RBMS/SAA Joint Task Force (Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures)
Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2017

Present:	Martha O'Hara Conway, Emily Novak Gustainis, Co-chairs; Adriana Cuervo; Lara Friedman-Shedlov; Angela Fritz; Elizabeth Haven Hawley; Lisa Miller; Katy Rawdon
Absent:	Rachel D'Agostino; Cyndi Shein
Next meeting:	March 2, 2017 1:00 EST, via conference call *Note: Next Level 2 working session will be Thursday, February 16, 12:30-2:00*

The group initiated discussion of Level 1 feedback received thus far, starting with comments regarding the use of the word "described"in the guidelines:

> I have only one concern: I think "described at the collection level" may be confusing, so I encourage use of "managed as a collection" as being more accurate. As I understand the proposed standard, materials "described at the collection level" could be represented online by a very detailed finding aid that might include item-level description of some components. The materials are managed as a collection, but described at more detail than just "collection-level description."

The group agreed that because collections often have components described at the item level in a finding aid (or database/system), that this may be confusing to some users, possibly those less familiar with archival description. The group agreed to consider changing the language in the Level 1 Reporting guidelines to something that would eliminate "described," such as:

> The Task Force is proposing a Level 1 count that consists of the following counts and measures:
>
> - Titles/title equivalents representing collection material ~~described and~~ managed at the collection level that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material.
> - Titles/title equivalents representing collection material ~~described and~~ managed at the item level that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material.
> - Physical space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material, in cubic or linear feet as appropriate.
> - Digital space occupied by collection material that is described online/discoverable, by category/type of material, in gigabytes.

The group agreed to think about the potential change and wait and see if we receive any similar feedback before the March 3 deadline.

The group then initiated a discussion of feedback issues related to quantifying digital space occupied, specifically:

- Is it OK to count the physical footprint of a hard drive (say in a box) when the digital space occupied for the records *on* that drive is also reported in gigabytes
    - According to our current thinking, yes, it is OK. You just wouldn't count the gigabytes on the drive and the gigabytes on the server twice.

- How do we address more detailed understandings of file types in mixed material collections? Especially when some systems enable more granular reporting for image, audio, cad, video, etc. file types? With Level 2? 3?

- Should we change the guidelines to overtly state that we are counting born digital records only (per Ricky Erway's OCLC definition), and that only one set of the digital records be counted (not the preservation copies, use copies, etc.)?

The group returned to previous discussions regarding the pros and cons of reporting all digital space occupied for all collections as one count, regardless of category or whether or not it is part of a mixed format collection.

The group reiterated the need to provide an FAQ or other supporting documentation to clarify why certain decisions were made and guidance on the actual hands on work of conducting the count.

The group ended the call by remarking on the very positive and constructive feedback that we have received thus far from both the SAA and RBMS communities.

Assignments
Following the initial discussion, the group agreed to break out existing comments, questions, etc. into categories for discussion. It was agreed that Emily would do the first pass on categorizing feedback and then circulate the links 3-4 days in advance of the March 2 call. Task Force members would then be responsible for recording their "gut level" responses to the questions in the "digital" category (unless another one is deemed preferable) in advance of the meeting to launch the discussion.