OASIS CMIS, ICOM, DAM Discussion

2 Oct 2013

OASIS continued this open discussion on the potential need for a Digital Asset Management (DAM) interoperability standard. The group decided to draft a charter for a new OASIS TC that will develop a CMIS profile for DAM. An open mailing list will be set up to facilitate collaboration on this charter.

Attendees:
Andrey Shobanov, Genus
Carol Geyer, OASIS
Celso Rodriguez, ASG
Chet Ensign, OASIS
David Riecks, Controlled Vocabulary
David Choy, OASIS CMIS TC chair
Ken Baclawski, Northeastern University, OASIS ICOM TC co-chair
Kevin Kramer, Fidelity
Mark Carlson, Oracle
Michael Steidl, IPTC
Oleg Polukeyev, Genus
Ralph Windsor, Daydream
Randy Dufault, Genus
Ray Gauss, Alfresco

Minutes

1. Recap of first call (Chet Ensign)

2. More on CMIS (David Choy)

*David Choy:* I see three ways CMIS could be leveraged to support a DAM standard:

1. Specify a DAM profile for CMIS (as part of the CMIS family of standards) via a new Technical Committee or SubCommittee. This would let us leverage the CMIS protocol bindings.
2. Specify a DAM standard on top of CMIS, encapsulating CMIS under the cover. This approach would be more independent.
3. Specify a DAM standard on top of CMIS that opens up the CMIS interface to allow CMIS clients to access DAM data. This would provide additional access to DAM data, and help with acceptance. We would need to consider what CMIS functionality to expose for DAM data.

3. More on ICOM (Ken Baclawski)

*Ken:* ICOM is concerned with collaboration to develop artifacts. It’s primarily a model and less concerned with protocol activities. It was developed to incorporate concepts of LDAP, CMIS, iCalendar, IMAP, and a variety of other standards into a single collaboration model. It consists of three branches:

1. Artifact (assets, objects)
2. Subject (actors, roles, groups)
3. Scope (links artifacts and subjects into a context)

The Scope branch has Community (collaborators) and Space (chat room, calendar, task list, forum, etc.). There’s a structure to define what the roles are, privileges, distribution lists, etc. There are also extension models that elaborate on the types of Artifacts.

We should consider if collaboration should be part of a DAM standard.

*Ralph:* The DAM market requires a higher level of interoperability than most of the work that is going on at the moment. There’s a gap between the DAM interoperability reality and what’s going on in CMIS. Ideally, they should connect up. There are some opportunities to do that with identifiers. Until that’s solved, not many people in DAM will take up CMIS.

*David Riecks:* In the best case scenarios, if all the needs of the clients are met by the fields in IPTC Core and Extension, and their systems allow them to move those files, you have interoperability. What usually ends up happening though, is a DAM system will export data into a comma- or tab-delimited file, migrate it to a new DAM, and try to match it up. That’s the state of where things are now. If CMIS could provide some ability to assist in mapping this data, that could be more useful. We’ve discussed this in the IPTC group.

*Ray:* These standards are well defined. You could do a DAM model on top of CMIS. CMIS is well architected and could handle that. CMIS is just the highway for the information to get from one place to another. A DAM profile could work here. CMIS didn’t start out to be a complicated standard. There are many players involved and everything in CMIS was put there because it was needed. If we started with a new standard, it would soon be just as complicated and we’d be reinventing the wheel. I think we should split the certification or implementation of the standard for different levels of support—systems could communicate over CMIS Level One or something like that. This would help vendors who don’t want to consume the entire standard all at once.

*Ralph:* I agree. We need something that’s ridiculously simple that gets people onboard with CMIS, then they can progressively add more layers on top of that. We’ve got a gap at the moment that we need to plug. I think a CMIS profile would get a level of participation from DAM vendors and would get users talking about it.

1. Next steps

*Chet:* There are several ways to move forward. First, we should note that all OASIS TC work is publicly archived and there is a [CMIS public comment list](https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/index.php?wg_abbrev=cmis) and an [ICOM public comment list](https://www.oasis-open.org/committees/comments/index.php?wg_abbrev=icom).

We seem to have consensus for drafting a proposal for a new Technical Committee to develop a CMIS profile. To facilitate that, OASIS will create a mailing list that anyone (members and non-members) can subscribe and use for further discussions. I will send out a template and instructions on how to develop a TC charter and assist in this process.

Thanks to all who participated.