Metadata Management SIG:
EAD-to-Inventory Mapping Subgroup

The EAD-to-Inventory Mapping Subgroup was formed in March 2019 under the auspices of the Metadata Management SIG to experiment with mapping non-MARC metadata schemas to the FOLIO Inventory schema. The archives and special collections (ASC) community has been interested in FOLIO almost since its inception; in fact, members of that community formed a FOLIO working group last year. Since some of those members transitioned to the MM SIG after the ASC working group completed its charge at the end of 2018, it seemed logical to select Encoded Archival Description (EAD) as the first test case for non-MARC mapping to FOLIO. The EAD-to-Inventory Subgroup consisted of Clint Bellanger (Auburn), Lisa Furubotten (Texas A&M), Noah Huffman (Duke), Peter Murray (Index Data), Michelle Paquette (Smith), Aaron Trehub (Auburn), and Laura Wright (Colorado/Cornell). Sebastian Hammer (Index Data), Jessica Janecki (Duke), Sarah Schmidt (Duke), and Charlotte Whitt (Index Data) were observers.

The subgroup met four times on Zoom: on April 4, 11, 18, and 25. At its first meeting, the subgroup decided that its work would be narrowly focused on mapping a subset of EAD data elements to Inventory for internal library business processes. In other words, public-facing discovery and display of EAD finding aids was off the table. Furthermore, all of the use cases the group came up with contemplated metadata mapping in one direction only: from an EAD repository (e.g. ArchivesSpace) to Inventory. These two limitations greatly simplified the subgroup's work.

Using a spreadsheet developed by Laura Wright and with the guidance of EAD expert Noah Huffman, the group members experimented with mapping EAD3 data elements to corresponding data elements in the Inventory Container and Instance records. The results can be seen at https://bit.ly/2DC0HKI.

Findings:

1. Correspondence between the EAD and Inventory metadata schemas is limited. Nevertheless, there is some overlap at the Container and Instance levels.

2. Archival collections are typically described at the collection, record group, and folder level, not the item level. For that reason, mapping EAD data elements to the Container level (as opposed to the Instance level) is the more-likely use case scenario. That said, it is possible to map some EAD elements to Instance, should an appropriate use case for doing so be identified.

3. In order to accommodate non-MARC metadata schemas for internal library business purposes, the Container schema will have to be expanded. Based on the EAD exercise,

the subgroup recommended adding six elements at the Container level: Language; Physical Description; Access & Use Conditions; Contributor; URL; and URL Note.

4. This exercise, the first of its type, shows that it is possible to accommodate non-MARC metadata in the FOLIO Inventory module. Now would be a good time to do similar exercises for other communities (e.g. music librarians), since the metadata specifications for Inventory are still being developed.