2022-09-15 Metadata Management Meeting notes

Date
15 Sep 2022

Attendees
Jamie Jesanis

Recordings

Recordings of meetings can be found in the Metadata_Management_SIG > Recordings folder on AWS from 2022 onwards: https://recordings.openlibraryfoundation.org/folio/metadata-management-sig/

Discussion items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notetaker</th>
<th>Laura Daniels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and question from Marc Johnson in Slack:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A long time ago (in the early days of FOLIO), two experimental features were added to mod-inventory: very minimal Dublin Core links a MODS based import These were built with the intention of demonstrating some of the ways FOLIO could approach ideas like linked data and importing. These significantly predate the work done on data import and source records. As far as I am aware, neither of which have been used beyond the MODS ingest being used to populate sample records in the hosted reference environments at one point. Given there have already been changes to mod-inventory which break compatibility in Nolana, and this is code that is mostly only a burden at this stage, I intend to remove them. I want to check with the community if that will impact them before I do. Would folks be affected by the removal of these two features?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please get in touch with Marc ASAP if your institution relies on these features.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte: we have not even begun to support other formats (other than MARC) –but this has always been the intention. Why not keep these features?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn (chat): it sounds like a maintenance issue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christie (chat): are they even usable in their current form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacque: sounds like these would not even work anyway?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action: Charlotte will reach out to Marc Johnson, and get a better understanding if this work are even usable at all in it's current form?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision: The work Marc Johnson want to deprecate dates back to the very early days back in 2017 where he worked on some experimental work for the so called Kabalog. Deprecating this experimental work will not prevent us for in the near future 2023-2024 to get back on track and finally start realizing ideas about BibFrame and Linked data. Marc clarified, that getting this work deprecated more likely would clear the way, and it is most likely that today this would be implemented radically different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the complete slack chat: <a href="https://folio-project.slack.com/archives/C20V5L40P/p1662546259229279">https://folio-project.slack.com/archives/C20V5L40P/p1662546259229279</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PC update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reviewed status of SIGs &amp; working groups (<a href="https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1hr7Vx-swyCGlQ3571AK8nYx2MMWb1VFoaqCYOPE8mM/edit#gid=0">https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1hr7Vx-swyCGlQ3571AK8nYx2MMWb1VFoaqCYOPE8mM/edit#gid=0</a>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please add meeting times as needed to the spreadsheet (e.g., quickMARC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Eustis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM SIG Release Note &amp; Other Highlights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of note: Bug in current LDP MARC 1.5 – temporary fix was applied in 1.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• the temporary fix is stable and fixes everything (for those who haven't updated yet)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need volunteers to help test/verify 2 bugs:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEARCH-430 Inventory Elastic Search (Morning Glory). Keyword search on identifiers throw unexpected results when the search only contains numbers and dashes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSEARCH-432 Inventory search on Title (all) return too many results, and does not honor the double quotes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Felix, Jacquie, Jennifer E., and Laura volunteered – Charlotte will set up a Slack channel and possibly meeting time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vision statement from working group

Next steps

1) Refining vision, how to leverage current work around MARC authorities in FOLIO
2) What are resource implications for creation of functionality around entity management?

Summary of WolfCon discussion:

- Khalilah outlined current development
- Tiziana shared info about Share VDE
- Proof of concept developed around Sinopia-FOLIO integration
- Questioning authorities tool

There is a lot of broad interest in this within the community; what are the practicalities of getting work done toward this now that there are more live libraries and unmet needs

Where should a working group start?

**Request: Form New Entity Management Working Group**

– not necessarily same group as before, should be cross-section of the community

Entity Management Epic in JIRA:

⚠️ ROAD-124 - Jira project doesn’t exist or you don’t have permission to view it.

The features under this epic need refinement

Charlotte suggests starting with an environmental scan: what has happened in the project since the last working group ended.

We also need: a convener, a PO, development resources

Jason offered to convene. Lots of plus ones to this. Thank you, Jason!

Felix offered every other week’s MM time for this group to meet.

Christie: suggests forming subgroups to investigate different approaches from a practical perspective

Steven: supports idea of concurrent work, including polling community to prioritize first steps

Charlotte: ARLEF might be interested in entity management?

Jason: what does membership look like?

Jenn: open broader discussions to help identify/self-select subgroups would be helpful

Christie: these conversations might need to be broader than MM SIG

Nancy: how do we make sure subgroup work meshes well together? needs to be some central organization; +1 from Jacquie

Jason acknowledged this concern

**October 6 MM meeting time will be devoted to the first Entity Management Working Group discussion**

Jason will send out calls for participation across FOLIO community

Christie: interested in helping structure the conversation so that we can come out with priorities

Anyone else who would like to help form the agenda, contact Jason in Slack – will organize planning meeting before Oct 6

Entity Management Slack channel: #entity-management-wg
Search: HRID and UUID for keyword search?

- Current situation: HRID and UUID of all 3 entities (Instance, Holdings, Item) are not included in the default keyword search index. A user has to select Instance/Holdings/Item HRID/UUID from the index dropdown list in order to search for them.
- Does the current implementation reflect user expectations?

GBV has mapped the record ID into identifiers array with namespace "PPN" which enables search in keyword index

Ann-Marie: Ideally would like them in both keyword and identifier searches

Lots of +1s to HRID in keyword search

HRID vs UUID – most of us seem to search more by HRID? but sometimes we have reports with UUIDs only, so both in keyword would be helpful

Do we have auto-truncation in keyword? Needs investigation (see bugs cited above)

Rita in chat: One remark: many of the numbers mentioned here are not identifiers for a resource or product but for a certain record. So we have a mixture of identifiers in this instance element.

Jacquie in chat: my concern is that we don't only have these IDs recorded in one place in one record.

How would getting Bound-withs and relationships mess up? Wouldn't the keyword search find matching values across the library collection?

Ann-Marie: HRIDs might conflict with other identifiers, but UUIDs should not

Proposal: include HRID and UUID in keyword, but not in Identifier (all) index

These stories won’t be happening until Nolana at the earliest, so the above bugs should be solved before this happens.

Chat:

11:33:27 From Rita Albrecht to Everyone:
+1!

11:33:58 From Jenn Colt to Everyone:
it sounds like a maintenance issue

11:34:15 From Jennifer Eustis (she/her) to Everyone:
+1 Jenn. It looks like extra work to maintain

11:34:42 From Christie Thomas (she/her) to Everyone:
Are they even usable in their current form?

11:35:49 From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone:
Part of the confusion may be Marc using the word feature instead of module or functionality

11:36:33 From Laura Daniels to Everyone:
stepping away for a minute, brb

11:37:09 From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone:
Yes, I remember the EAD group

11:38:28 From Laura Daniels to Everyone:
back

11:39:18 From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone:
No, I wasn't there

11:40:07 From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone:
This may be the WG for special collections/archives that we were remembering: https://wiki.folio.org/pages/viewpage.action?pageId=14453322

11:42:41 From Jason Kovari (he/him) to Everyone:
It was

11:44:47 From Jenn Colt to Everyone:
It was just a typo he fixed

11:44:51 From Jenn Colt to Everyone:
it should be fine

11:47:03 From Jennifer Eustis (she/her) to Everyone:
I can test them out later today or tomorrow

11:47:10 From Jacquie Samples -- Duke to Everyone:
I also volunteered, Charlotte.

11:49:12 From Ann-Marie Breaux to Everyone:
CSI: Library!

11:49:15 From Jacquie Samples -- Duke to Everyone:
Fascinating and a little gruesome!

11:49:59 From Jason Kovari (he/him) to Everyone:
https://wiki.folio.org/x/OSSuAq

11:55:43 From Christie Thomas (she/her) to Everyone:
https://issues.folio.org/browse/ROAD-124

11:56:13 From Charlotte Whitt to Everyone:
And we have new libraries who are considering FOLIO for whom entity management is very important

11:59:16 From Jenn Colt to Everyone:
That was my question too!

12:00:59 From nancy lorimer to Everyone:
you can point any questions about Sinolio to me...
Thanks Nancy

You did such a great job last time, Jason! I am happy you are willing to lead again.

You are very kind, Jacquie!

I am happy, as well, if you need more help. :)

I am happy, as well if you need more help. :)

I will volunteer

it is self-interest!

I am volunteering too :) 

I am not sure what for, but you are welcome. I am so thankful to Jason for stepping up. 

I have to drop off; have a great day all

Ideally I would love to have them in the Keyword and Identifier searches

That would be great

I would love to have HRIDs in keyword searching

That would be great

I would love to have HRIDs in keyword searching

To me - anything that can give me a single known item result would be magical in the keyword search, which are HRIDs, UUIDs, and (for items) barcodes

We search by HRID all the time so I would be happy to have in the keyword search

Same here,

That makes sense, Christie! I hadn't considered the clicking to get to the correct search box.

I do understand if it causes a problem for other searches to have the UUIDs in the index.

Wouldn't the keyword search find matching values across the library collection?

One remark: many of the numbers mentioned here are not identifiers for a resource or product but for a certain record. So we have a mixture of identifiers in this instance element.

we search by hrids all the time

To me - anything that can give me a single known item result would be magical in the keyword search, which are HRIDs, UUIDs, and (for items) barcodes

Do we have auto truncation in keyword search?

That's exactly my UX Christie - no results? what the heck? oh, change to HRID or UUID...

That makes sense, Christie! I hadn't considered the clicking to get to the correct search box.

I do understand if it causes a problem for other searches to have the UUIDs in the index.

Wouldn't the keyword search find matching values across the library collection?

One remark: many of the numbers mentioned here are not identifiers for a resource or product but for a certain record. So we have a mixture of identifiers in this instance element.

we search by hrids all the time

To me - anything that can give me a single known item result would be magical in the keyword search, which are HRIDs, UUIDs, and (for items) barcodes

Do we have auto truncation in keyword search?

That's exactly my UX Christie - no results? what the heck? oh, change to HRID or UUID...
12:27:30 From Charlotte Whitt to Everyone:
HRIDs and UUIDs are not product IDs

12:27:41 From Jacquie Samples -- Duke to Everyone:
Good point, Charlotte

12:27:42 From Christie Thomas (she/her) to Everyone:
the same thing is true for the hrids, too. Instance_HRIDs are not necessarily unique across the record.