[Slide stating problem]
Appropriateness — misusing DC to describe "people" or "places"

• Possible solution
  – Evaluate appropriateness element-by-element relative to entities described
  – At a minimum, Identifier and Type ("Person")?
    • Helps users decide utility of resources
  – Guidance, type-by-type, on appropriate usage
  – Use protocol to express preference for richer formats (see below)
Quality of metadata content

• "Junk" records make junky indexes

• Responses
  – Junk metadata problem broader than just DC!
  – Better tools, interfaces, partitioned workflows for metadata creation and quality control
  – Better guidelines for use of DC in specific communities
  – DC useful not just for indexing, but listing and browsing results
Quality – too-broad semantics

• Intrinsic problem with DC?
  – Broad, fuzzy buckets inevitably hold diversity

• Harvester must sometimes guess context
  – e.g., dc:identifier, dc:subject
    – Proliferation of more-specific elements/qualifiers would increase complexity
  – Rather, recommended constraints, e.g., "dc:identifier should be a URI"
Effort – stopping short of providing richer metadata

• Problem
  – People with rich metadata dumbing down to DC
  – People with no metadata make DC then stop, even if DC is not ideal

• Responses
  – Promote richer metadata parallel to DC
  – Point to preferred metadata from about container for required DC format
  – Or consider DC "non-preferred" by default (most cases)
Examples of richer formats

• LOM
• MARC
• Academic metadata format (AMF)
• RDF combination of multiple metadata formats
• OLAC
Group mood – summary

• Keep Dublin Core mandatory
• Encourage use of richer formats
• Support indication of "preferred" formats
• Constrain too-broad elements with usage recommendations ("use a URI for dc:identifier")
• Explain how to use DC with non-document-like resources (just Identifier/Type?)
Issues

- Constraint that no solution can invalidate current implementations
- Issue of empty DC records that are actually compliant