

Questions for reviewers of draft PREMIS OWL Ontology version 3

The PREMIS OWL Ontology Revision Working Group had the following general questions while undertaking the work of substantially revising the previous OWL ontology, which was made available in 2013.

1. There are a few existing ontologies that the ontology references (ODRL for rights, PROV-O for events), but we ended up duplicating significant parts of them because the semantics weren't a close fit for PREMIS. Would it be better to let the semantics shift more and recommend using these existing ontologies instead of duplicating them?
2. Use of Dublin Core elements <http://purl.org/dc/elements/1.1> (referred to as dce:) vs. DC Terms <http://purl.org/dc/terms> (referred to as dct:). We considered using dce: in cases where we expect a literal value and dct: when we need to enforce a range of resource (generally, a URI). In the end the guidelines leave it to the implementer to decide but references are to dct. Is this the best way to handle it?
3. How prescriptive should the ontology be in terms of Rights? PREMIS Rights wasn't designed as machine-actionable, but other ontologies could be used to allow for that.
4. What is the status of efforts to establish format registries that are Linked Data compatible? UDFR? Pronom is not Linked-Data compatible.
5. Are the controlled vocabularies in <http://id.loc.gov/preservationdescriptions> adequate for your local use cases when using the PREMIS ontology? Are there terms that could be added that would be useful for the community? (Note that the list of changes to the preservation vocabularies will be released after the initial documents.)

Any other comments about the ontology are encouraged. Please send all comments to: premis-ontology-review-2018@googlegroups.com.