

• PART I:

I selected a 4-item DVD collection that was part of my research for Intro to MIAP's final project. The films are New York-Puerto Rico co-productions that were filmed during the 1960's and 1970's. The films absorbed key themes and styles from the exploitation genre and in addition Hispanicized the genre by way of cultural markers and signifiers. The collection has enduring value because it captures the zeitgeist of a time period in which minority diaspora communities were being derided and discriminated against. Producing these films provided a means of gaining agency. The goal is to create a record that best describes the collection and its identifiable parts, while linking key contributors and themes.

• PART II:

Since there is no preservation data accompanying (the collection is composed merely of DVD's) my collection selection, my "metadata wish-list" comprises all available data for these films. I want to include descriptive, administrative, technical, rights metadata and structural. Some qualities won't be fulfilled through the board. Different elements have divergent data. On account of this, my aim is to create a record that comprises all available data for my collection in a cohesive, coherent manner that won't leave out any information gaps.

My chosen standard would have to allow alternate titles to include the English translation of the films, if it applies. I also hope to link the films by way of shared themes, crewmembers etc. this can be made possible by using a structure metadata standard and cross-referencing titles. I am also looking for a metadata structure that can tolerate different date fields, so that one could reference and discern from an original film release date and the DVD's production date. Since these films are in Spanish, it is important to adopt a standard that includes or can adapt to the specifics of language. Those specifics would ideally include the use of dubbing, spoken language and if the film has accompanying subtitling. On the technical side I wanted

to include DVD basics such as encoding information, running time and have the allowance to include file size. I also wanted to implement a metadata standard that would allow me enough leeway to adapt and use terms that are not necessarily part of a controlled vocabulary list, but are valuable and specific enough to be used to describe the collection.

My “metadata wish list” is as follows:

**Descriptive:**

Title- capable of ingesting alternative Spanish or English language titles

Author/Creator-

Cast/Contributor

Crew/Contributor

Date- The ability of specifying between Date of release, Date of DVD release and Copyright date

Keyword tags- subjects, themes or topics that can link films together

**Administrative:**

Rights or restrictions- copyright information if applicable

Location-possible call number, identifier

**Technical:**

Running time- valuable if one where to consider programming the films or scheduling an event related to the films

Encoding information- DVD’s are encoded or formatted according to region or the time in which they where produced, this is essential when considering playback options for the films

NTSC/PAL Format- This field is specific to consumer DVD’s and can vary according to manufacturer or where it was purchased or how it was acquired

**Qualities:**

Associated files-Associated films and other ancillary data such as pictures, text and sound files amassed that can facilitate research. The metadata standard should ideally express linkage to other files in the collection to gain a better understanding of the context in which they were produced.

• PART III:

I choose to Dublin Core Qualified because of its simplicity and malleability, also a contributing factor in choosing this standard is that some groups in the moving image archiving world support it and I wanted to test its ease of use and performance. Dublin Core is made up of 15 element sets:

- Title · Creator · Subject · Description
- Publisher · Contributor · Date · Type
- Format · Identifier · Source · Language
  - Relation · Coverage · Rights
  - Distributor

Additionally, I chose Dublin Core because it allows expressing relationships between objects and I want my collection to be linked to one another. I will stick to Dublin Core's controlled vocabulary suggestions. During the crosswalk exercise, I found out that Dublin Core is very well documented on the web, which made it an ideal metadata candidate for a small collection recorded by a beginner with the purpose of simple organization.

For the subject field in Dublin Core, I stuck to Getty's Thesaurus for Geographical Names and AAT (Art and Architecture Thesaurus), but since DC does not require a specific type of controlled vocabulary, I also included keywords or terms specific to this collection. For dates, I used DCMI Period Values and for the type field I used DCMI as well. In the coverage field, under the spatial and temporal distinctions I used ISO 3166-2 controlled vocabulary. While sticking to controlled vocabulary, I was faced with thought choices, electing within the sets and what the record actually needed. In that regard, Dublin Core's malleability was useful in creating strong complete records.

For my second choice, I selected MARC21 because it is so widely used and popular and allows a lot of tweaking and sub-elements. Since the purpose of this exercise is to validate a record through an XML validator, I also wondered if M21 would translate to XML. MARCXML is an XML schema that is based on M21, I sought to see how one would crosswalk into the other. M21 is also a widely used metadata standard, but I had heard some scornful comments about it in AMIA, so I decided to expand my experience with it. In addition, I learned about a year ago during a workshop that it was the standard implemented in the moving image division of the Puerto Rican National Archives, spiking my interest in seeing how current the standard

really is. I consulted with a DVD Cataloguing Task Force Member's *Guide to Cataloging DVD and Blu-ray Discs Using AACR2r and MARC21*<sup>1</sup>. The guide was published in 2008, which can mean it is a little dated, but it still was an excellent guide for general terms and issues to look out for.

**General Qualities desired:**

1. Identifier
2. Creator Personal name
3. Creator Dates
4. Subjects
5. Abstract
6. Creator description
7. Genre
8. Contributors
9. Format
10. Running time
11. Color
12. Sound
13. Rights
14. DVD Distributor

---

<sup>1</sup> [http://www.olacinc.org/drupal/capc\\_files/DVD\\_guide\\_final.pdf](http://www.olacinc.org/drupal/capc_files/DVD_guide_final.pdf)

## DATA ELEMENT LIST

Wish list	Dublin Core	Marc21
Title	<dc:title>	130, 500 \$a title from container
Author/Creator	<dc:creator>	508
Cast	<dc:contributor>	003
Crew	<dc:contributor>	508 (repeatable field)
Date	<dc:date>	260 (copyright date) 5xx note (original production date)
Keyword tags	<dc:description>	5xx (notes)
Rights or restrictions	<dc:rights>	540
Location-possible call number, identifier	<dc:identifier>	033 b and c
Running time	<dc:format>	500 \$a Duration stated on container
Encoding information (NTSC/PAL)	<dc:format>	007,538
Format-	<dc:format>	007/00 \$a (category) 007/08 \$i (playback channels)
Associated files	<dc:relation>	740 \$6
Language	<dc:language>	041 and 546
DVD Distributor	<dc:publisher>	260 \$a \$b