

Metadata for Moving Image Collections

R. Guenther

Jacob Zaborowski

23 April 2016

Data Mapping Crosswalk Comparison

This crosswalk compared three metadata standards: Dublin Core, PBCore, and EBUCore. This comparison considered all three in terms of their strengths and weaknesses in describing moving image collections. This evaluation also considered granularity, benefits of controlled vocabularies, equivalencies between standard elements, and relationships between fields (many-one, one-many).

Dublin Core is the least granular of the standards compared, comprising of only fifteen elements at initial conception (with qualifiers added for some granularity since). Its benefits for controlled vocabularies are somewhat sparse and broken up across several elements (type, Format, and Source, with some qualifiers). The equivalencies between Dublin Core and the PBCore elements are noticeable, specifically in the original set of fifteen elements and the elements for PBCore (Title, Coverage, Creator, Contributor, to name a few). This is worth noting due to Dublin Core's conception as a standard for describing moving image materials and PBCore's intended use for public broadcasting materials.

PBCore's granularity is broken down into Root Element, Intellectual Content, Intellectual Property, Extensions, and Instantiations. I focused on Intellectual Content, Intellectual Property, and Instantiations minus Essence, just to give an idea of similarities, differences, and benefits/drawbacks that PBCore has in relation to the other two standards I mapped and compared. The benefits for controlled vocabularies are still broken up across elements (Relation, Genre, Subject), but more robust than Dublin Core in that by breaking it into DescriptionDocument and InstantiationDocument, PBCore allows for more use of controlled vocabularies in a record (AssetType, MediaType, instantiationPhysical, Relation, RelationType). PBCore equivalencies are strongly aligned with Dublin Core; I recall during my internship at Democracy Now! that Dublin Core was integrated with PBCore

in order to create their catalog records. PBCore, while more robust than Dublin Core, is still weak in comparison to EBUCore, specifically in terms of rights management for a moving image record.

EBUCore's granularity is best exhibited by their elements for describing the presentation format, the technical specifications of the medium, and the legal information. The legal information is of note because of how they break it down into the following elements(Publisher, Date, Date Issued, Date Created, Rights, Rights Type, Rights Holder, Coverage, Exploitation Issues, Clearance Flag, Disclaimer, RightsID, Publication History, First Transmission Date, First Transmission Channel, Repeat Date/Time, Repeat Channel, Contact Details). They make it a point of noting the difference between creation and transmission dates as well as having a field to track clearance issues. EBUCore's benefits for controlled vocabularies are most evident in their elements for media formats (Format Medium, Format Container Format, Format File Format, Format Audio Format, Format Video Format, to name but a few). This is useful in considering that audiovisual formats can be incorporated into controlled vocabularies in catalog records. The equivalencies with PBCore and Dublin Core are minimal, and in the case of EBUCore, many of its elements are now being integrated with PBCore due to their granularity.