VRA Core is an unusual schema for a Moving Image crosswalk given that it typically is used to describe inert, non-audio visual artworks in media such as painting, sculpture, and photography. This ultimately means that many of the field names, while technically satisfying such categories as date of creation, format and size, or version do not literally translate to the same descriptive details. For example, "material, extent: base" would certainly help to describe the film as an 16mm acetate film but in actuality VRA Core would intend this to mean something like "Oil on Canvas." In other words, the relationship of the "base" (acetate/canvas) to the actual "medium" (film emulsion/oil paint) do not necessarily employ the same vocabulary. VRA also lacks some granularity as relates to the creator and dates associated with the work. While multiple "creators" could be involved in a work, VRA Core is likely approaching this towards the angle of an artists guild, workshop, or team of conservators or restoration experts who have contributed to the "work" over centuries. On the other hand, moving image material can intend this to include director, author of original work or adaptation, cinematographer, and the general "village" that it takes to create a work of moving image. There does not appear to be a good way in VRA Core to parse out the various contributors to a work, though there is a subelement for listing the role that the individual had in the work. Similarly, such terms as "release date" in moving image language may actually refer to "exhibition date" of a work in VRA Core. Again, these are all terms that could quite literally translate but have different industry definitions.

Dublin Core is well-suited for recording moving image metadata, given its history as a schema that arose out of an expressed need for concise and specific definitions of moving image material. Most of the elements tie directly to the language of moving image objects, such as abstract, format, and access rights. Though because it is such an essential scheme, it is less granular than other schemas. There do not appear to be subelements for creator roles or between the format of the original versus the format of the digital file (though there is a section for determining format migration). In the latter example, perhaps it can be deduced that an original and a migrated version are, in fact, completely separate records. All in all Dublin Core is able to cover most criteria for moving image metadata but may not be as flexible in terms of applying multiple names or dates when relevant.

MODS is extremely granular with subelements and attributes all flexibly applying any given criteria to an element. For example, in dictating a creator of a work one can attribute it to a director, producer/production company, or distributor by indicating this in nameType. In applying as much information as possible to a moving image work, MODS is perhaps most ideal as compared to the first three examples. In crosswalking between Dublin and MODS, there are many notes about loss of granularity even though they employ a lot of the same elements and subelements. For example, genre is a subelement of type, Date of Release would seem to be expressed as dateIssued, and extent (file size) is a subelement of the physical description. However, in MODS, extent also appears to define the runtime so it may just be a catch-up for any quantifiable technical information associated with the work. A more granular subelement could by applied to distinguish this in MODS however this would likely be lost in transferring to Dublin Core. Nonetheless, a DC to MODS crosswalk mapping explains that many times

the metadata will default to a "note" in subelements so this information may not be lost entirely.