

Jon Dieringer
November 19, 2012
Access to Moving Image Collections
CINE-GT 1803
Professor Rebecca Guenther

MAPPING METADATA

For my metadata mapping exercise, I created crosswalks between three standards: Dublin Core, PBCore and VRA Core.

DUBLIN CORE emerged in 1995 from an OCLC/NCSA workshop. It's known for its simplicity and flexibility: an elegant "core" of 15 "broad and generic" repeatable elements. It can then be adapted to other disciplines for more specific usages. This simplicity is at once its greatest strength and weakness. On one hand, it is fairly intuitive and adaptable, yet on the other hand it may be considered too generic for very specific applications.

PBCORE is presently in its second iteration, released 2011, after the schema was first published in 2005. It is based upon Dublin Core and adapted for media such as radio and television programs in both analog and digital formats. As such, this is a particular area of strength and tailored to a production environment. Due to its scalability, it is also useful for simpler assets like still images. It also does a good job of delineating intellectual content, intellectual property and instantiation information. Its capacity for linked data is useful and effective for linking source elements to the greater resource. Its greatest drawback is that it isn't easily adaptable to non-image material.

VRA CORE was developed by the Visual Resources Association, a group of image media professionals. Loosely based on Dublin Core, VRA Core's standards were first published in 1996, and the current version, 4.0, was released 2007. It's greatest strength is in documenting visual objects such as paintings, decorative arts, sculpture and prints. It has a great deal of granularity for describing works from these disciplines. It also has good standards for physical location data. However, it seems to be lagging in its ability to describe digital and moving image works. There is also some ambiguity, as I noted in my attempt to find equivalency for "aspect ratio," being torn between the "width/height" parameters and "resolution"—whose vague, arguably flat-out inaccurate description, suggests the creators are a little behind the curve on technology. There is also little accounting for the language of film dialog, producing entities and runtime. Therefore, it is not good for moving image applications.