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Governance

The Council approved revisions to charges for all technical subcommittees. There are six technical subcommittees and development and review teams of the Standards Committee:

1. Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (2 chairs, 3 members, 2 ex officio members);
2. Technical Subcommittee on Describing Archives: A Content Standard (1 chair, 8 members, 3 ex officio members);

---

1 Drake resigned before her term was complete and Lisa Miller was appointed to fill the vacancy. Miller’s term began June 30, 2011.
3. Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Context (2 chairs, 12 members, 4 ex officio members);  
4. Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (2 chairs, 8 members, 12 ex officio members);  
5. Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team (1 chair, 7 members, 2 ex officio members), and the  
6. Schema Development Team (1 chair, 5 members, 5 ex officio members).

Appointments were made filling all open positions for Standards Committee members, technical subcommittee chairs, technical subcommittee members, and liaisons with the exception of two remaining vacant positions for Standards Committee ex officio representatives to CC:DA and ARMA.

**SAA programs and documents endorsed:** SAA Annual Meeting session: “Hosting a Virtual and Accessible Session at Your Next Conference” (Chair: Daria D’Arienzo) ACCEPTED; SAA “Core Values of Archivists” Statement.


**External draft document comments:**  
*ACRL/RBMS Guidelines for Interlibrary and Exhibition Loan of Special Collections Materials*, http://www.rbms.info/committees/task_force/borrowing/index.shtml;  
*Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts) DCRM(Ms) Area 4*, http://www.rbms.info/committees/bibliographic_standards/dcrm/dcrmmss/dcrmmss.html;  
*Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Graphics) DCRM(G) Areas 1, 5 and App B*, http://dcrmg.pbworks.com/w/page/6108102/FrontPage  
BIBCO Standard Record Requirements for Archival Collections (Program for Cooperative Cataloging Standards Committee), http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcd/bibco/BSR_Archival%20Collections_Combined_Version_110610.pdf

**Ongoing Projects/Activities:** Current SC projects and activities are matched to desired outcomes identified in the report, *SAA Strategic Priority Outcomes and Activities, FY 2010 - FY 2014*, http://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/0511-StratPlan_PublicPosting_060111.pdf.

**Technology Initiatives**

**Standards Portal:** Standards Committee chairs provided input on the Standards Portal grant application to the Delmas Foundation. Committee continues to work with SAA staff on Portal taxonomy, structure, and procedures. Standards Committee administration and governance pages were migrated to Drupal by Sibyl Schaefer in 2010. Goals are for all technical subcommittee pages to be migrated and to begin to populate the Portal with
more standards documents. This meets desired outcome #2 since the Portal is an online mechanism for information sharing related to archival standards.

**Trusted Repositories Audit Checklist / Digital Preservation Standards:** Committee coordinated with Brad Westbrook, Nancy McGovern, Brian Doyle, and Bruce Ambacher about next steps for supporting the TRAC guidelines. It was proposed that SAA endorse the CCSDS document as well as the OAIS model, but the Council directed the committee to wait for the CCSDS document to be finalized. ISO review is still to be completed, and promotional activities may be needed following endorsement. This will meet desired outcome #2 since it supports external standards related to born-digital records.

**Diversity Initiatives**

**Standards Representatives:** To date, 13 representatives from Sections, Roundtables, and Groups volunteered to serve 3 year terms participating in standards development and review. These standards liaisons do not have voting privileges on the Standards Committee, but provide feedback on draft standards under review. The SC will continue the program, soliciting volunteers representing other SAA groups for the 2012-2014 term. This initiative helps meet desired outcome #4 since it promotes diversity and inclusiveness throughout the range of special interest groups within SAA.

**Advocacy/Public Awareness Initiatives**

**Standards Committee involvement with SAA programs:** Initiating efforts to work with the Education Committee to develop and support standards-based workshops and encourage technical subcommittees to propose standards-based workshops and sessions. To achieve this objective, may survey archivists to identify standards-based needs and interests. The committee and technical subcommittees will actively work with the Education Committee to ensure that workshops and education offerings present the most up-to-date information about the status of SAA standards in development. This effort meets desired outcome #2 since it establishes a plan for communication between Education and the SC, which will increase public awareness of archival standards.

At the Council’s request, SC submitted information on the implications of becoming an ANSI standards developer (see Appendix I). This inquiry into standards development and accreditation meets outcome #2 as SAA explores increasing the visibility of archives and archivists to the public.

Respectfully Submitted,
Marcy Flynn and Cory Nimer, Co-Chairs, 2011-2012
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Appendix A

Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)
Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee
August 4, 2011

I. August 10, 2010, SAA Standards Committee Meeting, Washington, DC

Michele Pacifico, co-chair of the Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines, attended the SAA Standards Committee meeting to update the committee on the status of the Guidelines and to obtain guidance for future actions of the newly established Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines.

Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers was published in 2009 and was approved as a SAA Standard. With the publication and Standard’s status, the Task Force was terminated. In 2009, SAA established the “Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG).” Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted agreed to co-chair the new technical subcommittee.

Pacifico reported to the Standards committee that Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers would be receiving the SAA Preservation Publication Award at the SAA annual meeting on August 13, 2010. Pacifico reported to the Standards committee that the Guidelines had been public for one year and that the publication received positive reviews in The Journal of North Carolina Archivists, Archives and Manuscripts: The Journal of Australian Society of Archivists, and The Public Historian. The Guidelines also are being used in NARA, SAA and regional archives’ training courses.

There was discussion of putting the Guidelines online but the actual process of how and when to make this available had not been fully discussed with SAA’s technical staff.

The new TS-AFG was advised by the Steering Committee to review the criteria for the official five year review process for SAA standards. In addition, the new technical subcommittee was tasked with drafting the official charge for the new subcommittee and submitting subcommittee candidate names to the SAA Vice President.

II. Annual Report of the TS-AFG: September 2010 to August 2011

October 2010. A draft of the charge for the TS-AFG was sent to the SAA Standards Committee. It outlined the subcommittee’s purpose, membership, size, length of term, reporting procedures, duties and responsibilities, and meetings.

November 2010. Co-chairs Pacifico and Wilsted proposed several candidates for consideration for the subcommittee. Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers received additional favorable reviews in The American Archivist, Archival Issues, Archivar: Zeitschrift fur Archivwesen (Assoc. of German Archivists) and Metropolitan Archivist.

January 2011. On January 27, 2011 the TS-AFG and its charge was formally approved by the SAA Council. The charge is available on the SAA website.

March 2011. Vice President/President Elect Gregor Trinkaus-Randall officially approved the following people to the TS-AFG: The subcommittee members are:
Michele F. Pacifico, co-chair; Thomas Wilsted, co-chair; Scott C. Teixeira; Diane L. Vogt O’Connor; Gregor Trinkaus-Randall

April – July 2011. Issue of joint standard with Canada. One of the subcommittee’s goals is to investigate the possibilities for developing joint guidelines with Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA). Co-chair Wilsted discussed with SAA Executive Director Nancy Beaumont the appropriate means of contacting the ACA. Wilsted corresponded with ACA Executive Director Duncan Grant, who referred the issue to Loryl MacDonald, the ACA President. Wilsted attended the ACA Annual Meeting in Toronto in late May and met with MacDonald. MacDonald was enthusiastic about the potential for a joint guideline and agreed to take the idea to the ACA Board. She later indicated that the ACA Board also was enthusiastic, however building guidelines and standards fell under the purview of the Canadian Council on Archives (CCA), a national government body. MacDonald offered to discuss the matter with the CCA and determine how the ACA and CCA might move forward in cooperation with the SAA to develop joint facility guidelines. The TS-AFG is waiting for a response from the two Canadian organizations. At this time there is no Canadian appointee to the TS-AFG.

April – July 2011. Issue of funding for work on a joint standard with Canada. In May, co-chair Wilsted spoke with Executive Director Nancy Beaumont the need for funding for travel and other related subcommittee expenses, especially if there was to be work on a joint standard. They discussed the option of again seeking funding from the Spacesaver Corporation (Spacesaver had generously provide funding for the initial task force that developed the facilities guidelines). Beaumont noted that SAA has no plans to seek funding from Spacesaver and suggested that Wilsted make contact with them. Wilsted contacted Spacesaver Vice President Mark Haubenschild and discussed the ongoing work of new TS-AFG. Mr. Haubenschild tentatively agreed made a commitment of $9000.00 for 2012 to support the subcommittee’s work assuming that we would find additional needed funding. If the Canadians agree to participate they have indicated that they would be able to procure additional funding.

May 2011. Issue of becoming an ANSI standard. The co-chairs, in conjunction with the Standards Committee, have had some preliminary discussions via e-mail about ANSI standards. SAA would need to become an ANSI member, with membership ranging from $3355 to $4870. Questions were raised about the overall worth of an ANSI standard, whether SAA’s standards might be “watered down,” and how it might change the mechanics of SAA’s standards management and review cycles. ARMA and AIIM are both ANSI standards developers and it was decided that it would be useful to discuss their experiences before moving forward with this issue. Marcy Flynn was going to meet with the Standards Director of AIIM in May.

August 2011. TS-AFG meeting. The TS-AFG has been communicating by e-mail. They will not hold a meeting at the SAA Annual Meeting in Chicago as some of the subcommittee members cannot attend. The co-chairs will be scheduling a conference call in early fall.

Respectfully submitted, Michele F. Pacifico and Thomas Wilsted
Co-Chairs, SAA Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines
Appendix B

Technical Subcommittee on Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS)
Annual Report
Submitted July 2011

The Technical Subcommittee on Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS) has had a busy year. TS-DACS is responsible for overseeing the timely and ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of Describing Archives: A Content Standard. This report covers the period August 2010-July 2011.

TS-DACS was reconstituted beginning in August 2010. The new chair, Gordon Daines, spent the months of August and September working with SAA president Helen Tibbo to invite new committee members.

TS-DACS Membership

Service, 2010-2015
J. Gordon Daines III (Brigham Young University), chair
Hillel Arnold (New York University)
Kathryn Bowers (Harvard University Archives)
Chatham Ewing (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)
Steven Hensen (retired, Duke University)
Roslyn Holdzkom (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)
Mary Lacy (Library of Congress)
Sibyl Schaefer (Rockefeller Archive Center)
Claudia Thompson (University of Wyoming)

Ex Officio Members
Marcy Flynn (Standards Committee co-chair)
Cory Nimer (Standards Committee co-chair)
Jerry Simmons (Description Section Chair)

TS-DACS charge and revision timeline

The first activity completed by TS-DACS was a revision of the subcommittee’s charge. The new charge is available at http://bit.ly/ri2S2d.

Upon completion of the charge, the subcommittee created the following timeline for a revision of Describing Archives: A Content Standard:

29 October 2010 Submit new charge and proposed revision to the Standards Committee and SAA Council for approval
Nov.-Dec. 2010 Teleconference of TS-DACS
3 January 2011 Issue call for public comment on DACS
June 2011 Teleconference of TS-DACS
August 2011 Meeting of TS-DACS at SAA Annual Meeting
Forum for public comment on DACS at SAA Annual Meeting
October 2011 Teleconference of TS-DACS
Spring 2012 Working meeting of TS-DACS (subject to funding)
August 2012 Meeting of TS-DACS at SAA Annual Meeting
Forum on proposed revisions at SAA Annual Meeting
October 2012 Teleconference of TS-DACS
November 2012 Release draft of proposed revisions to DACS
Solicitation of comments on proposed revisions
August 2013 Meeting of TS-DACS to discuss plan for publicizing
revised edition of DACS and creating revised DACS
trainings at SAA Annual Meeting
Publication of revised version of DACS

Revision of Describing Archives: A Content Standard

TS-DACS began the process of revising *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS) by carefully evaluating *Resource, Description and Access (RDA)* and its relationship to DACS. We held our first teleconference in December. We used this teleconference to talk about RDA and DACS as well as to create working groups tasked with responsibility for the major sections of DACS. Each working group is responsible for creating a revision proposal based on community feedback. A call for community comment was issued during the first quarter of 2011 and community feedback was received through the first week of May. A second teleconference was held in June 2011 to review the community feedback and to begin discussing draft revision proposals. Further discussion on these revision proposals will occur at the TS-DACS meetings in Chicago during the 2011 SAA Annual Meeting.

The call for comments on DACS generated a fair amount of feedback from the community. The feedback can be summarized as follows:

**Not directly related to the text of DACS:** Make DACS available online (possibly as a for fee service)—this has been a consistent request and theme in the feedback.

**Potential New Material**

- Add a section that addresses the required descriptive elements for the finding per se (would correspond to the <eadheader>).
  - Author and publisher of the finding aid
  - Date it was created
  - Rules used in its creation
  - List of revisions
- Create an index that linked MARC/EAD codes with corresponding DACS elements.
- Discuss the use of abbreviations and square brackets with clear explanations.
- Elevate information in footnotes to the main text.
- Provide guidance on the use of acronyms.
- Add a title conventions element to DACS and make it required at the collection level in multi-level descriptions.
- Add appendices covering:
  - Applying DACS to folders
  - Applying DACS to electronic records
Applying DACS to non-textual materials
• Working with DACS and companion standards

**Introductory Text**
- Clarify the intent of “In a minimum description, this element may simply provide a short abstract of the scope and content of the materials being described” on p. 8 while in 3.1 DACS states that a brief summary of the scope and content and the biographical information may be combined to create an abstract, but that “such an abstract does not serve as a substitute for the scope and content element.” (p. 35)
- Expand the discussion of access points and put it in one place (currently split between 2.6 and the Overview).
  - Explicitly state that names of creators are meant to be provenance access points.
- Add statements to the “statements of principles” that explain provenance/respect de fonds, original order, and archival ethics in the context of archival description.

**Part I: Describing Archival Materials**

**Levels of Description**
- Require a title conventions note for both single-level minimum and multi-level minimum archival descriptions (Levels of Description).
- Rename “Levels of Description” as “Levels of detail in description”—make clear that it describes what elements are mandatory and which are optional.

**2.1 Reference Code**
- Add information on control numbers for component parts of archival collections.

**2.3 Title**
- Add guidance for including inclusive or bulk dates in supplied titles.
- Allow differentiation of titles by date.
- Provide guidance on additional format types useful for titles (video, film, computer files, etc.). Provide examples.
- Clarify how to determine the nature of archival materials in a record group when a personal name is heavily associated with the records.
  - Indicate that the role of an individual is the important point in determining the nature of archival material.
- Provide advice on when and how to transcribe folder titles.
- 2.3.6 refers archivists to rules 2.3.18-20 and 2.3.22 in cases where the repository has assembled the collection or creator is not known. 2.3.21 would also be relevant, and should be added to the list of rules referred to.
- Provide direction on which creator to record first in a title if there are multiple creators.
- Provide direction on choosing between personal/family and corporate body responsibility (papers v. records).
- Provide additional direction about choosing among multiple corporate names (2.3.17).
- Provide guidance on the creation of “good” titles as well as examples.
- Decide whether or not to remove AACR2 reference (2.3.2) and whether to add DCRM, CCO, RDA, etc.
- Clarify when to use supplied vs. formal titles. Add more detail to the rules.
• Provide guidance on aggregations that have titles—when do you use the title and when should you create new titles?
• Provide guidance on what to do when alternative titles exist.
• Provide guidance on devising titles for aggregations.
• Explicitly state that devised titles must be unique. They cannot be duplicated anywhere else in the description.
• Consider replacing papers with something that works in a digital environment.
• Replace the word “supply” with “devise”; would apply to all forms of the words.

2.4 Date
• Clarify how to describe a range of exact specific dates falling within the same month. Provide examples.
• Clarify 2.4.16 to discourage descriptions lacking dates.

2.5 Extent
• Add computer files/formats into extent types. Provide examples.
• Define a preferred expression of extent.

2.6 Name of Creator(s)
• Clarify the purpose of this element.
• Add rules assist archivists in choosing a main entry when they have multiple creators.

2.7 Administrative/Biographical History
• Make the Administrative/Biographical History a required element for minimum description at all levels

3.1 Scope and Content
• Clarifying wording, specifically use of the word “abstract.”

3.2 System of Arrangement
• Explicitly state that this element identifies the whole-part relationship to the next lowest level.
• Explain clearly when this element should be used and to what purpose.
• Provide additional guidance on the two components of arrangement statements—intellectual units and overall physical order of the units.
• Add a statement explaining that “arranged chronologically” implies that the arrangement is by date of document creation or have the examples specify what date is being used for chronological arrangement (i.e. diaries arranged chronologically by the creation date).
• Change the text in the second example on page 40 from “…arranged alphabetically with the exception of…” to “…arranged alphabetically by subject with the exception of…”

4.3 Technical Access: Add information on computer files and include relevant examples.


We will be soliciting additional comment from the archival community during an open forum to be held during the 2011 SAA Annual Meeting.
Appendix C

Encoded Archival Context Working Group/Technical Subcommittee – Encoded Archival Context
Annual Report
August 2011
Katherine M. Wisser, Chair

The EAC Working group was formed in 2006 to move the EAC beta standard to a full standard. In May 2008, the EACWG gathered in Bologna, Italy for a three-day face-to-face meeting. This was generously supported by the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, the IBC (Istituto per I beni artistic culturali e naturali) of the Regione Emilia-Romagna, the Archivio di Stato di Bologna, OCLC Research, and the National Library of Australia. During that meeting, the working group established the foundational architecture and principles upon which the standard is based. The working group then continued work virtually, and released the Encoded Archival Context – Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF) standard in March 2010. Significant community feedback and dissemination activities took place throughout the process.

EAC Working Group membership
Anila Angjeli, Bibliothèque nationale de France (National Library of France)
Lina (Vasiliki) Bountouri, Ionian University
Karin Bredenberg, Riksarkivet (National Archives of Sweden)
Basil Dewhurst, National Library of Australia
Wendy Duff, University of Toronto, Faculty of Information
Hans-Jörg Lieder, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (Berlin State Library)
Dennis Meissner, Minnesota Historical Society
Victoria Peters, University of Strathclyde
Daniel Pitti, University of Virginia, Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities
Chris Prom, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Jennifer Schaffner, RLG Programs (OCLC Programs and Research)
Bill Stockting, British Library
Stefano Vitali, Soprintendenza archivistica per l’Emilia-Romagna (Bologna)
Kathy Wisser, Chair, Simmons College, Graduate School of Library & Information Science

A preconference to SAA 2010 was held at NARA, “EAC-CPF: Moving Forward with Authority.” This preconference included presentations by Kathy Wisser (Simmons College), Anila Angjeli (Bibliothèque nationale de France), Daniel Pitti (Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities, University of Virginia), Angelika Menne-Haritz (Bundesarchiv), Ana Cristán (Library of Congress), Patricia Harpring (The Getty) and breakout sessions led by participants on optics such as implementation across agencies, consortium building, national or global standards, and crossing community boundaries. Over 100 people attended the preconference. Proceedings from this preconference are forthcoming.

The Chair of the Working Group submitted to the Standards Committee a petition for full adoption of the standard by SAA in September 2010. Council voted in January 2011 for full adoption and the EACWG was disbanded; working with the chair, a slate of
recommended members for the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Context (TS-EAC) was put together by the Standards Committee. TS-EAC membership consists of at least five SAA members as well as significant international representation. The current technical subcommittee consists of representatives from France, Germany, Greece, Sweden, Australia, Canada, Scotland, and Italy as well as representatives from NARA, academic institutions, and the Smithsonian Institution.

The TS-EAC is charged with the maintenance and review of the standard, documentation and collaboration with the Schema Development Team (SDT). The XML schema and tag library are published on the EAC website at hosted by the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (http://eac.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/).

**TS-EAC membership**

Anila Angjeli, Bibliothèque nationale de France (National Library of France) (Co-Chair)
Kerstin Arnold, Bundesarchiv
Erica Boudreau, John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum
Lina (Vasiliki) Bountouri, Ionian University
Karin Bredenberg, Riksarkivet (National Archives of Sweden)
Basil Dewhurst, National Library of Australia
Wendy Duff, University of Toronto, Faculty of Information
Tammy Peters, Smithsonian Institution Archives
Victoria Peters, University of Glasgow
Chris Prom, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Aaron Rubenstein, Tufts University
Jerry Simmons, National Archives and Records Administration
Stefano Vitali, Soprintendenza archivistica per l’Emilia-Romagna (Bologna)
Kathy Wisser, Simmons College, Graduate School of Library and Information Science (Co-Chair)

Terry Catapano, Columbia University *Ex Officio* (SDT-DRT Chair)
Marcy Flynn, Silver Image Management, *Ex Officio* (SC co-chair)
Hans-Jörg Lieder, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin, *Ex Officio* (Webmaster)
Dennis Meissner, Minnesota Historical Society, *Council Liaison*
Cory Nimer, Brigham Young University, *Ex Officio* (SC co-chair)
Michael Rush, Yale University, *Ex Officio* (TS-EAD co-chair)
Jennifer Schaffner, OCLC Research, *Ex Officio*, (OCLC)
Bill Stockting, British Library, *Ex Officio* (TS-EAD co-chair)

Given that this has been a transition year for the EACWG and TS-EAC, few new initiatives have been started, but on-going promotion and use of the standard by the members in their respective environments. This coming year, a primary focus will be on the translation of the Tag Library.

EAC-CPF XML schema and tag library are published on the EAC website at hosted by the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (http://eac.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/).

The TS-EAC will hold an open meeting at SAA 2011 on Tuesday, August 23, 2011, 3:00 pm – 6:00 pm. This meeting is being prepared jointly by the two co-chairs.

*Katherine M. Wisser, Co-chair, TS-EAC*
Appendix D

Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description Report

The Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description is happy to report a busy and successful year of work focused on beginning the process of revising EAD. Following our meeting at last year’s SAA Annual Meeting, TS-EAD had five primary goals:

1. Establish a timeline for the revision of EAD
2. Issue a call for comments
3. Pursue funding to support the revision
4. Schedule a working meeting
5. Plan a forum on the revision of EAD at the 2011 SAA Annual Meeting

TS-EAD established the following timeline for the revision of EAD. The timeline is tentative and may be subject to change as the revision process proceeds.

- October 2010: Call for comments
- February 28, 2011: Deadline for comments
- August 2011: Discussion forum at SAA Annual Meeting
- Spring 2012: Working meeting of TS-EAD
- December 2012: Release of draft schema for testing and comment
- August 2013: Publish revised version

TS-EAD issued a call for comments on the revision of EAD in October of last year. The call for comments was sent to twenty-seven email lists of related interest internationally. Comments were received through a form on the SAA website and via email. The comment period concluded on February 28, 2011, and resulted in 127 comments. The submissions received during the comment period were compiled into a spreadsheet and made available via the SAA website.

TS-EAD applied for and received funding support from the Gladys Krieeble Delmas Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Archief of the Netherlands. With the generous support of those three groups, TS-EAD and the Schema Development Team will meet for a three-day working meeting to review the received comments, discuss other necessary changes, and agree on the functional requirements for a revised version of EAD on March 7-9, 2012, at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University in New Haven, Connecticut.

In conjunction with the EAD Roundtable, TS-EAD will host a forum on the revision of EAD at the SAA Annual meeting, from 5:30 to 8:30 on Wednesday, August, 24, 2011, at the Hyatt Regency Chicago, Columbus G/H. The revision forum agenda includes a report on tag usage research by Kathy Wisser and Jackie Dean; presentations by members of TS-EAD and the Schema Development Team on the comments received, likely changes, and technical possibilities and considerations; and ample opportunities for questions and discussion.
TS-EAD’s agenda for the upcoming year will focus on preparing for the working meeting, agreeing on the changes necessary in EAD, and assisting the Schema Development Team to begin writing the updated standard.

TS-EAD will hold its second annual meeting on Wednesday, August 24, 2011, from 9 AM to 12 PM, at the Hyatt Regency Chicago, Columbus C/D. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

TS-EAD meeting agenda:
- Minutes and actions: Library of Congress EAD site report (Glenn)
- Working meetings: Review funding; Establish timeline for working meeting prep; plan for TS-EAD Working Meeting (March 7-9, 2012); plan for Schema Development Team Working Meeting (Date TBD).
- Review revision process: Have we done enough to solicit input? Do we need to pursue webcasts or other venues? Agree on how to manage comments received. Discuss comments received, how they relate to our thoughts. Continue our discussion of revision.

Respectfully submitted by Michael Rush and Bill Stockting, TS-EAD co-chairs, August 2011.

TS-EAD Members:

Michael Rush, Co-Chair (Yale University)
Bill Stockting, Co-Chair (British Library)
Michael Fox (Minnesota Historical Society)
Kris Kiesling (University of Minnesota)
Angelika Menne-Haritz (Bundesarchiv)
Kelcy Shepherd (University of Massachusetts Amherst)
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard (Direction générale des patrimoines)
Henny van Schie (Nationaal Archief / Bibliotheek)
Sharry Watson (Provincial Archives of Alberta)
Bradley Westbrook (University of California, San Diego)
Karin Bredenberg, ex officio, Schema Development Team (National Archives of Sweden)
Terry Catapano, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Columbia University)
Michele Combs, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Syracuse University)
Marcy Flynn, ex officio, Standards Committee (Silver Image Management)
Glenn Gardner, ex officio, Library of Congress (The Library of Congress)
Mark Matienzo, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Yale University)
John Nemmers, ex officio, EAD Roundtable (University of Florida)
Cory Nimer, ex officio, Standards Committee (Brigham Young University)
Daniel Pitti, ex officio, Schema Development Team (University of Virginia)
Merrilee Proffitt, ex officio, OCLC Research (OCLC Research)
Salvatore Vassallo, ex officio, Schema Development Team (University of Pavia)
Katherine Wisser, ex officio, EAC Working Group (Simmons College)
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Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team  
Date: August 12, 2011  
To: Standards Committee  
From: Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team  
RE: Annual Report  

In its second year, the Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team (RD-DRT) continued to develop guidelines for reappraisal and deaccessioning. The group met at the 2010 SAA meeting in Washington D.C. to further discuss and flesh out a preliminary draft of the document. From September 2010 through March 2011 each team member had the opportunity to revise and edit the draft.

1. Linda Whitaker reformatted and rewrote the draft to appear more like a standard/guideline
2. Chela Weber reviewed it and reformatted it further; some of Linda’s reformats reverted back to the original version (Sept 2010)
3. Marcella Wiget reviewed it and made changes (October 2010)
4. Peter Blodgett reviewed it and made changes (Nov/Dec 2010)
5. Anne Foster reviewed it and made changes (Jan 2011)
6. The document was becoming cumbersome to work through and make any substantive changes so Laura Uglean Jackson cleaned it up by incorporating all of the suggestions thus far (February 2011)
7. Jeremy Brett and Cathi Carmack reviewed the clean version (Feb/March 2011)
8. Laura incorporated their changes and suggestions (March/April 2011)
9. Laura added a table of contents, cover page, and made other minor edits. She cleaned up the outline so that it was consistent with numbers/letters/bullets and spacing. Also added forms, donor letter templates, and the annotated bibliography as appendices (April 2011).

The review process began in April 2011 and the document was sent to a first round of reviewers including the Acquisitions and Appraisal Steering Committee, individuals who expressed interest in the RD-DRT at the 2009 SAA meeting, and colleagues with experience in reappraisal and deaccessioning. The group received several comments and suggestions and discussed them by email and a teleconference. Further changes were made to the draft of the guidelines in June 2011.

In July 2011 the Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning were distributed to the general SAA membership and other regional archives organizations. Thus far we’ve received comments from six individuals. The review period is scheduled to close on September 16, 2011.

Also of note, in August 2011 SAA Council approved the charge for the group and a name change from Deaccessioning and Reappraisal Development and Review Team to Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team.

Submitted by: Laura Jackson, Chair, August 2011
Canadian Committee on Archival Description

DATE: August 12, 2011

NAME: Report on the Canadian Committee on Archival Description

SOURCE: Sharry Watson, Canadian Committee on Archival Description

SUMMARY: This document describes the activities of the Canadian Committee on Archival Description (CCAD), a committee of the Canadian Council of Archives, for the period of July 2010 to August 2011 and proposed activities for 2011-2012.

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP: Paula Warbas has continued as chair of CCAD. Sharry Watson and Richard Dancy continue as members. Joanna Andow, François Cartier, Katherine Timms and Marg Stewart have left the Committee. CCAD welcomed Robert Nahuet as a new member representing Library and Archives Canada. This year, CCAD intends to increase its number of corresponding members.

LIAISON WITH OTHER STANDARD-RELATED BODIES: CCAD continues to work to strengthen relationships with other standards-related bodies and increase the Committee’s knowledge of other standards initiatives. Towards this end, Sharry Watson is representing CCAD on the Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Description Working Group (TS-EAD), the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing (CCC), the Canadian Committee on MARC (CCM) and the Society of American Archivists’ Standards Committee.

FURTHER REVISION TO RAD: CCAD has begun discussing further revisions to RAD/RDDA as identified in Toward a Second Edition of RAD: A Report.

CONCISE RAD: CCAD continues to support the development of Concise RAD by Library and Archives Canada.

ICA-ATOM PILOT: This spring CCAD reviewed ICA-atom. The Committee explored access points and how they could become important elements to the ICA-atom application. CCAD also compared ISAAR descriptive elements and RAD Administrative history and Biographical sketch to demonstrate that mapping is possible and relevant for elements of these two standards.
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July 15th, 2011

The National Archives of Romania hosted the annual meeting of the CBPS sub-committee on archival description, 2011, 23rd-26th May, at Bucharest (Romania), with ICA support.

The meeting focused on the draft of compendium the sub-committee decided to develop two years ago in order to promote consistent use of the standards and to clarify the relationship between archival entities (archival materials, corporate bodies, persons or families, whether records creators or records holders, functions and occupations performed by corporate bodies, persons or families).

The meeting also gave the participants the opportunity to discuss the latest features developed by Artefactual Systems for the ICA-AtoM software, a free open source tool for creating and publishing on-line descriptions compliant with ICA standards.

1. Compendium on ICA descriptive standards: Broadly speaking, the discussion focused on the objectives of the compendium of standards. Is it intended to replace the 4 ICA standards as a new standard? Or is it only a new 'render' of the standards with a few additions? The problem is that the level of use of the 4 standards, developed at different times, is not the same. ISAD(G) is the best known, ISAAR(CPF) is much less, the last two standards, much less. The sub-committee decided to postpone more substantial changes of ICA standards until after 2012, but having them together in a single document has resulted in some changes (grouping ISAAR and ISDF chapters 6 on relationships, merging the description control areas of the four standards, introducing new concepts ...).

So, it was decided to prepare, for the International Congress of Brisbane (Australia) in 2012, a draft of a common chapter to be included in all 4 ICA standards on relationships between different types of archival entities and a progress report which will focus on improving the consistency between the content of the standards in their current versions and the main directions of future revisions.

The sub-committee decided to distinguish the relationships between archival entities of the same type (a fonds and its components, a corporate body, person or family related to another corporate body, person or family, a function related to a function) and relationships between different types of archival entities (for example between a series and the function that produced it). Relationships between archival authority records, descriptions of functions and archival descriptions and descriptions of other resources (books, artefacts, etc.) should also be considered.
Only three descriptive elements should be available to establish links between archival entities and between archival entities and other information resources: “Identifier of related entities and resources”, “Nature of relationship” and “Dates of relationships”. Moreover, 2 diagrams will be drafted to provide visual support and representation of the relationships between ICA descriptive standards and archival entities represented by their descriptions. It is intended that these diagrams do not include all the possible relationships but only those relevant for the purpose of the draft on relationships. Diagram 1 will represent the relationships between the four ICA standards. Diagram 2 will represent the relationships between archival entities (it was suggested to include archival institutions into CPF). Examples of relationships between a series, a corporate body, a function and an institution with archival holdings, and between a function, corporate bodies and a bibliographic resource will also be provided.

2. ICA-AtoM software (version 1.1) and discussion: issues raised in the audit report and corrective steps; educational role: ICA-AtoM is an international cooperative project which aims to develop a free and open-source tool enabling archivists to edit archival descriptions compliant with ICA descriptive standards and to upload archival finding aids (see: http://ica-atom.org/). The software is developed by a Canadian company, Artefactual Systems, and the project is managed by a Steering Committee including representatives of Library and Archives Canada, The National Archives of Scotland, Archives of France, Unesco and the Netherlands Archives School.

In the current version 1.1, the user can create 5 types of descriptive records by clicking on 5 tabs:
- Archival Descriptions: you can create an ISAD(G) description. But you can also select “admin”, then “settings” and “default templates” to select the archival description standard you want to be applied (ISAD(G), Dublin Core, Metadata Object Description Schema or MODS or the Canadian Rules of Archival Description). This tab also allows users to export records in EAD, Dublin Core and MODS XML formats.
- Authority Records: you can create ISAAR(CPF) records. These features are related to the description of records creators.
- Archival Institutions: you can create an authority record for an archival institution in compliance with the ISDIAH standard.
- Functions: you can create a description of a function in compliance with the ISDF standard.
- Terms: throughout ICA-AtoM, controlled vocabularies (“taxonomies”) are used to generate drop-down menus. These provide value lists that restrict data entry in certain fields to certain values. These values are stored as term records in the database and assigned to taxonomies. So, this tab enables you to create terms, to assign them to a taxonomy and to relate them to narrower terms.

A menu “Taxonomy” allows the user to create terms in a taxonomy. It is also possible to create hierarchical thesauri in accordance with ISO 2788. A menu “Import” provides an EAD import functionality that can be used to import hierarchical archival descriptions along with related authority records and archival institutions. You also can upload digital
objects and link them to descriptive levels. Finally, a menu “Admin” enables users to administer ICA-AtoM, whether for a single institution or for a network.

Several members of the Steering Committee stressed the importance of a technical audit, in order to provide users with a reinforced guarantee that they would be getting a tried and tested product, as well as protect the project’s credibility (and that of ICA as a whole).

So, the Archives of France have contacted a company, Atol CD, that conducted the audit from October 2010 to January 2011. The audit included an acquisition phase, a dynamic and a static audit:
- acquisition phase: getting acquainted with technique and function;
- static audit: studying the code and checking that it follows the functional constraints, and studying the architecture (meaning the implemented communication model, the access database, ...);
- dynamic audit: study of the application’s behaviour under “extreme” situations (voluminous master data (thesauri, reference index...), numerous simultaneous connections, numerous connections to the database), installing the software on a system other than Linux (Windows 2003 Server).

The results of the audit are the following: ICA-AtoM is a Quality Application, which needs only few improvements to be used by archival institutions.

One of the biggest problem is the high number of queries done to build a page, and the fact that this number is related to the number of children of the description. However, this point should not be difficult to fix.

The next steps in the application development should be:
- decrease the number of queries for page construction;
- make both the XML import and the indexing asynchronous;
- resolve XML import issues with large files.

The developer has proposed a roadmap to a version 2.0 which will be ready early spring 2013.
NISO Mission Statement: NISO fosters the development and maintenance of standards that facilitate the creation, persistent management, and effective interchange of information so that it can be trusted for use in research, learning and publishing. NISO website:  http://www.niso.org/home

Current (as of 8/18,2011) list subscriptions for the Society of American Archivists

- ANSI/NISO Z39.19-2005 Review Ballot (CCM)
- ANSI/NISO Z39.50-2003 Review Ballot (D2D)
- ANSI/NISO Z39.84-2005 Review Ballot (CCM)
- ANSI/NISO Z39.87-2006 Review Group (CCM)
- ANSI/NISO Z39.89-2003 Review Ballot (D2D)

Ballot 64 (D2D)

Newsline
NISO Voting Members
TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

The Society of American Archivists is eligible to participate in two voting pools: the larger, comprehensive, NISO Voting Member group (143 members, from 83 organizations) and the TC46 Ballot Advisory Group (121 members, from 70 organizations). The latter group votes and comments on initiatives presented by the Technical Committee 46 (TC46) which is the ISO committee responsible for standards in the area of Information and Documentation. NISO has been designated by ANSI as the U.S. Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Administrator for TC46. NISO Voting Members located in the U.S. make up the TAG membership and may participate in voting and commenting on proposed standards. NISO submits the U.S. votes and comments on standards developed by TC46 and identifies the U.S. experts for subcommittees and working groups. TC46 focuses on the standardization of practices relating to libraries, documentation and information centers, publishing, archives, records management, museum documentation, indexing and abstracting services, and information science.

As has been discussed in earlier reports, the liaison and the chair should consider ways to better engage Standards Committee members in the NISO voting process. In past years, I have posted standards on a website hosted by the University of Michigan and have also experimented with attaching PDFs to emails sent to the committee. Neither of these
methods of sharing information, and garnering responses, were particularly successful. A
next step would be to experiment with posting the text of standards or proposals on the
Committee’s site on the SAA webpage. Low response rates to liaison requests for input is
widespread amongst NISO member institutions (see report from 2008/2009), but I think
it’s in our best interest to make additional attempts to engage our colleagues to consider
these emerging and/or redefined standards that relate to information and documentation.

2010/2011 Proposals, Reviews and Standards

Listed below are 49 standards, proposals and election ballots that were voted on, on
behalf of the Society of American Archivists, during the period August 2010 through
August 2011. Out-of-scope or outside-our-field-expertise subjects will have “abstain”
votes. The ballot descriptions are truncated; if anyone is interested in reading the full
document please contact me at kdow@umich.

ISO/FDIS 27730, Information and documentation — International standard collection identifier
(ISCI)

Open Date: Thursday, 14 July 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you approve this standard for publication?
This is a ballot for the final draft international standard, ISO/FDIS 27730, Information and documentation
— International standard collection identifier (ISCI). This standard establishes the specifications for the
international standard collection identifier (ISCI) as a unique international identification system for each
collection, fonds...

Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-07-20 Pri 11 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 5

Voting Pool Formations for 11 Standard Ballots

Open Date: Friday, 8 July 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Which voting pools do you want to join so you can vote on approving these standards?
ALL NISO VOTING MEMBERS ARE REQUIRED TO VOTE ON THIS BALLOT. This ballot is to form
voting pools for a number of standards that are coming up for ballot. The use of voting pools as the
consensus body for a standard is defined in section 5.1 of the NISO Procedures. The standards that will be
balloted later this year are listed below...

Your Vote:
ANSI/NISO Z39.85 - 2007 The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
23 12 11/47%
ANSI/NISO Z39.7 - 2004 Information Services and Use: metrics & statistics for libraries and
information providers -- Data Dictionary 20 10 30/47%

Voting Pool Formations for 11 Standard Ballots

ANSI/NISO Z39.62 - 2000 Eye-legible Information on Microfilm Leaders and Trailers and on Containers
of Processed Microfilm on Open Reels 9 4 37/47%
ANSI/NISO Z39.85 - 2007 The Dublin Core Metadata Element Set 31 16 23/47%
ANSI/NISO Z39.7 - 2004 Information Services and Use: metrics & statistics for libraries and information providers -- Data Dictionary 20 10 30/47%
ANSI/NISO Z39.86 - 2005 Specifications for the Digital Talking Book 15 7 46/47%
NISO Z39.96 - 201x JATS: Journal Article Tag Suite 26 13 39/47%
Abstain (from joining any voting pools) 1 0 25/47%

2011-08-12 ISO/IEC WD 27000, Information technology - Security techniques - Information security management systems - Overview and vocabulary

Open Date: Friday, 24 June 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a ballot to solicit comments on the 3rd working draft of ISO/IEC WD 27000, Information technology – Security techniques – Information security management systems – Overview and vocabulary. This standard is part of a family of "management system of standards" for information security. This particular standard provides an overview of...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/IEC WD 27000, Information technology - Security techniques - Information security management systems - Overview and vocabulary TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
I have comments w/comment 2 25%
I have no comments 6 75%
Abstain 10

2011-08-12 ISO/IEC WD 27002, Information technology -- Security techniques – Code of practice for information security management

Open Date: Friday, 24 June 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you have any comments on this working draft?
This is a ballot to solicit comments on the 4th working draft of ISO/IEC WD 27002, Information technology -- Security techniques – Code of practice for information security management. This standard is part of a family of "management system standards" for information security. This particular standard is designed for organizations to use as a...

Your Vote: Abstain
I have comments w/comment 0 0%
I have no comments 9 100%
Abstain 8
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

2011-08-11 ISO/TR 11219, Information and documentation — Qualitative conditions and basic statistics for library buildings — Space, function and design

Open Date: Tuesday, 28 June 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you approve this technical report for progression to the next stage (which could be publication)?
This is a ballot for the TC46/SC8 draft technical report, ISO/TR 11219, Information and documentation — Qualitative conditions and basic statistics for library buildings — Space, function and design. A copy of the report is available from the ballot webpage or the link in the announcement e-mail. This Technical Report provides guidance for...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/TR 11219, Information and documentation — Qualitative conditions and basic statistics for library buildings — Space, function and design TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Open Date: Monday, 6 June 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you approve a new work item to revise ISO 3901:2001?
This is a ballot to approve the formation of a new project and working group to revise the standard, ISO 3901:2001, Information and documentation — International Standard Recording Code. This proposal was submitted by the International ISRC Agency which acts as the Registration Authority for ISO 3901. This project is to completely revise...

Your Vote: Abstain
Yes 11 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-07-20 Pri 9

2011-08-08 Draft ISO Guide 83 - High level structure and identical text for management system standards and common core management system terms and definitions.

Open Date: Monday, 11 July 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you have any comments on this guide for ISO management system standards?
ISO/Technical Management Board (TMB) has recently circulated the outputs from the ISO/TMB/TAG13-JTCG as Draft Guide 83 for ballot by ISO Member Bodies and for consultation to relevant ISO TCs and SCs. Draft ISO Guide 83 is the common high level structure and identical text, plus common core terms and definitions for all ISO management system...

Your Vote: Abstain
Draft ISO Guide 83 - High level structure and identical text for management system standards and common core management system terms and definitions. TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
I have comments w/comment 0 0%
I have no comments 8 100%
Abstain 7
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

2011-07-29 ISO/DIS 22274, Systems to manage terminology, knowledge and content — Concept-related aspects for developing and internationalizing classification systems

Open Date: Monday, 21 March 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you recommend approval of this standard for the next stage (either FDIS or publication)?
This is a liaison ballot from ISO TC37 (Terminology and other language and content resources) / SC 3 (Systems to manage terminology, knowledge and content) for the standard: ISO/DIS 22274, Systems to manage terminology, knowledge and content — Concept-related aspects for developing and internationalizing classification systems. Since...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/DIS 22274, Systems to manage terminology, knowledge and content — Concept-related aspects for developing and internationalizing classification systems TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes 5 71 3/7%
No w/comment 2 28 4/7%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-07-20 Pri 14
2011-07-15 ISO/NP 5127, Revision of "Information and documentation--Terminology"

Open Date: Tuesday, 10 May 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you approve a new work item to revise ISO 5127:2001?
This is a proposed new work item to revise the standard ISO 5127:2001, Information and documentation -- Terminology. This proposal is being made by the Standardization Administration of China (SAC), who have also provided a working draft with additional terminology added from a recent Chinese standard, (GB/T 4894-2009). Included with...ISO/NP 5127, Revision of "Information and documentation--Terminology" TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Yes 13 100%
No 0 0%
Abstain 6

2011-07-05 ISO/FDIS 15511, Information and documentation — International standard identifier for libraries and related organizations (ISIL)

Open Date: Tuesday, 24 May 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you approve this standard for publication?
This is the final ballot for ISO/FDIS 15511, Information and documentation — International standard identifier for libraries and related organizations (ISIL). An ISIL identifies an organization, i.e. a library, an archive, a museum or a related organization, or one of its subordinate units, which is responsible for an action or service in an...

Your Vote: Yes
ISO/FDIS 15511, Information and documentation — International standard identifier for libraries and related organizations (ISIL) TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Voted Yes 2011-06-22 Pri 17 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 0

2011-06-172011 NISO BOD Vice-Chair/Chair Election

Open Date: Friday, 29 April 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you approve the election of Barbara Preece to the position of Vice-Chair of the NISO Board of Directors for 2011-2012 and Chair for 2012-2013?
This is part one of a two-part official 2011 ballot for the NISO Board of Directors' Officers. This part is a ballot for the position of Vice-Chair. ALL MEMBERS ARE REQUIRED TO VOTE ON THIS BALLOT. The following individual has been nominated for the position of Vice Chair for the 2011-2012 term and will then automatically advance to the...

Your Vote: Yes
2011 NISO BOD Vice-Chair/Chair Election NISO Voting Members
Voted Yes 2011-04-29 Pri 34 100%
No 0 0%
Abstain 2

2011-06-17 2011 NISO BOD Election of Directors

Open Date: Friday, 29 April 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Vote for up to 4 of the identified individuals for Director of the NISO Board of Directors for the 2011-2014 term
This is part two of a two-part official 2011 ballot for the NISO Board of Directors. This part is a ballot for the position of Director for the 2011-2014 term. ALL MEMBERS ARE REQUIRED TO VOTE ON THIS
BALLOT. The following individuals have been nominated for the position of Director for the 2011-2014 term. You may vote for up to four...

**Your Vote: Wendy Pradt Lougee (University Minnesota Libraries), Mike Teets (OCLC)**

2011 NISO BOD Election of Directors  NISO Voting Members

Jane Burke (ProQuest)  15  14 2/107%
Gerry Grenier (IEEE)  22  20 60/107%
Chuck Koscher (CrossRef)  24  22 46/107%

Wendy Pradt Lougee (University Minnesota Libraries)  Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

Voted Wendy Pradt Lougee (University Minnesota Libraries), Mike Teets (OCLC) 2011-05-16 Pri 19 17 81/107%

Mike Teets (OCLC)  Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

Voted Wendy Pradt Lougee (University Minnesota Libraries), Mike Teets (OCLC) 2011-05-16 Pri 26 24 32/107%

Abstain from voting  1  0 100/107%

2011-06-10 New work item proposal: Ontology Integration and Interoperability (OntoIOp)

Open Date: Friday, 1 April 2011 @ 12:00 pm ET

Do you recommend approval of this new ISO project?

This is a liaison ballot from ISO/TC 37, Terminology and other language and content resources, Subcommittee SC 3, Terminographical and lexicographical working methods, for a new project proposal on: Ontology Integration and Interoperability (OntoIOp). This proposed International Standard will specify a language for distributed knowledge...

**Your Vote: Yes**

New work item proposal: Ontology Integration and Interoperability (OntoIOp)  TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Yes  Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

Voted Yes 2011-05-09 Pri 13  100%

No w/comment  0  0%

Abstain  10

2011-05-23 ISO/FDIS 25964-1, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 1: Thesauri for information retrieval

Open Date: Tuesday, 19 April 2011 @ 8:00 am ET

Do you approve this standard for publication?

This is a ballot for the final draft international standard, ISO/FDIS 25964-1, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 1: Thesauri for information retrieval. This standard is a revision and merger of the two current international standards: ISO 2788:1986, Documentation — Guidelines for...

**Your Vote: Yes**

ISO/FDIS 25964-1, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 1: Thesauri for information retrieval  TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Yes  Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

Voted Yes 2011-05-03 Pri 8  100%

No w/comment  0  0%

Abstain  6

2011-05-18 ISO/CD 25964-2, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 2: Interoperability with other vocabularies

Open Date: Wednesday, 2 March 2011 @ 8:00 am ET

This is the first ballot for ISO/CD 25964-2, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 2: Interoperability with other vocabularies. This committee draft stage is the best time to get substantive comments to the working group. This new standard deals with thesauri and other types of...
Your Vote: Yes
ISO/CD 25964-2, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 2: Interoperability with other vocabularies TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-04-27 Pri 11 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 11


Open Date: Monday, 9 May 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you recommend approval of this standard for the next stage (either FDIS or publication)?
SHORT TURN-AROUND BALLOT This is a liaison ballot from ISO/TC 171, Document management applications, Subcommittee SC 2, Application issues for the draft international standard, ISO/DIS 14289-1, Document management applications — Electronic document file format enhancement for accessibility — Part 1: Use of ISO 32000-1 (PDF/UA-1). This..
Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Yes 8 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 5

ISO/FDIS 24616, Language resources management — Multilingual information framework

Open Date: Monday, 4 April 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you recommend approval of this standard for publication?
This is a liaison ballot from TC37, Terminology and other language and content resources, SC4, Language resource management for: ISO/FDIS 24616, Language resources management — Multilingual information framework This International Standard provides a generic platform for modeling and managing multilingual information in various...
Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/FDIS 24616, Language resources management — Multilingual information framework TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes 2 66 2/3%
No w/comment 1 33 1/3%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-04-25 Pri 12

2011-04-29 ISO/DIS 13008, Information and documentation — Digital records conversion and migration process

Open Date: Monday, 20 December 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This ballot is to approve the TC46/SC11 draft standard: ISO/DIS 13008, Information and documentation — Digital records conversion and migration process. This standard specifies the planning issues, requirements, and procedures for the conversion and/or migration of digital records (which includes digital objects plus metadata) so as to...
Your Vote: Yes
ISO/DIS 13008, Information and documentation — Digital records conversion and migration process TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-03-18 Pri 15 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 8
2011-04-08 Nomination of new Working Group Convenor for TC 46 SC 4 WG12 - WARC File Format

Open Date: Monday, 14 March 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
Do you agree with the appointment of Clement Oury as convenor of Working Group 12? THIS IS A SHORT TURN-AROUND BALLOT Christian Lupovici has indicated his intention to retire and resign from the role of convenor of Working Group 12. AFNOR have now requested Clement Oury to be appointed to this role. This Working Group has been retained to consider any updates and modifications to ISO 28500 WARC File Format until it...

Your Vote: Yes
Nomination of new Working Group Convenor for TC 46 SC 4 WG12 - WARC File Format TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-03-28 Pri 16 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 5

2011-04-01 ISO/FDIS 24619, Language resource management — Persistent identification and sustainable access (PISA)

Open Date: Thursday, 17 February 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a liaison ballot from ISO TC 37/SC4 --Terminology and other language and content resources, Language resource management-- for the standard: ISO/FDIS 24619, Language resource management — Persistent identification and sustainable access (PISA). This International Standard specifies requirements for the persistent identifier (PID)...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/FDIS 24619, Language resource management — Persistent identification and sustainable access (PISA) TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes 5 62 1/2%
No w/comment 3 37 1/2%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-03-28 Pri 10

2011-04-01 ISO/DTR 17068 Information and documentation — Records management — Third party repository for electronic records

Open Date: Thursday, 20 January 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a ballot for the draft technical report, ISO/DTR 17068 Information and documentation — Records management — Third party repository for electronic records. The purpose of this technical report is to present a method of keeping and utilizing electronic records based on Trusted Third Party Repositories (TTPRs) in order to enhance social...

Your Vote: Yes
ISO/DTR 17068 Information and documentation — Records management — Third party repository for electronic recordsTC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-02-28 Pri 10 83 1/3%
No w/comment 2 16 2/3%
Abstain 11


Open Date: Thursday, 10 February 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a liaison ballot from JTC1/SC27 (Information technology / IT Security techniques) for a new draft standard ISO/IEC CD 27037, Information technology — Security techniques — Guidelines for
identification, collection, acquisition, and preservation of digital evidence. Since this is a liaison ballot we can only recommend a vote and...

**Your Vote: Abstain**


TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Yes 5 83 1/3%

No w/comment 1 16 2/3%

Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

Voted Abstain 2011-02-14 Pri 8

2011-03-03 New Work Item Proposal -- Information and documentation - International standard document link

Open Date: Tuesday, 21 December 2010 @ 8:00 am ET

This ballot is for approval of a TC46/SC9 new work item to develop a standard for Information and documentation - International standard document link. A copy of the proposal and a draft text of the proposed standard are available from the ballot webpage and the link in the announcement e-mail. Your vote options are: Yes (approve the...

**Your Vote: Abstain**

New Work Item Proposal -- Information and documentation - International standard document link

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Yes 14 87 1/2%

No w/comment 2 12 1/2%

Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

Voted Abstain 2011-02-24 Pri 7


Open Date: Monday, 8 November 2010 @ 8:00 am ET

This is a systematic review for the standard ISO 3166-2:2007, Codes for the representation of names of countries and their subdivisions — Part 2: Country subdivision code. This second edition of this part of ISO 3166 establishes a universally applicable code for the representation of the names of principal administrative divisions of...

**Your Vote: Confirm**


TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Confirm 2 90%

Revise/Amend 2 10%

Withdraw 0 0%

Abstain 6


Open Date: Monday, 8 November 2010 @ 8:00 am ET

This is a systematic review for the standard ISO 3602:1989, Documentation -- Romanization of Japanese (kana script). This International Standard is one of a series of standards dealing with the conversion of systems of writing to provide a means for communication of written messages in a form which permits the automatic transmission and...

**Your Vote: Abstain**


TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Confirm 7 87 1/2%

Revise/Amend 1 12 1/2%

Open Date: Monday, 8 November 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a systematic review for the standard ISO 11940-2:2007, Information and documentation — Transliteration of Thai characters into Latin characters, Part 2: Simplified transcription of Thai language. This first edition of part 2 of ISO 11940 provides a specification for the conversion of Thai characters (or the transliteration of Thai...

Your Vote: Abstain
Confirm 6 100%
Revise/Amend 0 0%
Withdraw 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-02-10 Pri 15

2011-02-21 Comments request for Discussion Paper - Archiving and electronic storage media

Open Date: Thursday, 13 January 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
A liaison committee, ISO TC171/SC1 (Document management applications/Quality), is distributing this discussion paper on Archiving and Electronic Storage Media for comments. This document looks at information and standards available in archiving activities and underlines a lack of technical elements useful to the establishment of safe and...

Your Vote: Do not have comments
Comments request for Discussion Paper - Archiving and electronic storage media TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Have comments 6 40%
Do not have comments Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Do not have comments 2011-02-14 Pri 9 60%
Abstain 3


Open Date: Friday, 7 January 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a ballot for ISO/FDIS 16175-2, Information and documentation — Principles and functional requirements for records in electronic office environments — Part 2: Guidelines and functional requirements for digital records management systems. This is the second part of a three-part standard that has been fast-tracked through the ISO...

Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-02-10 Pri 13 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 11
2011-02-08 ISO/FDIS 28560-1, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 1: Data elements and general guidelines for implementation

Open Date: Monday, 3 January 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a ballot for ISO/FDIS 28560-1, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 1: Data elements and general guidelines for implementation. This is Part 1 of a three-part standard. The other two parts are in separate ballots with the same ballot deadline. Your options are Yes (approve), No (do not approve), or Abstain...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/FDIS 28560-1, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 1: Data elements and general guidelines for implementation TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes 11 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-01-20 Pri 10


Open Date: Monday, 3 January 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a ballot for ISO/FDIS 28560-2, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 2: Encoding of RFID data elements based on rules from ISO/IEC 15962. This is Part 2 of a three-part standard. The other two parts are in separate ballots with the same ballot deadline. Your options are Yes (approve), No (do not approve), or...

Your Vote: Abstain
Yes 9 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-01-20 Pri 10

2011-02-08 ISO/FDIS 28560-3, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 3: Fixed length encoding

Open Date: Monday, 3 January 2011 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a ballot for ISO/FDIS 28560-3, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 3: Fixed length encoding. This is Part 3 of a three-part standard. The other two parts are in separate ballots with the same ballot deadline. Your options are Yes (approve), No (do not approve), or Abstain. Yes votes can have editorial...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/FDIS 28560-3, Information and documentation — RFID in libraries — Part 3: Fixed length encoding TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes 9 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2011-01-20 Pri 10

2011-01-28 New work item proposal, Revision of ISO 21127:2006

Open Date: Wednesday, 17 November 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This ballot is a proposal to revise the standard ISO/NP 21127:2006, Information and documentation — A reference ontology for the interchange of cultural heritage information. This proposal was made by ICOM (International Council of Museums) CIDOC (International Committee for Documentation) to incorporate changes requested by the CIDOC CRM...

Your Vote: Yes
New work item proposal, Revision of ISO 21127:2006  
TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Yes  Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2011-01-26 Pri 15  100%
No w/comment  0  0%
Abstain w/comment  7


Open Date: Monday, 29 November 2010 @ 10:00 am ET
NISO recognizes that its standards require regular review to remain effective. For ANSI/NISO standards, this review is done in accordance to ANSI requirements for maintenance. For those ANSI/NISO standards under periodic maintenance, this must be completed not later than five (5) years after the ANSI approval date. This is a periodic review...


ANSI/NISO Z39.87-2006 Review Group (CCM)
Reaffirm  Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Reaffirm  10  100%
Withdraw  0  0%
Revise (i.e., do not reaffirm)  0  0%
Abstain  1

2010-12-01 Systematic review ISO 3297:2007, Information and documentation — International standard serial number (ISSN)

Open Date: Monday, 19 July 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a systematic review for the standard ISO 3297:2007, Information and documentation — International standard serial number (ISSN). The fourth edition of the ISSN standard broadened the scope to apply the ISSN identifier to all types of continuing resources (not just serials) and introduced the mechanism of the "linking ISSN (ISSN-L)"

Your Vote: Abstain
Systematic review ISO 3297:2007, Information and documentation — International standard serial number (ISSN)  TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Confirm  19  100%
Revise/Amend  0  0%
Withdraw  0  0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)

2010-12-01 Systematic review ISO 17933:2000, GEDI — Generic Electronic Document Interchange

Open Date: Tuesday, 27 July 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a systematic review for the standard ISO 17933:2000, GEDI — Generic Electronic Document Interchange. This is the first edition of the International Standard that specifies a format for exchange of electronic document copies between computer systems. The format includes the definition of a GEDI Header containing information about the...

Your Vote: Abstain
Confirm  9  100%
Revise/Amend  0  0%
Withdraw  0  0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2010-08-03 Pri 10

2010-11-02 ISO/FDIS 26324, Information and documentation — Digital object identifier system
Standards Committee Report

Open Date: Monday, 20 September 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a TC46/SC9 ballot for the standard: ISO/FDIS 26324, Information and documentation — Digital object identifier system. This International Standard specifies the syntax, description and resolution functional components of the digital object identifier system, and the general principles for the creation, registration and administration...

Your Vote: Yes
ISO/FDIS 26324, Information and documentation — Digital object identifier system TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-09-24 Pri 23 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 2


Open Date: Friday, 17 September 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a TC46/SC11 ballot for the standard: ISO/FDIS 16175-1, Information and documentation — Principles and functional requirements for records in electronic office environments — Part 1: Overview and statement of principles. This is a fast-track standard and therefore does not have to conform to all ISO format requirements. ISO 16175-1...

Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-09-24 Pri 9 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 11

2010-10-25 Re-election of Dr Roswitha Poll as Chairperson of ISO/TC 46/SC 8

Open Date: Thursday, 7 October 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
The term of office of Dr Roswitha Poll as Chairperson of ISO/TC 46/SC 8 is ending in December 2010. The ISO/TC 46/SC 8-Secretariat has nominated Dr Poll for another term. This is a short bio of her that was taken from the QQML2010 conference where she gave a keynote talk: "Dr. Roswitha Poll was chief librarian of Münster...

Your Vote: Yes
Re-election of Dr Roswitha Poll as Chairperson of ISO/TC 46/SC 8 TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-10-18 Pri 14 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 7


Open Date: Monday, 23 August 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a liaison ballot to approve a new work item: ISO/NP 19005-3, Document management -- Electronic document file format for long-term preservation including embedded files -- Part 3: Use of ISO 32000-1 (PDF/A-3). This part of ISO 19005 specifies the use of the Portable Document Format (PDF) 1.7, as formalized in ISO 32000-1, for...

Your Vote: Yes
2010-10-08 ISO/CD 17024, Conformity assessment — General requirements for bodies operating certification of persons

Open Date: Tuesday, 24 August 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a liaison ballot for ISO/CD 17024, Conformity assessment — General requirements for bodies operating certification of persons, to approve moving the standard to the next stage as a DIS (Draft International Standard). This ballot was issued by the ISO Committee on conformity assessment (CASCO). This International Standard specifies...

Your Vote: Abstain
ISO/CD 17024, Conformity assessment — General requirements for bodies operating certification of persons
TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes 6 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2010-08-25 Pri 18

2010-10-07 ISO/DIS 30300, Information and documentation — Management system for records — Fundamentals and vocabulary

Open Date: Wednesday, 2 June 2010 @ 5:00 pm ET
This ballot is to approve the TC46/SC11 draft standard: ISO/DIS, Information and documentation — Management system for records — Fundamentals and vocabulary. This International Standard establishes the objectives for using a Management System for Records (MSR), provides principles for an MSR, describes a process approach and specifies roles...

Your Vote: Yes
ISO/DIS 30300, Information and documentation — Management system for records — Fundamentals and vocabulary
TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-09-16 Pri 9 90%
No w/comment 1 10%
Abstain 14

2010-10-07 ISO/DIS 30301, Information and documentation — Management system for records — Requirements

Open Date: Wednesday, 2 June 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This ballot is to approve the TC46/SC11 draft standard: ISO/DIS 30301, Information and documentation — Management system for records — Requirements This Standard specifies requirements for a Management Systems for Records (MSR) to support an organization in the achievement of its mandate, mission, strategy and goals through the development...

Your Vote: Yes
ISO/DIS 30301, Information and documentation — Management system for records — Requirements
TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-09-16 Pri 11 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 14

Open Date: Monday, 16 August 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a draft technical report ballot for ISO/DTR 23081-3 Information and documentation — Managing metadata for records — Part 3: Self-assessment method. The two previously published parts are both standards. The first part addresses "Principles" and the second part covers "Conceptual and implementation issues". This third part provides...

Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-08-25 Pri 10 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 12


Open Date: Tuesday, 31 August 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is the second ballot for ISO/DIS 16175-2, Information and documentation -- Principles and functional requirements for records in electronic office environments -- Part 2: Guidelines and functional requirements for records in electronic office environments. This ballot is being fast-tracked and the standard is therefore not required to...

Your Vote: Yes
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-09-14 Pri 7 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 12

2010-10-01 Liaison ballot -- Annex A.7 ISO/DIS 19011, Guidelines for auditing management systems

Open Date: Thursday, 8 July 2010 @ 10:00 am ET
This is a ballot from TC 176/SC3 (Quality management and quality assurance / Supporting technologies) for ANNEX A.7, Discipline-specific knowledge and skills of auditors – Records, from the standard ISO/DIS 19011, Guidelines for auditing management systems. As a liaison, we can provide comments only. Please note we are only asked to comment...

Your Vote: Abstain
Liaison ballot -- Annex A.7 ISO/DIS 19011, Guidelines for auditing management systems TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Have comments 2 22 2/9%
Do not have comments 7 77 7/9%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2010-07-20 Pri 14

2010-09-27 ISO/DIS 27730, Information and documentation — International standard collection identifier (ISCI)

Open Date: Friday, 14 May 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This ballot is for the draft standard, ISO/DIS 27730, Information and documentation — International standard collection identifier (ISCI). This International Standard establishes the specifications for the International Standard Collection Identifier (ISCI) as a unique international identification system for each collection, fond and...

Your Vote: Yes
2010-09-24 Draft Digital records preservation: Where to start guide

Open Date: Monday, 30 August 2010 @ 10:00 am ET
This is a short turn-around call for comments on the TC46/SC11/WG7 draft Digital records preservation: Where to start guide. Following this ballot, the guide will be edited based on comments and then will likely go directly to publication. The guide is available from the ballot webpage or the link in the announcement e-mail. Your vote...

Your Vote: Comments have been submitted
Draft Digital records preservation: Where to start guide TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Comments have been submitted Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Comments have been submitted 2010-09-16 Pri 4 100%
Abstain 13

2010-09-10 ISO/CD 13008, Information and documentation – Digital records conversion and migration process

Open Date: Tuesday, 29 June 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is the first draft of the standard, ISO/CD 13008, Information and documentation – Digital records conversion and migration process. This standard specifies the planning issues, requirements, and procedures for the conversion and/or migration of digital records (which includes digital objects plus metadata) so as to preserve the...

Your Vote: Yes
ISO/CD 13008, Information and documentation – Digital records conversion and migration process TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Yes 2010-08-06 Pri 11 100%
No w/comment 0 0%
Abstain 9

2010-09-03 Call for experts and a convenor to revise of ISO 8: 1977 Documentation -- Presentation of periodicals

Open Date: Wednesday, 14 July 2010 @ 12:00 pm ET
ISO TC46 has voted to revise ISO 8: 1977 Documentation -- Presentation of periodicals, which "sets out rules intended to enable editors and publishers to present periodicals in a form which will facilitate their use." This ballot is to identify one or more U.S. experts to be on this revision working group. If you are nominating someone,...

Your Vote: Abstain
Call for experts and a convenor to revise of ISO 8: 1977 Documentation -- Presentation of periodicals TC46 Ballot Advisory Group
Yes I want to nominate an expert for the ISO 8 revision project 4 100%
Yes this nominee is willing to be the convenor (chairperson) 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2010-07-20 Pri 19


Open Date: Thursday, 22 April 2010 @ 8:00 am ET
This is a systematic review ballot for the published standard: ISO 15706-2:2007, Information and documentation — International Standard Audiovisual Number (ISAN) — Part 2: Version identifier. This part of ISO 15706 establishes a voluntary system for the identification of versions of audiovisual works and other content derived from or...

Your Vote: Abstain


TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Confirm 9 90%
Revise/Amend 1 10%
Withdraw 0 0%
Abstain Dow, Kathleen (Primary)
Voted Abstain 2010-04-26 Pri 12

Appendix I

ANSI Standards Development Process

Standards Developer Accreditation Process

- Must be accredited in order to be a standards developer
- Accreditation requires audit

ANSI Membership Fees and Obligations

- Organizational member: Full membership required to apply for and maintain ANSI accreditation as a developer; audited every 5 yrs.
- Organizational member fee structure is tiered based on operating budget, ranging from $3355 to $4870 annually
- Audited Designator is another category of developer with different procedures and fees. Organization undergoes audit process each time a document is submitted.
- Additional annual fee per document accredited
- Additional costs: ISO secretariat/s, US tag to ISO tech committee, international representation

Review Cycle

- Still responsible to do the standards work and manage standards development
- Must conform to ANSI accreditation due process operating procedures
- Balanced consensus body required; representative of community (SC might qualify)
- 5 year review cycle for standards; 3 year review cycle for technical reports

Other ANSI Standards Developers

- There are about 200 accredited ANSI standards developers, including: AIIM, ARMA, IEEE, NIST, SMPTE

AIIM: Full-time Standards Director on staff. Could be interested in partnering on standards development related to electronic information

---

2 Based on information on the ANSI website and discussion with Betsy Fanning, AIIM Standards Director (12 May 2011). ANSI’s standards activity page: [http://www.ansi.org/standards_activities/overview/overview.aspx](http://www.ansi.org/standards_activities/overview/overview.aspx)

3 ANSI’s organizational membership application: [http://publicaa.ansi.org/sites/apdl/Documents/Membership/Organizational_Application.pdf](http://publicaa.ansi.org/sites/apdl/Documents/Membership/Organizational_Application.pdf)

### Appendix J

#### Section and Roundtable Liaisons to the Standards Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section and Roundtable</th>
<th>Liaison</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisitions &amp; Appraisal Section</td>
<td>Ginny Hunt</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archivists of Religious Collections Section</td>
<td>Gwynedd Cannan</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College &amp; University Archives Section</td>
<td>Tom Sommer</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscript Repositories Section</td>
<td>Elizabeth Russey Roke</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum Archives Section</td>
<td>Francine Snyder</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional Papers Roundtable</td>
<td>Linda Whitaker</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesbian &amp; Gay Archives Roundtable</td>
<td>Margaret Gonsalves</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone Arrangers Roundtable</td>
<td>Dan McCormick</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts Roundtable</td>
<td>Helice Koffler</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy &amp; Confidentiality Roundtable</td>
<td>Linda Long</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Collections Roundtable</td>
<td>Sherrie Bowser</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Education</td>
<td>Lori Lindberg</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Group on Intellectual Property</td>
<td>Jean Dryden</td>
<td>2010-2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>