Hannah Franklin
CINE-GT 1803: Metadata for Moving Image Collections
4/11/16
Assignment 2: Metadata Mapping

For this assignment, I compared the data structure standards MARC, CEN, and PBCore (in their most current iterations). I created a crosswalk using ten fields that apply to moving image collections. Working with these standards gave me a better understanding of what type or size of institution would want to use which standard. For example, while MARC is very granular and allows for more detailed metadata, it is difficult to navigate or understand. One would have to learn the extensive list of elements and their corresponding numbers in order to find or process a work or collection in a reasonable amount of time. Further, MARC was not created for moving image collections. When trying to describe format, I could not simply choose the "Format" element, like I could with the CEN standard. To describe the format, one would have to describe the physical makeup of the work, using subfields such as "material base and configuration" or "technical specifications of medium." However, because of the granularity of MARC, it is highly adaptable and a viable option for the description of moving image material. I could easily specify duration, rights holder, version, unique item identifier, and genre. Fields that are missing can also be described in "Notes" in an appropriate element.

Because the CEN standard was created for cinematographic works, there are more options for descriptive metadata elements for moving image material. For example, while the PBCore and Marc 21 standards did not have a specific element or attribute for describing preservation actions, CEN has the element "Preservation Event", including elements "preservation type", "date", and "preservation detail." This information would be especially useful for an institution holding moving image collections. However, I found it strange that CEN

does not differentiate between genre and subject, but groups them within the element "subject terms". Parsing out this information would be useful to an institution that specializes in experimental or avant-garde films. Although MARC and PBCore are not meant or used only for cinematographic works, they make this useful distinction.

PBCore allows for more technical metadata than CEN or MARC, while the elements for descriptive metadata offered by CEN and MARC are more granular. PBCore allows for the description of a particular instantiation of a work with element "pbcoreInstantiation" and subelements "instantiationPhysical" and "instantiationDuration". PBCore not only allows one to differentiate between versions, but to describe the technical differences between versions. One weakness I found is with describing the field "Source Collection". While MARC and CEN have clear elements that contain information about a record's source, PBCore uses "pbcoreRelation" with two required subelements, "pbcoreRelationtype" and "PBCoreRelationIdentifier". While these fields would explain how a work came from a specific collection or archive, the element name does not make it the most obvious location for this information.

Although MARC is the most granular of the three standards, it is the least user-friendly and is a bit difficult to adapt for moving image material. PBCore does have controlled vocabulary and more technical metadata than the other two standards, but, like MARC does not make specific mention of preservation actions. CEN is meant for cinematographic works and also requires a controlled vocabulary for subject terms, but is the least granular.