   d. Descriptive Subgroup  
2. Issues / Questions  
3. Structural Subgroup update  
4. HydraConnect 2015 Program  
5. Additional Items  
   a. Community Metadata needs  
6. Action Items  

**Notes:**

### I. Subgroup Reports

**Technical Metadata Subgroup**
- Finalize deliverables (Aaron and Nick reporting)  
- Base metadata profile was published a few weeks ago: the group has almost completed phase 1, but there are a few loose ends to figure out (ex. how does technical metadata fit into pcdm structure); the group had an action item regarding tools (these are now listed on the wiki). Group will start phase 2 soon, which will involve description of specialized formats

**Applied Linked Data Subgroup** (Steven Anderson reporting)  
- Main things on recent call: 1) planning around linked data fragment sprint June 8-19 (figuring out the scope for that, will be published under active triples github). 2) Broader/Narrower SKOS with search. Trey Terrell will do experimentation with this and reporting back on next call. Next call delayed until June 25, due to Open Repositories Conference

**Rights Metadata Subgroup** (Esmé Cowles reporting)  
- Group met 2 weeks ago and are working through draft recommendations of what properties to use. Examples include: essential rights metadata, known vocabularies of names, copyright, status, jurisdiction. Group is down to 1-2 topics left to work through (how to handle embargoes / licenses), hoping to get that wrapped up shortly

**Descriptive Subgroup** (Carolyn Hansen reporting)  
- Group met last week. Constructing survey to be sent to all known Hydra implementers. Draft of survey to be finished mid-late June and group will be in discussion with User Interface Group regarding survey questions. Survey will be deployed for 2 weeks, likely in late June/early July. Use Cases to be created out of the survey; goal of having something to present at HydraConnect
2. Structural Subgroup update

- Postponed until Rights Subgroup wraps things up

3. HydraConnect 2015 Program

- What is a good way to talk about metadata at HydraConnect
  - Tabled

4. Additional Items: Community Metadata Needs

- Esme: Question came in regarding FITS recommendations (user updating FITS to latest version) – how should requests like this be handled? Should Technical Metadata Group answer or should it be more ad-hoc? How much organization is needed?
- Aaron: We should be careful with being too prescriptive in how everyone should model FITS or whatever tool is being used to generate technical metadata, one of the thing I recommend is applying general principles, using existing/common vocabularies that are sustainable. Also, b/c FITS uses XML it can have a lot of nested properties, certain kinds of files that have nested properties can become challenging in context of RDF
- Esme: Agrees with not being too prescriptive. One approach could be to say lots of people are using FITS, it’s a good starting point and these are recommendations for using FITS
- Nick: It also depends on the type of file. FITS will bring in schema depending on the file type (ex. images / MIX, video / variety of schemas). It’s difficult to map these from XML to RDF
- Another concern is utility of some of these. FITS has declared a schema, but lots of properties created/populated inconsistently depending on the software used
- Question is not how do we map FITS to RDF, since there is technical metadata that FITS makes available and there is no mapping. One approach would be to ask Mike: what metadata do you actually need? Crosswalk may not be the responsibility of the technical metadata group
- Esme: figuring out what technical metadata is useful/important is bigger part of question, what properties would help an application be able to work with specific file types (images, video). Approach should not be: we have FITS, how do we shove it into RDF? Approach should be: Which properties are people using from FITS in Sufia right now? Handle these, and defer others
- There’s a difference between metadata they need and metadata they have; whether or not the application needs that metadata is an important question to ask