Society of American Archivists
Council Conference Call
January 17, 2018

Annual Report: Standards Committee and
Technical Subcommittees
(Prepared by Co-chairs Caitlin Christian-Lamb and John Bence)

2016 – 2017 Standards Committee Co-Chairs Carrie Hintz and Caitlin Christian-Lamb compiled the Committee's annual report, summarizing Standards tasks and discussions from the past year. This report was discussed at the Standards Committee Annual Meeting in Portland in August 2017. The report, along with sub-committee annual reports and the meeting minutes are attached.

INDEX

Standards Committee Annual Report and Annual Meeting Minutes

Appendix A: Technical Subcommittee on Guidelines to Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD) Annual Report

Appendix B: Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) Annual Report

Appendix C: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries Annual Report

Appendix D: ICA/EGAD Records in Context: A Contextual Model for Archival Description Comments

Appendix E: SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries Annual Report

Appendix F: Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG) Annual Report

Appendix G: External Standards Draft Evaluation

Appendix H: Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS) Annual Report

Society of American Archivists Standards Committee Annual Report, 2016–2017

Membership

Carrie Hintz (2014-2017; Co-Chair, 2015-2017)
Caitlin Christian-Lamb (2014-2018; Co-Chair, 2016-2018)
John Bence (2014-2018)
Hillary Bober (2014-2017)
Christiana Dobryzinski (2015-2018)
Julia Lipkins (2016-2019)
Anna Naruta-Moya (2015-2017)
Rebecca Wiederhold (2016-2018)
Lindsay Wittwer (2016-2019)

Bertram Lyons, Council Liaison (2016-2019)

Ex Officio:

Michelle Janowiecki (Intern)
Meg Tuomala (Immediate past Co-Chair)
Maureen Callahan (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Adrien Hilton (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Katherine Wisser (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Laura Uglean Jackson (TS-GRD Chair)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair/Rep to NISO)
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard (Rep from ICA-EGAD)
Stephan Weatherly (Rep to ALA/Description & Access and MARC)
Sharry Watson (Rep from CAA CCAD)
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)

Vacant (Rep to ARMA)

Incoming members:

Keith Chevalier (2017-2020)
Kira Dietz (2017-2020)
Elizabeth Dunham (2017-2020)
Renae Rapp (Intern, 2017-2018)

Incoming Chair:

John Bence (Co-Chair, 2017-2019)

Completed projects and activities

Governance

Technical Subcommittees and Task Forces

Council approved revisions to *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* and approved TS-GRD for another 5-year review cycle (to be completed by August 2022) in May 2017. Appointments for TS-GRD in this new review cycle are in progress. See appendix A for their annual report.

Council voted to extend term of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines in November 2016 (term will now end in August 2018), so that the current revision can be completed, reviewed, and published by TS-AFG.

$11,000 approved by Council during February 2016 call to fund a DACS revision meeting in March 2017, as well as approving a change to TS-DACS description to allow a co-chair "as needed" and to add another regular subcommittee member. TS-DACS brought together a group of archival description experts at the 2016 Annual Meeting in order to evaluate existing principles and set the stage for full principles revision, which was conducted at the DACS Principles meeting in March 2017. See appendices B and C for the request for changed membership/co-chair structure, and a full report of the meeting, including revised DACS principles for community feedback, as submitted to Council, and appendix D for the TS-DACS annual report.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries submitted a draft standard for review and approval by Standards and Council. The approval process agreed upon by the committee was to submit to RBMS first, then ACRL, then SAA. However, because of ACRL's Standards Committee's backlog, now ACRL will be submitted to last. This package was submitted to the RBMS Executive Committee on June 9, 2017.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries has released a draft of its Level 1 Guidelines, now open for public comment. See appendix E for their full annual report.

Revisions to *Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies* were approved by Council in November.

External representatives

The external representative to ARMA seat remains vacant.

Liaisons

The committee continues to use liaisons to SAA component groups for such purposes as calls for comments on draft standards. Communication with the liaisons is via the Standards collaboration listserv.

Endorsements and comments

Standards Committee participated in the following standards reviews this year:

External standards and documentation

The standards committee was asked to again consider endorsing the Role Delineation Statement developed by the Academy of Certified Archivists as an external standard. At the 2016 Annual Meeting Standards Committee voted that this was out of the committee's scope and needed to be considered by Council.

Standards Committee and TS-EAS submitted comments on ICA/EGAD Records in Context: A Contextual Model for Archival Description. See appendix F for submitted comments and appendix L for TS-EAS annual report.

Standards Committee added links to RightsStatements.org and the Intellectual Property Working Group's Guide to Implementing Rights Statements as a Non-Endorsed Standard following a January 2017 committee conference call, but did not endorse as an external standard at this time.

We added the following external standards to the Portal:
IASA-TC 03 (2005): Safeguarding the Audio Heritage: Ethics, Principles and Preservation Strategy (http://www.iasa-web.org/tc03/ethics-principles-preservation-strategy)

IASA-TC 04 (2009): Guidelines on the Production and Preservation of Digital Audio Objects (http://www.iasa-web.org/audio-preservation-tc04)

IASA-TC 05 (2014): Handling and Storage of Audio and Video Carriers (http://www.iasa-web.org/handling-storage-tc05)

Standards development and revision

Several standards are currently being developed or revised. Three standards are being developed in collaboration with the Rare Book and Manuscript Section of the American Library Association: Measured for Public Services, Holdings Counts and Measures, and Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy. All of these have been in active development this year.

Additionally, the technical subcommittee on archival facilities guidelines (TS-AFG) continues to work on a draft of a revision of that standard.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

- Draft standard was sent out for comments in January 2017 and submitted to RBMS for approval in June 2017
- See appendix G for complete report (not available in print packet due to size)

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

- Met at ALA Midwinter 2017
- Revision drafts underway as of June 15, 2017

- See appendix H for complete report

SAA/ACRL-RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Guidelines for Primary Source Literacy

- Development of Standard began in September of 2015 and is underway
- Draft circulated for comment in May 2017

Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers (Revision)

- Council voted to extend term of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines in November 2016 (term will now end in August 2018), so that the current revision can be completed
- See appendix I for complete report

Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning

- Revisions to *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* were approved by Council in May 2017
- TS-GRD was also renewed by Council for another 5-year review cycle (to be completed by August 2022) in May 2017
- See appendix A for complete report

Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Archival Studies
- Revisions to *Guidelines for a Graduate Program in Archival Studies* were approved by Council in November 2016
- See appendix J for council agenda item

Archival Continuing Education Guidelines
- Council passed a motion to revise the description of Committee on Education and create a Graduate Archival Education Subcommittee at the November 2016 meeting
- Committee on Education was tasked with revising and updating the Archival Continuing Education Guidelines
- ACE Guidelines were sent out for comment in May 2017

Describing Archives: A Content Standard
- Met in March 2017 to revise the DACS principles; revisions sent out for public comment in April 2017
- See appendix D for complete report

Ongoing projects and activities

Review of Standards portal (Julia and Michele) and discussion of defining a "standard" in the context of SAA Standards Committee
Committee members Michele Pacifico and Julia Stein compiled a spreadsheet of all external standards listed as endorsed on the committee's page, recording name of standard, external organization that

developed the standard, a link to the standard, questions related to the standard, and recommendation to continue listing the standard or review it. During the May 5, 2017 Standards Committee conference call, members proposed developing straightforward, clear criteria for endorsing external standards. Potential criteria include:

- Owned and maintained by an organization
- Something we can link to
- Currency - is it being updated, is there a schedule for updates
- Usage by membership
- Categorization of external standards - cleaning up organization
- Defining language - what does "endorsement" mean? By Standards Committee and/or by SAA as a whole – is there a difference? What does providing a link to a standard but not endorsing it mean?
- ISO standards - behind paywall, do we want to recommend standards that might not be accessible to SAA members? On the other hand, ISO is the maintainer of many standards that apply to the archival profession, so not including these would also pose a major problem.

Committee members voted to table action on criteria and next steps, pending a full committee discussion at the 2017 Annual Meeting. See appendix K for spreadsheet and the notes from conference call.

Initiatives associated with the 2013–2018 Strategic Plan

Goal 1: Advocating for Archivists and Archives

Revisions to *Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Archival Studies*, which provide a set of benchmarks for graduate programs to use to ensure that emerging professionals are equipped to succeed in the archives field (1.1).

Goal 2: Enhancing Professional Growth

All approved standards are added to the Standards Portal, delivering information effectively and affordably (2.2). Employing the use of continuous revision cycles for standards (used by both *DACS* and *EAD3*) allows for the delivery of information that keeps pace with technological change (2.2).

Reviewing the *Archival Continuing Education Guidelines* and supporting the revamped DACS curriculum developed by TS-DACS helps to ensure that the educational offerings available to archivists are appropriate, high value, and meet the developmental needs of participants (2.1, 2.2).

Goal 3: Advancing the Field

The committee continues to support the active revision of existing standards *Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers*, *Guidelines on Reappraisal and Deaccessioning*, and *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (3.1).

Continued work on the joint task forces with RBMS will both develop new standards (3.1) and enable active participation in partnerships and collaborations (3.3).

Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs

Continuing to use liaisons and the Standards Collaboration listserv, and seeking wider comments on draft standards facilitates communication (4.1) and creates opportunities for members to participate (4.2).

In addition to convening multiple conference calls since the 2014 annual meeting, the co-chairs continued to seek standards committee member involvement in drafting Council agenda items and reviewing drafts of those items. Additionally, we held a few discussions and votes remotely (over email) when faced with requests for quick turnaround on getting recommendations to Council. These activities improve communication among committee members (4.1) and create opportunities for broader participation among committee members (4.2).

Continuing to appoint standards committee, technical subcommittee, and task force members and chairs who are early to mid-career archivists provides expanded leadership opportunities in SAA (4.2).

Questions and concerns for Council attention

The external representative to ARMA International remains vacant pending additional research regarding a 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between SAA and ARMA International (item D.3, Council meeting minutes, August 12–13, 2013[1]). Last year our Council liaison reported to standards committee that SAA staff would investigate this matter. The committee simply wishes to remind the Council of this in case it is considered a priority.

Respectfully Submitted,
Carrie Hintz and Caitlin Christian-Lamb, Co-Chairs, 2016–2017

Society of American Archivists
Standards Committee Annual Meeting Minutes

Tuesday July 25, 2017 5:00pm - 7:00pm
B112 *Oregon Convention Center*
777 NE MLK, Jr. Blvd, Portland, OR 97232

5:10   **Welcome and call to order**
           Introduction and announcement of new members

Present:
Carrie Hintz (Co-Chair)
Caitlin Christian-Lamb (Co-Chair)
Daniel Pitti
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard (Rep from ICA-EGAD)
Kathy Wisser (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Michelle Janowiecki (Intern)
Rebecca Weiderhold
Maureen Callahan (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
John Bence
Amy Schindler
Hilary Bober
Lindsay Wittwer
Weatherly Stephan (Rep to ALA/Description & Access and MARC)
Kris Kiesling (Council)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair/Rep to NISO)
Emily Novak Gustainis
Bert Lyons (Council)
Kira Dietz (incoming Standards Committee member)

5:15   **Council Liaison update (Bert Lyons)**

- Issued statement of concerns about 2019 meeting at Austin, Texas
- Approved petition to form new section, Independent Archives Section, for standalone, consultants, and other archivists
- Discussed survey about barriers to SAA
  - Membership committee survey: what are obstacles to becoming active and contributing to SAA?
  - Action item: bring it to the November meeting to inform conversation
  - Discussed new criteria for component group funding requests: how to make fair, consistent, and transparent decisions, reviewing this at the end of the week
  - Approved SAA support for two ICA documents, Principles of Access for Archives and the Basic Principles of the Role of Archivists and Records Managers in Support of Human Rights; expressed support but not endorsement

- o Chris and Bert working on project to review the efficacy of publishing changes to our standards over time, will gather data on how it's working and how to improve, want to have clearest line of communication that we can between committee members and SAA members, and the community at large
    - Carrie opened up this issue for question and comments
    - Marie: what is the impetus for this?
        - At what point do we do another printing of DACS, for instance? What are the benchmarks for the revision process? Make sure coordination process is good?
        - Comment from Daniel Pitti (EGAD) for ICA standards can be out for 5-10 years, interested in this issue, for EAS and for DACS, clear guidelines, non-trivial from revenue point of view, are what point are revision substantial enough to republish/make new release?
    - Marie: numbered revision is helpful so people can track their compliance to a certain revision
    - Question from Claire: curious about if print version really make money
        - Daniel Pitti: Online version is free, print is desirable for some people
        - Michele: majority of the Facilities manual is bought by people outside of the profession

Update about committee as a whole (Carrie Hintz)

- Complying feedback about RIC led by Rebecca Weiderhold, submitted to ICA at the beginning of this year
- Considered endorsing Role Delineation Statement from Academy of Certified Archivists, decided it was out of scope and moved it onto SAA council for consideration
- Added new standards to portal
- Carrie has heard from Tanya Zanish-Belcher about Council's intention to revisit and revise standards about archives and disabilities; forming a diversity working group
    - Discussed review of Standards Committee Portal (Michele Pacifico & Julia Lipkins Stein)
        - o Standard Committee website has external standards (endorsed) and others (not endorsed), most were added in 2012, no additions since
            - Issues: many standards links are broken, we don't know if they are the most recent versions, inconsistency if free or behind paywall
                - Michele and Julia created a spreadsheet of standards from the portal to develop criteria for what to list on our website, but felt they need expertise of the whole committee, how do we approach the next step?
                - General discussion of some initial questions about endorsement and the process.
                    - o Does the standard have maintenance?
                    - o Who is using the standards?
                    - o What does endorsement even mean?
                    - o Should we change structure and content of portal?
                    - o Concern about consistence about ISO standards

- There are some, not all on the portal
- Most ISO standards have paywall
  - Maureen asked if we've looked at analytics from the website?
    - Not yet, but general agreement that this would be good to use as another metric

5:45-6:30   **Constituent group updates**

- JTF-Holdings Metrics (Emily Novak Gustainis)
  - Finalized draft guideline for Level 1 Guidelines, posted in January 2017, followed by three months of feedback
  - Considered issues like linear vs. cubic feet
    - Created detailed responses to feedback
  - Developed with timeline to get standard released by August 2018
  - Hope to have complete revised Level 1 and Level 2 guidelines on the website by January
- TS-Archival Facilities Guidelines (Michele Pacifico)
  - Back in business, charter ran out, now there are new interested members
  - 2009 Guidelines are outdated
    - Science is rapidly changing,
    - Currently considering whether ongoing project to change guidelines is a revision or something new
    - Meeting on Thursday to start to make changes
    - Some drafts of some chapters already started
    - Talking about authorship, in 2009 each committee member had authored a chapter, considering what to do with revision
- TS-DACS (Maureen)
  - Last year kicked off revising the workshop for DACS
    - Created series of video lecture and quizzes, so instructor can know where you are, and makes the rest of workshop more interactive
      - Jackie Dean has been getting really great feedback
      - The videos are free online
    - Asked council for another member for DACS and formally getting co-chairs
    - Accepted change proposal for crosswalks for EAD3
    - Revision of DACS principles starting at annual last year
      - Questions included: How to best express principles? What do we need to revise?
        - Since DACS hasn't been revised since 2004, decided time was right for revision
      - User-based perspective, met in March in Connecticut to explore needs of different users and how they would interact with archives and how it might be frustrating

- Considered what principles could exist that would create better outcomes and reviewed literature
- 11 principles distributed for feedback that closed on July 1st, now reviewing with TS-DACS
  - 52 responses, most supported new principles (7 out of 10), make a decision if they are going to change how clear theory is in the principles, going to summarize areas of disagreements and decide what steps
  - Carrie: feedback is a little muddled about difference between rules and principles, might clarify how to put principles into practice
  - Weatherly: some discomfort about word choice, but seemed to like principles

- TS-EAS (Kathy Wisser)
  - 1st year as TS-EAS, result of combining TS-EAD, TS-EAC-CPF, and SDT
    - Some struggles with communication over the groups, so combination
    - During 2016 meeting came up with team structure
      - recruited people to lead
      - Six teams created and a temporary team to respond to RIC
        - EAD
        - EAC-CPF
        - SDT
        - Schema
        - Documentation
        - Collaborating with other standards
    - Currently standardizing GitHub presence
    - Reviewing team structure
      - Internal reflection of how to accomplish and spread load
    - Submitted feedback for RIC
    - Discussed what constitutes a major revision of a standard
    - Resolved feature requests for EAD
      - Discussed when it is a minor vs. major feature request
      - Priority to figure out how feature requests will work for EAC-CPF
    - Website has revision via Glenn Gardner and committee members
    - Working to develop priority issues for upcoming year
- TS-Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (Caitlin Christian-Lamb)

- Approved minor revisions
  - GRD hopes to clarify revision cycle
- New chair elected: Dara Baker
- External reps:
  - Expert Group on Archival Description/ICA (Daniel Pitti)
    - ICA: RIC draft standard released in September 2016
    - Put it out for comments
      - Got 82 sets of comments from individuals and groups, more groups than individuals from 19 countries
      - Good response
      - 200 pages of comments total, a lot for the committee to handle
      - Fortunately, one member Kim, really likes looking at the comments and has organized them and picking out main themes
      - Holding teleconferences every three weeks, meeting Rome in October 2017, putting out another draft after that for comments
      - Thanks committee, DACS, TS-EAS for their comments
      - RIC ontology, beginnings of a draft started, hope to have something out on that by the beginning of the year
  - ALA Description & Access and MARC Advisory Committee (Weatherly)
    - Proposal passed by MARC, subfield 1 approved for URI (Uniform Resource Identifier)
    - All subfields are now used, causing some anxiety
    - CC:DA, proposal in August from aggregate working group, met with a lot of resistance because model still in beginning stages, so put into 3R project
    - ALA providing comments, wanted feedback from specialist groups
    - Not clear crosswalk between RDA and DACS, very underrepresented
      - Archives and museum working group to report back to RDA steering committee, will follow up with that and see if it actually happens because not a new idea
  - NISO (Michele)
    - A lot of feedback about vote to develop rights information standards for digital collections in NISO, SAA did not vote for it because it wanted a coordinated effort, written up in NISO Newsline because it didn't pass
    - The vote covered right statements, creative commons license, and other issues

6:30 **Standards Committee discussion items**

- JTF-Public Services Metrics (Amy Schindler)
  - Submitted standard to ARCL and SAA on June 9, 2017 for approval

- Released version one last summer, released version two in January
- Three members of taskforce did webinar, 144 turned into live broadcast, recommended if you'd like to learn more about the standard
- Lots of word choice changes, 8 domains with 48 measures
- Incorporated a lot of feedback and tweaks, but not all incorporated—didn't remove term for reading room for instance
- People really care about this, received about 300 comments, many through in-person sessions or through email
  - Also held panel sessions at regional conferences
- Vote (Standards Committee)
  - Did committee sufficiently do due diligence getting feedback and do we want to forward that to council for approval and discussion?
  - Motion passes

6:40   Suggestions of activities/projects/goals for 2016–2017 Standards Committee

- Michele and Julia's work on endorsed standards on the portal
  - Google form for standard suggestions?
  - Should we survey other committee to see if they have links and how they manage the portal?
  - Kathy: Should we separate official standards and external standards portal, like EAD roundtable (community orientated) & EAD working group (official) previously did?
  - Caitlin: Maybe standardize with previous standard members?
  - Claire: Should we used word external, is a little exclusive? Maybe don't have exhaustive list but have main standard?
  - Should we poll membership to see top standards used?
- Best Practices for Working with Archives Researchers with Physical Disabilities and archivists with physical disabilities needs to be updated
- Native American Archives Section would like to bring back protocols back for reconsideration next year
- Liaison assignments https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1xarm935hgms8-ReM06JCGzxz5eeDA7MyGqOpo8AIToo/edit#gid=0
  - Started in 2014, need to reassign some; also revisit and more formally define what they do and how often to reassign.
    - Maybe investigate how SAA Council does their liaisons
    - Should we combine the liaisons for groups that are pretty inactive?
  - Need 3 new liaisons for DACS, Museum Archives, and TS-AFG
    - Tabled for future call with all the new members (7:00pm)

6:59   Adjourned

Annual Report: Technical Sub-Committee on Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD)

August 2016-July 2017

Submitted by: Laura Uglean Jackson, July 20, 2017

Members:
Laura Uglean Jackson (Chair)
Chela Weber (Committee Member)
Mark Shelstad (Committee Member)
Margery Sly (Committee Member)
Bethany Anderson (Ex Officio, Acquisitions & Appraisal Section)
Caitlin Christian-Lamb (Ex Officio, Standards Committee Co-Chair)
Carrie Hintz (Ex Officio, Standards Committee Co-Chair)
Bertram Lyons (Council Liaison)

Please accept the final report for the first review cycle of the TS-GRD. It outlines our activities for the year and includes recommendations to improve the review process for SAA standards.

In the TS-GRD's final year, we successfully completed the review and revision process for the Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning.

In October 2016, we submitted the full review package to the Standards Committee with a recommendation to revise the Guidelines. The TS-GRD replaced outdated forms and definitions, made minor additions and deletions to clarify procedure and make it applicable to all types of repositories, and revised the cover page to reflect the new version. All of these changes were minor, there were no substantive changes recommended or made, yet we had to go through the lengthy and somewhat cumbersome process of proposing that the standard be revised according to the Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard, sections V.C through V.D.7. We encourage the SAA Standards Committee to consider changing the process (make it simpler, faster, and more streamlined) for Standards review when the proposed changes during a review cycle are minor.

The Standards Committee approved the changes in November 2016 and forwarded the review package to SAA Council. Council reviewed and voted to approve the changes in May 2017, and implemented a new five year review cycle. The revised standard was made available online in June.

One final recommendation for improving the review process is to make explicitly clear that the sub-committee include the standard with the revised additions underlined and deletions struck through in the review package. In January, the TS-GRD chair received an email from the Council Liaison requesting the document with the revisions ASAP, so that Council could vote on the revisions at their next meeting. The *Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard* does not state that this document with the changes noted needs to be included in the review package.

The chair and committee members of TS-GRD wish to thank SAA for the opportunity to lead the first review of the Guidelines. We believe that the revised Guidelines will serve the archival community well for its collection management activities now and into the future.

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

July 2017

The Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) has had an active and productive year in fulfillment of its charge to oversee the timely and ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS). This report covers the period August 2016-July 2017.

The major focus of the committee over the past year has been leading a group of archival description experts in a revision process for the DACS Principles of Archival Description (hereafter referred to as the Principles). At the annual meeting last year, the group convened for an initial assessment of the current principles. Each principle was analyzed in terms of its clarity, relevance, and teachability. It was determined that a full rewrite of the principles was warranted. Members of TS-DACS drafted a funding request to SAA, which was initially rejected. We submitted a subsequent proposal with a change in venue that was accepted. The committee then went on to organize and arrange a five-day work retreat for eighteen participants held at the Lewis Walpole Library of Yale University in Farmington, Connecticut. A full report of the work meeting was submitted to SAA leadership and Council.

The work retreat successfully produced what we considered a minimum viable product (MVP) that was ready to be tested and commented on by the community at large. The idea of an MVP is to test and to test often, as taken from the software development community, in order to continually hone your product before you get too far down a potentially misguided path. We put out a request for public comment on the revised principles in April, announcing the revision process through listservs, Twitter, and direct emails. The draft was sent to fifteen first reviewers, consisting of expert practitioners and seasoned theorists. We created a structured form on Google for gathering the data that could be parsed and analyzed in a single place. Since July 1, the deadline for public comment, we've been analyzing the feedback through a combination of careful reading and a series of worksheets. We've asked our analyzers to suggest a possible resolution to the comments we received, whether that is through more revision, direct education, enhancing the DACS workshop, or with introductory remarks to the revised principles.

TS-DACS continued to polish our work on the DACS workshop revision. The webinars and quizzes were mounted on SAA's website. The workshop was taught two times and received

positive feedback on the revised format. Our intention for the coming year is to make a final push in refining and packaging the workshop content and delving into how to best educate around Part II of DACS.

One revision was made to DACS through the use of Github and our community comment mechanisms. It consisted of an update to the crosswalks to account for EAD3.

TS-DACS created a communication strategy that will serve in the coming year as a basis for which to educate and advertise the standard and the work of TS-DACS. The committee also produced documentation for the SAA Vice President / President-Elect and the Nominating and Standards Committees when selecting new members for TS-DACS. The documentation outlines both requirements and expectations to help those who want to join the committee and also those doing the selecting. Lastly, the committee successfully lobbied for changes in our charge to include an additional member, allow for co-chairs, and to advocate for membership to be archival description experts.

Lastly, we commented publicly on two documents, the Records in Contexts draft revision to the suite of ISAD standards and the OCLC report on metadata for web archives.

Society of American Archivists
Standards Committee
July 20, 2017

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development
of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures
for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Annual Report to Standards Committee

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter "JTF-HCM") is responsible for the development of guidelines (hereafter "Guidelines") that will provide metrics, definitions, and best practices for quantifying the holdings of archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Guidelines will consider and address both the wide range of types and formats of material typically held--including analog, digital, and audiovisual materials--and the different ways in which collection material is managed and described. The Guidelines might also accommodate a two-tiered approach involving basic/minimum metrics and advanced/optimum metrics and/or include recommendations for institutions that wish to engage in collections assessment.

Officers
• Martha O'Hara Conway, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, University of Michigan
• Emily R. Novak Gustainis, Co-Chair, SAA, Harvard University

Membership
• Adriana Cuervo (SAA), Rutgers University
• Elizabeth Haven-Hawley (ACRL/RBMS), University of Florida
• Rachel D'Agostino (ACRL/RBMS), Library Company of Philadelphia
• Lara Friedman-Shedlov (ACRL/RBMS), University of Minnesota
• Angela Fritz (SAA), University of Arkansas Libraries
• Lisa Miller (SAA rep), Hoover Institution Archives, Stanford University
• Katy Rawdon (ACRL/RBMS), Temple University
• Cyndi Shein (SAA), University of Nevada, Las Vegas Libraries

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force met thirty-one times between September 1, 2016 and July 25, 2017. This includes:

- 14 standing meetings via conference call
- 12 working sessions via conference call
- 2 working meetings scheduled during ALA Midwinter (January 22, 2017) and SAA Annual (July 25, 2017)
- 3 open meetings for ALA (January 22, 2017 and June 25, 2017) and SAA membership (July 25, 2017)

Minutes through March 2 are available on the SAA microsite: http://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-holdings-metrics/jtf-hcm-meetings; post-March 2, meeting discussion points were generally recorded in draft documents. Should the Committee be renewed, the posting of formal minutes for its standing meetings will resume in September.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

The Joint Task Force is currently engaged in:

1. Refining its draft timeline for proposed 2017-2018 activities (attached)

2. Revising core documentation and drafting guidance in response to feedback received for the draft *Level 1 Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* distributed January 11, 2017

3. Preparing scenarios for the application of the Level 1 rubric to accompany (or potentially replace) distributed "Examples and Explanations" document

4. Preparing responses to feedback received from RBMS and SAA communities

COMPLETED ACTIVITIES

During the reporting period, the Task Force:

- Completed and posted draft *Level 1 Guidelines* to SAA microsite

- Distributed call for comments and feedback on the draft Guidelines to thirty professional organizations and listservs, with comment period open from January 11, 2017 – March 3, 2017

- Compiled, categorized, and conducted preliminary review of feedback received from eighteen individual RBMS and SAA members and collectively from members of the Special Collections and Archives Council of the Harvard University Library. Comments and corresponding issues extracted from feedback received can be summarized as follows:

- o Born digital and digitized content-related (19 comments)
- o Categories/types of collection material (7 comments)
- o Containers (1 comment)
- o Determining physical and digital space occupied/conducting count and units of measure (21 comments)
- o Discoverability requirement (5 comments)
- o Other (15 comments)

- Revised core document, "Categories/Types of Collection Material" in response to feedback (attached)

- Revised core document, "Level 1 Count" Rubric in response to feedback (attached)

- Drafted outline for *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2 Counts)*

UPCOMING ACTIVITIES

- Consult with SAA Standards Liaison John Bence regarding extension/renewal request procedures

- Submit extension request/renewal with smaller Task Force membership (attached)

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries
(Prepared by: Emily R. Novak Gustainis, SAA Co-chair)

Proposed Timeline: August 1, 2017 – August 31, 2018

Aug. 2017	Review feedback received during the Annual SAA meeting, Portland, Oregon; Prepare Task Force extension request
Sept. 2017	Submit extension request
Sept. 2017 – Jan.2018	Finalize level 1 documentation; develop and prepare supporting documentation for Level 2
Feb. 2018	Post revised *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries* to SAA microsite, incorporating final revisions to Level 1 Guidelines and introducing Level 2 rubric and supporting documentation; issue call for comments and feedback through March 16, 2018
Mar.-June. 2018	Compile, categorize, review, and respond to community feedback; make revisions as necessary
July 2018	Prepare *Guidelines for Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (Level 1 and 2)* and supporting documentation for submission to SAA Standards Committee
Aug. 2018	Hold open meeting at SAA to present Guidelines release; meet with Standards Committee; submit final annual report to SAA Council

1

Categories/Types of Collection Material

Archival and Manuscript Material

<u>Definition</u>: Documents, or aggregations of documents, in any form or medium, created or received by a person, family, or organization, public or private, in the conduct of its affairs and preserved because of their continuing value.

<u>Scope</u>: Includes organic collections, artificial collections (including vertical files), records, and manuscripts. Manuscripts may take the form of fragments, scrolls, codices, or single or multiple sheets. Also includes data, email, and archived web content.

Published Language Material

<u>Definition</u>: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for language and intended for distribution.

<u>Scope</u>: Includes books, pamphlets, single-sheet publications, and other formats of textual material, as well as formats that present non-textual content in book form, including artists' books and graphic novels.

Cartographic Material

<u>Definition</u>: Collection material consisting of content that represents the whole or a part of the Earth, any celestial body, or an imaginary place.

<u>Scope</u>: Includes cartographic datasets, images, moving images, and three-dimensional forms. Also includes atlases, diagrams, globes, maps, models, profiles, remote-sensing images, sections, and views.

Computer Programs

<u>Definition</u>: Collection material consisting of content expressed through digitally encoded instructions intended to be processed and performed by a computer.

<u>Scope</u>: Includes operating systems and applications software.

Graphic/Visual Material

<u>Definition</u>: Collection material consisting of content expressed through line, shape, shading, pigment, etc., intended to be perceived primarily in two dimensions.

<u>Scope</u>: Includes material in opaque and transparent formats, including those intended to be projected. Includes conventional still images as well as still images that give the illusion of depth or motion. Includes charts, collages,

drawings, paintings, photographs (positives and negatives), postcards, posters, and prints. Includes interactive and/or dynamic materials such as advent calendars, anatomical flap books, paper dolls, volvelles, and computer aided design (CAD) and building information modeling (BIM) files.

Moving Image Material

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through images intended to be perceived as moving, and in two or three dimensions.

Scope: Includes motion pictures using live action and/or animation; film and video recordings, including digitally streamed content; and video games.

Notated Movement

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of notation for movement.

Scope: Includes forms of notated movement for dance and game play.

Notated Music

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form of musical notation.

Scope: Includes choir books; table books; sheet music; vocal, instrumental, and conductor parts; and complete scores.

Objects/Artifacts

Definition: Collection material consisting of content expressed through a form or forms intended to be perceived in three dimensions

Scope: Includes artifacts (objects intentionally made or produced for a certain purpose) and naturally-occurring objects.

Sound Recordings

Definition: Collection material consisting of recorded content expressed through language or music in an audible form, or recorded content other than language or music expressed in an audible form.

Scope: Includes recordings of readings, recitations, speeches, interviews, oral histories, performed music, and natural and artificially-produced sounds, as well as computer-generated speech and music.

		Intellectual Units Held
		Number of Titles/Title Equivalents
Archival and Manuscript Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)

		Intellectual Units Held
		Number of Titles/Title Equivalents
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings		
managed as items		recommended (level 1)
managed as collections		recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

		Physical Space Occupied	
		In Linear Feet	**In Cubic Feet**
Archival and Manuscript Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings			
described online/discoverable		recommended (level 1)	recommended (level 1)
not [yet] described online/discoverable		optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

		Physical Space Occupied	
		In Linear Feet	**In Cubic Feet**
Other Physical Space Occupied			
described online/discoverable		as needed	as needed
not [yet] described online/discoverable		as needed	as needed

Note: For the purpose of conducting the count at the local level, institutions are encouraged to record space occupied per local practice. For the purpose of aggregating data across multiple institutions, physical space occupied for all categies/types of collection materials should be aggregated and reported in cubiuc feet, except for Published Language Material, which should be aggregated and reported in linear feet.

	Digital Space Occupied
	In Multiples of Bytes
Archival and Manuscript Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Published Language Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Cartographic Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Computer Programs	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Graphic/Visual Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Moving Image Material	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Movement	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Notated Music	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Objects/Artifacts	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)
Sound Recordings	
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable	recommended (level 1)
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable	optional (level 1) / recommended (level 2)

		Digital Space Occupied
		In Multiples of Bytes
Other Digital Space Occupied		
Actively managed in bytes and described online/discoverable		as needed
Actively managed in bytes and not [yet] described online/discoverable		as needed

Note: For the purpose of conducting the count at the local level, institutions are encouraged to record space occupied per local practice (btyes, megabytes, gigabytes, or terbytes). For the purpose of aggregating data across multiple institutions, digital space occupied for all categies/types of collection materials should be aggregated and reported in gigabytes.

Records in Contexts-CM

Comments from Society of American Archivists on
ICA EGAD RiC consultation draft, September 2016
Direct link to the draft: http://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/RiC-CM-0.1.pdf

SAA Standards Committee

December 29, 2016

Please find below the Society of American Archivists response to the International Council on Archives Experts Group on Archival Description Records in Contexts: A Conceptual Model for Archival Description. SAA is deeply invested in Records in Contexts due to our interest in advancing international archival description and because we are responsible for maintaining a suite of archival standards compatible with current ICA standards. The Society of American Archivists has gathered feedback on the RiC Consultation Draft v0.1 from the SAA community, including SAA Council, Standards Committee, Technical Subcommittee on Describing Archives: A Content Standard, Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Standards, the Description Section, and various leaders within the organization. This report is a synthesis of the comments and reports received by the organization and represents SAA's response to the draft of RiC-CM. Individual members and formal groups have also been encouraged to submit their feedback directly to EGAD; most notably, expert groups from the Technical Subcommittees on DACS and Encoded Archival Standards have prepared detailed reports, which have heavily informed this response.

First and foremost, SAA wishes to congratulate EGAD on the release of a draft of the RiC conceptual model and on this ambitious undertaking. RiC-CM manages to successfully incorporate the most salient features of ICA's four current descriptive standards—ISAD(G), ISAAR-CPF, ISDF, and ISDIAH—into a single conceptual model. We are impressed with the comprehensive nature of the model and with its efforts to align archival description with description standards coming out of other communities, including records management, libraries and museums. RiC-CM makes a major contribution to the

overall understanding of archival description as a consistent, complex whole. RiC-CM provides archivists, records managers, information architects and other possible audiences with a framework that presents a comprehensive understanding of archival description concepts and positions them within the context of other cultural heritage traditions and practices.

SAA is particularly impressed with the ways that the RiC conceptual model recognizes and embraces the complexity of relationships between records, as well as between records and their creators and users, by moving away from the multi-level description of ISAD(G) towards a "multi-dimensional" model for understanding archives and records. This move, reflected in the title of the standard, "Records in Contexts," allows archivists to take on the complex task of expanding the representation of collections' hierarchical and relational aspects and recognizes the pluralities of both records and contexts and the ways that those pluralities impact the records and our work as records keepers.

We very much look forward to the forthcoming RiC Ontology, which we hope will address many of our use and implementation questions such as if there are required elements or defined levels of description, which elements are repeatable, and what required or preferred vocabularies are intended to be used with RiC elements. We hope that the ontology will provide a more concrete sense of how the conceptual model can be practically applied to descriptive practice.

While we are impressed overall with the standard and the direction that it is heading, SAA and members of our community do have specific comments and questions on both the overall design of the content model and on specific elements within the model. Detailed feedback on individual sections of the conceptual model is presented below, followed by final takeaways and suggestions.

Comments and Feedback

Introduction

RiC-CM is an ambitious content model that provides guidance for thinking broadly about records themselves, recordkeeping practices, and agents who act upon records and recordkeeping systems. In the preface to RiC, the rationale for the creation of this conceptual model was to bring together archival principles and represent them in archival description. We very much agree that grounding descriptive practices in foundational archival principles is valuable and necessary, and as such we would like to see a clearer enumeration of these principles as understood and applied by EGAD. These principles are not

fully enumerated or defined in the content model, nor is there robust discussion of how an understanding of archival principles has driven the development of the model overall or has guided the development of individual elements. Section 1.5 discusses the value and limitations of the principles of provenance, context, and original order, but principles such as authenticity, reliability, accountability, and our responsibility to document diverse human experiences are only referred to obliquely. SAA would like to see a more comprehensive discussion of archival principles and how they shape the conceptual model.

We would also like to have a deeper understanding of the design principles that informed the conceptual model. We often found ourselves wondering about the rationale behind certain decisions and would be interested in seeing a brief discussion about the design principles of RiC in the introduction to the conceptual model. In particular, we have a number of questions about why certain elements are modeled as an Entity versus a Property. In cases where entities do not have a complex data model (and also when they are strictly associated with particular other Entities), questions arise whether it would be more suitable to treat them as Properties. For example, it seems that entities RiC-E5 Occupation, RiC-E6 Position, Ric-E7 Function, RiC-E9 Activity, and RiC-E10 Mandate suggest that all of these entities relate specifically to, or are properties of, Ric-E4 Agent. It would be useful to either have clearer definitions and examples of how these entities operate independently of Agent, or to see them as properties of Agent. We would like the conceptual model to be clearer on how entities are understood and defined and EGAD's rationale behind these definitions.

Additionally, the model and the provided examples seem to disproportionately address institutional (ie government and corporate) records. Section 1.4 of the Introduction, which discusses the role of records and recordkeeping in society, only addresses one of many ways to understand the development and purpose of records: organizing and maintaining social hierarchy. We would recommend a significant revision of this section to reflect other purposes for recordkeeping, that reflects a more recordkeeping practices globally, and that addresses the evolution of digital records. We would like to see more guidance on how manuscript collecting repositories can and should apply the model to description of personal and family papers, community organizations, and non-hierarchical groups, including robust examples of how to apply the model to the papers of complex and decentralized entities such as families and social movements.

Entities

RiC-E1 - RiC-E3 Record, Record Component, and Record Set

We have questions about the ordering of entities E1-E3. The current order discussing and defining item and sub-item elements before the Record Set as a whole runs counter to most archival descriptive practices which first describe a body of records and then subcomponents. Is there a requirement to describe the Record Sets, Record Components, and Records in any particular order? SAA would not support a model that emphasizes the description of items and sub-items above aggregates. We do hope that either further guidance is provided in future drafts or that the ontology provides clarification on these descriptive levels.

RiC-E1 Record

The scope note indicates that the distinguishing criterion between a Record and a Record Set is that the Record is evidence of a *single transaction*. In this case "single transaction" needs to be defined more concretely. Most transactions consist of a complex set of significant smaller transactions that in concert make up the transaction. What constitutes the "single transaction" exactly, say, in the takeover of a firm, the accessioning of records, or even a car purchase? How far should a transaction be broken down--or not be—to be an actionable concept in this context? And does this mean that all records must, by definition, be transactional? How is the "sketch map of the Qatar Peninsula" in the examples transactional? Further definition and clarification is recommended here.

RiC-E1 Record and E2 Record Component

The delineation between a Record and a Record component needs more clarification and additional, contextualized examples. The current examples obfuscate rather than clarify the concept of a Record Component for many of us. For one of the current examples given for RiC-E2 Record Component, "two digital photographs attached to an email message" it seems that the two photographs could well be considered entities in their own rights that could be connected to the email with a relationship rather than being described as a Record Component. In this case, handling them as record components would be reductive. We do see clear use cases for, say, a signature that forms part of a record, or any other component that is indivisible from the record. Such indivisibility should be part of the definition of record component to remove the arbitrariness of use and overlap with the definition of record; the two

entities should be unambiguous and non-overlapping. This is a case where the entity is valuable, but requires a more refined definition and additional examples to be fully intelligible.

RiC-E3 Record Set

SAA finds the concept of a Record Set to be very useful and one of the most significant contributions that RiC-CM makes to furthering archival description. We are glad to have a descriptive entity that allows us to refer to an aggregation of records that share common description outside of the concept of a series. By removing the implicit requirements of provenance and original order from arbitrary sets of records, archivists have much more flexibility in describing various aggregates of records that we hold and administer. We see practical value in formalizing the description of catch-all series (the example given is "miscellaneous") or artificial collections.

We also very much appreciate the explicit acknowledgement that Records and Records Sets can be part of multiple Record Sets. This is one of the clearest examples given of the "multidimensionality" of records put forth in the introduction and a welcome move towards a more sophisticated, multivalent understanding of records and contexts than purely hierarchical definition allows.

We do ask for a few points of clarification on the Record Set entity, in particular about how Record Sets are represented over time. The entity is defined as "One or more Records that are brought together **at some Date, by an Agent**…" This definition could be interpreted as the Records of a Record Set were brought together at a given moment of time, but our understanding is that the creation of a Records Set can be an ongoing process that unfolds over a more or less long period of time. We recommend that the scope note clarifies that "... at some Date" can refer to both a single date and a date range or ranges. Similarly, can a creator be an agent that produces a Record Set or is this concept only intended to refer to actions taken after the active life of a Record? The definition appears to allow the creator to be an agent, but the examples in the Scope Notes focus on roles that interact with records after the end of their active life.

RiC-E4 Agent

We are glad to see that non-human entities are included in this definition of Agent and that things like software are understood as actors on records. However, we think that the current definition and

modelling of Agent is too simplistic to accommodate anticipated use cases and inappropriately asks archivists to make implicit judgment calls on Agent's identities.

The scope notes continually privilege a singular "true" identity in presence of multiple identities or identity facets. For example, the first note says that "Persons or groups commonly have one identity" but may also have "assumed or fictitious identities." We encourage EGAD to consider identity more broadly than each person "commonly having one identity" and to not make assumptions of a single "true" identity when faced with evidence of a more complex network of potential identity markers.

As an extension, we question the construction of the scope note that reads "Typically archivists will want to attribute responsibility to the person or persons, or group or groups 'behind' the assumed identity." Rather than making predictive statements about how a user community would likely desire to use an entity we would recommend instead providing guidelines on the application of the entity.

RiC-E5 Occupation

We ask for guidelines as to how to assign occupations, particularly with respect to dilettantism and other less formal activities-- at what point is an activity an occupation? Why are statements about success and competency part of the Scope Note, when it is possible that a person could hold an occupation and be perceived by others as being unsuccessful or incompetent in that occupation? It is unlikely that an archivist will be able to assess professional competency. Is there a distinction between training and application of said training? We recommend that EGAD consider revising the definition in order to emphasize the fact that there is evidence that an Occupation exists only if the acquired skill or competency pursued is put in practice. In other words, in the definition, stress the action of exercising rather than the skill or competency as such. A clearer definition may be: "The pursuit, by a person, of a profession, trade, or craft in fulfillment of a Function."

RiC-E6 Position

What definition of a corporate body is being used here? Can families or artists' collectives, for example, be corporate bodies? The scope notes suggest not, but clarification would be appreciated.

RiC-E7 Function

There is a general lack of clarity on the distinction between Function and Activity. We recommend including guidance on where Functions end and Activities begin and vice versa, as well as why EGAD has chosen to maintain these as two separate entities.

RiC-E7 Function and E8 Function (Abstract)

We would like clarification on why there is both Function and Function (Abstract). This seems to us to be a departure from the modularity of the other elements, since Function is defined as Function (Abstract) associated with a context. Why wouldn't RiC-E8 Function (Abstract) have a property that identifies the context to achieve that? We suggest that if both forms of Function are kept that Function (Abstract) be renamed to Function (Generic) or some other other term as "Abstract" has other meanings, both in contexts such as publishing, and in archival description (such as a finding aid abstract). The multiple uses of abstract is imprecise and potentially confusing.

Finally, we note that there is no History Property for Function (Abstract) and are curious to the rationale behind this choice.

RiC-E7 Function and E9 Activity

The difference between RiC-E7 Function and RiC-E9 Activity could use further clarification. The examples for each of these elements appear interchangeable.

RiC-E10 Mandate

We ask for additional clarification on Mandate. Must a Mandate always be external to an Agent? What are the boundaries on the definition of Mandate; for instance, when might it be a motivation? Are personal moral or spiritual values Mandates or does a Mandate need to come from some kind of institutional structure? Does there need to be documentation to show someone is aware of and following a Mandate (i.e. the mission of their institution) or is it enough to document it existed even if a creator wasn't following it? What is an example of a tacit mandate and how would it be documented?

RiC-E11 Documentary Form

In the current model, Documentary Form is an Entity that is principally applicable to the Record, Record Set, and Record Component; we wonder, therefore, if it may be clearer to define Documentary Form as

a Property of those three Entities rather than an entity in and of itself. We would like to see additional rationale or guidance on the application of the Documentary Form entity.

RiC-E12 Date

Comments from our component groups and user communities indicate some significant questions and disagreements around the way that the Date element is modeled and its application within the RiC conceptual model. In particular, there was considerable discussion around whether Date would function most effectively as an entity or as a property of entities. We see good arguments on both sides and strongly suggest that EGAD share their rationale for declaring Date as entity and provide additional guidance on how Date can and should function outside of the context of an Agent, Record, Record Set or Record Component.

We also recommend that RiC include guidance in determining when an archivist should use RiC-E12 Date and when it is more appropriate to use named periods in RiC-E14 Concept/Thing, as named periods have a strong chronological dimension.

While SAA and its members have not formed a full consensus over the application Date, it is clear that there are significant questions around the entity and its application. At the very least, we recommend the addition of meaningful scope notes that provide rationale for making Date an entity and enumerate the various types of chronological information that can or should be represented by Date.

Properties of Entities

While we accept the utility of Data Type generally, we question the appropriateness of including Data Type for individual entities as part of the conceptual model. We believe that the conceptual model should not carry technological barriers to implementation, so including entities that are required to be represented by a URI represents a potentially unacceptable implementation barrier. The Data Types would be more appropriate to supporting documentation providing instructions and best practices for implementing RiC-CM. We are confident that RiC-O will take care of the Data Type appropriately and suggest that RiC-CM does not declare the "Data Type" for the Properties in the conceptual model but leave that work to the ontology.

RiC-P3 Name

We feel that, as currently modeled, the simple RiC-P3 Name property is insufficient for characterizing the range of information related to naming an Entity.

The current definition notes that Name is "*A title or term designating the entity*" seemingly indicating that Name is persistent across time and contexts. Better wording would be "designating an individual instance of a given entity." Additionally, we require significantly more complexity and flexibility in expressing names. In archival description we are frequently required to make any number of statements about a name, including its status (authorized, parallel, variant, etc.), use dates, contexts of use, or the source(s) of the name(s). The current model doesn't address how to handle multiple authorized, parallel, and alternate forms of names. Nor does it give guidance on reflecting changing names over time.

A possible solution would be to handle Name as an entity rather than a property and put it in relation with any of the other RiC entities. This would dramatically increase the possibilities for expressive information about names and allow for more granular representation. This would also more closely parallel the way that FRBR-LRM models the entity "Nomen."

In addition to a more flexible and nuanced application of Name, we would like to see more guidance on formatting names. The RiC-P3 Name Property looks like it can be used for controlled or uncontrolled forms of names, but it doesn't allow for precise indication of the name format. Establishing other more specific Properties for variant forms of names could allow for more granular representation of that information.

RiC-P4 General Note

The scope note indicates that a General Note can only "include information in the relation of the entity to any other RiC entity." But it seems that a General Note might well include information other than that regarding the relation of the entity to any other RiC entity. We suggest clarifying this point.

RiC-P9 Scope and Content

We can see a number of use cases where a scope note would describe things other than "description of relations with Agents, other Records, Functions, Activities, Dates, and Places." There might be cases, for a variety of reasons, whether intellectual or economic, that Agent, Places, Dates, etc. are not identified

individually as entities in the description but are only mentioned in RiC-P9 Scope and Content. In other cases the Agent that creates the description would select to identify these entities individually and relate them to the Record. We recommend that this entity allow for more flexibility of description.

RiC-P11 Language

We question the Language entity combining controlled ISO language codes, free text, and including both the language and the script. We hope that the ontology will provide additional, more specific guidance on properly forming this entity. We have the same questions and concerns with regard to RiC-P34- the Language Information as used by an Agent.

RiC-P20 and RiC-P28 History

We would like to know the rationale behind using a narrative history entity to record the history of the Record or Record Set, rather than using defined events or actions to record actions (with associated dates and agents) that have been taken on the Record (or Record Set).

RiC-P33 Identity Type

Our concerns with the definition and suggested application of Identity Type echo those we expressed about Agent; we question the utility of establishing a singular "true" identity in contrast to "assumed or fictitious identities" when an Agent exhibits multiple identities or identity facets. This is particularly true when the activities recorded in a Record or Record Set apply exclusively or primarily to an "assumed" identity.

Additionally, as we will discuss in more depth in our comments on RiC-P33 Gender, we question whether the archivist has the authority to make these distinctions about others' identities. As currently written this property requires the archivist to determine whether an identity is "real." None of us is in the position to state the "realness" of a particular identity.

If EGAD determines that identifying whether an identity is "given" or "assumed" is still a useful category of description, we would suggest developing the model further to help make this relationship more meaningful and to render accountable the agent responsible for this determination. We would also request further guidance on applying Identity Types. The Identity Type element distinguishes between given and assumed identities. Historical actors change their names frequently for sanctioned or

unsanctioned reasons. Is a name change because of marriage or joining a religious order an "assumed" identity? We recommend additional nuance in the scope and additional examples for this property.

RiC-P36 Gender

SAA has questions about the degree to which it is advisable for RiC to retain RiC-P36 which assigns Gender as a property of a Person. There are both practical and ethical considerations that need to be carefully considered when making statements about others' identities and we strongly encourage EGAD to refer to social science researchers who have written about the dangers of fixing the category of gender.[1]

Our primary concern about the Gender property rests on the authority to assign identity categories to third party Agents; we do not think that an archivist has the authority to fix gender in archival description in ways that may be at odds with an Agent's lived experience. To address this we would recommend adding an additional element to cite the source of information regarding an individual's gender to remove the responsibility of gender assignation from the archivist.

We also want to make sure that the conceptual model explicitly recognizes the complex nature of gender as a fluid identity category that may change over time and be context-dependent and provides models that allow for the description to be as nuanced as necessary. To this end we recommend that Gender be a repeatable element and that EGAD include additional examples in the documentation. While we understand that RiC's examples are illustrative and not prescriptive, the examples of "male; female; unknown" are both reductive and rooted in biological sex rather than the social experience of gender. Guidance on differentiating between the identification of gender versus sex is recommended, as are additional examples that represent a fuller range of possible ways of representing gender such as genderqueer, trans*, nonbinary, cisgender, etc.

---

[1] Labuski, Christine, and Colton Keo-Meier. "The (Mis)Measure of Trans." *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly* 2, no. 1 (February 1, 2015): 13–33. doi:10.1215/23289252-2848868.

Magliozzi, Devon, Aliya Saperstein, and Laurel Westbrook. "Scaling Up Representing Gender Diversity in Survey Research." *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World* 2 (January 1, 2016): 2378023116664352. doi:10.1177/2378023116664352.

Westbrook, Laurel, and Aliya Saperstein. "New Categories Are Not Enough Rethinking the Measurement of Sex and Gender in Social Surveys." *Gender & Society* 29, no. 4 (August 1, 2015): 534–60. doi:10.1177/0891243215584758.

If Gender is retained as a property we strongly suggest making it an uncontrolled element. The definition of Gender in RiC appropriately centers on an individual's self-identification. This is important and appropriate and works to ameliorate the ethical pitfalls of archivists making gender assignations. However, by then making gender a controlled element and providing a vocabulary limiting possible identifications, the proposed use of the property is placed in direct conflict with its definition.

Even with our deep concerns about assigning gender to Agents, we do appreciate the utility of documenting gender identity in archival description. However, we strongly question why gender is called out as the sole Additional Property that can be assigned to a Person and Person Assumed Identity. If we are assigning Gender properties to Agents why not other facets of human identity such as religious affiliation, race, ethnicity, cultural context and sexual orientation?

We recommend that, insofar as EGAD wants to continue to support Identity elements given our feedback, EGAD explore other facets of human identity in RiC and explore them with the same degree of caution and responsibility as gender with regards to the power of the acts of naming and describing.

Relations

4.1 Editor's Note 1

It is recognized that the work of specifying and defining relations among entities within RiC is as of yet incomplete. Some of the future work to be undertaken by EGAD in revising section 4 has been outlined in Editor's Notes under 4.1. We appreciate the transparency of EGAD's intentions for future work in this area of the model.

We suggest that, in addition to the controlled relation types defined in RiC, the model should also allow for the use of external vocabularies to expand the utility of the model.

4.1 Editor's Note 3

An attempt to include the hierarchical relationships between generic relations and more specialized relations may also be useful. Editor's Note 3 addresses the example of the "is associated with" relation, of which all other relation types are a more specific representation. One member noted that this relation type is found about 180 times in the document. Beyond simply addressing redundancy, having the hierarchical relationships defined as subrelations, perhaps, could prove useful.

4.1 Editor's Note 4

Editor's note 4 forewarns that the current, extensive layout of every distinct option may be merged into unique relations in a future draft of the model. We do see the value in exploring the increased utility of a presentation which would be less redundant, by consolidating relation types. Including each relation type's inverse relation as well as the elements which can be related thereby would be critical components of such an approach. Some members feel that the explicit inclusion of the inverse relation type may not be very useful in some instances and instead suggest that instruction could be provided for how to infer inverse relationships.

4.1 Editor's Note 5

We have concerns about the impact of the decision to include both present and past tense versions of relations. As described in Editor's Note 5 of section 4.1, this method allows for the description of both past and current and permanent and non-permanent traits. However, this method would necessitate the monitoring of the changing state of each described relation by the archivist, in order to prevent these relationships from becoming out-of-date and outright incorrect. This is likely to be an unsustainable practice in the real world application of archival description. We recommend removing the option to choose between present and past tense expressions of a relation and instead utilize RiC-CM's alternate suggestion when needed: "The P68 Date property can also be used to clarify when a relation was active."

Final Takeaways

The RiC Conceptual model represents a welcome step forward in thinking about how archivists can describe records and their various uses over time. The relationship-rich model allows an unprecedented level of flexibility in representing the contextual relationships between records and agents.

The methodical overview—broadly encompassing the role and long history of record keeping; the use and reuse of records; the role and history in the permanent evolution of records' description, in conjunction with the evolution of technologies for communicating archival descriptions—provides the necessary background to demonstrate why and how RiC is re-envisioning archival description. This new vision as synthetically expressed in "From Unit of Description to Record and Record Set" and "From

Multilevel Description to Multidimensional Description" and is one that is very welcome and that we very much admire.

We appreciate the tremendous amount of thought and work that has gone into the creation of this conceptual model and wish to register our support of the document. Along with our enthusiastic support of the conceptual model, we have identified three key areas that we think would benefit from further thought and development:

Agents and Identities

The conceptual model does not adequately address the diverse and variant ways that an individual or group can experience identity and identity categories over time. Multiplicities and contextual variations of identities are not handled well across the RiC conceptual model, with name and gender being primary examples of areas where a more nuanced approach to describing identity is needed. The main strength of RiC—understanding records in multiple contexts which may be overlapping, context dependent, and change over time—is not mirrored in RiC's discussion of the multiplicities inherent in the individuals and groups acting on those records.

Call for More Examples

The inclusion of examples within particular entity, property, and relations entries are appreciated. SAA would like to see more examples in general, as well as more variation in the source of examples, allowing for better understanding of the intended application in various scenarios. More explicit examples are needed to help understand entities, properties and relations. This could be an area where contribution from other professionals (such as EAC-F experts) might be beneficial to EGAD.

Transition and Implementation Guidelines

SAA encourages as much transparency as possible from EGAD on decisions that went into this model, perhaps in the form of an annotated version of the standard explaining the reasoning behind it. We also encourage read-only access to the listserv archives for non-subscribers. Moving forward, SAA continues to encourage transparency and community input on discussions, revisions, and maintenance of the standard.

We also request implementation guidelines to assist the international archival community's transition and adoption of the standard, particularly for institutions and tool developers who are not in a position to adopt the ontology but would like to start using the RiC concepts.

Additionally we recommend drafting audience-specific guidelines to assist the other sectors called out as audiences in 1.3 (records managers, libraries, and museums) that address how RiC can interoperate with their domain's standard(s).

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries

SAA Progress Report

July 20, 2017

Prepared by: Amy Schindler, SAA co-chair

BACKGROUND

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for Public Services in Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries is responsible for development of a new standard defining appropriate statistical measures and performance metrics to govern the collection and analysis of statistical data for describing public services provided by archival repositories and special collections libraries. The Standard will describe and quantify users of special collections and archival materials and services and their usage of the same, including reading room paging/circulation, paging/circulation of materials for other purposes, reference interactions, reproduction orders, interlibrary loan requests, and events. If feasible, the Standard may also include recommendations for gathering and analyzing statistics about special collections website visitors and their page views and file downloads. The task force was charged for two years in 2014; a one year extension was requested and granted officially bringing the work of the task force to a close in August 2017.

Officers
- Christian Dupont, Co-Chair, ACRL/RBMS, Boston College
- Amy Schindler, Co-Chair, SAA, University of Nebraska at Omaha

Members
- Moira Fitzgerald (ACRL/RBMS), Yale University
- Thomas Flynn (SAA), Winston-Salem State University
- Emilie Hardmann (ACRL/RBMS), Harvard University
- Brenda McClurkin (SAA), University of Texas at Arlington
- Sarah Polirer (SAA), Cigna Corporation
- Gabriel Swift (ACRL/RBMS), Princeton University
- Bruce Tabb (ACRL/RBMS), University of Oregon
- Elizabeth Yakel (SAA), University of Michigan

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archives Repositories and Special Collections Libraries created by the SAA Council and RBMS Executive Committee met eight times

in-person and via conference call as a group between September 2016 and July 2017. Small groups of task force members met in separate working sessions over a dozen times between September 2016 and March 2017. The task force solicited feedback from attendees at the ALA Midwinter Meeting (January 2017)on Version 2 of the proposed standard. The task force also solicited feedback on the submitted proposed standard and discussed future work by related bodies at the ALA Annual Meeting (June 2017). The final meeting will be held at the SAA Annual Meeting (July 2017).

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

Since September 2016, Task Force members have continued discussions about the proposed standard, gathered feedback on the draft documents, and compiled continuing related initiatives. On January 18, 2017, the Task Force published Version 2 (https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-public-services-metrics/draft-open-for-comment) of the document for comment. The comment period included opportunities for live feedback at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and a webinar hosted by the Nebraska Library Commission's NCompass Live series. The document was published on the SAA and RBMS websites and publicized through many mailing lists. Comments reaching 33 pages were received via emails to the co-chairs and on the SAA and RBMS websites. These comments, along with the discussions of task force members informed revisions.

The Task Force submitted the final version of the proposed standard to the RBMS Executive Committee and SAA Standards Committee on June 9, 2017. The proposed standard without accompanying documents is available on the group's website (https://www2.archivists.org/groups/saa-acrlrbms-joint-task-force-on-public-services-metrics/final-version-of-standard-submitted-).

The Task Force is compiling a list of potential ongoing and future actions related to public services measures and metrics for consideration by SAA and RBMS component groups. Individual members also plan to continue offering workshops and presentations about the group's work and the proposed standard.

NEW ACTIVITIES
- Published Version 2 of the standard for comment on January 18, 2017.
- Solicited comments received in-person during the Task Force's meeting at the ALA Midwinter (11 attendees) and ALA Annual (14 attendees) Meetings and during live broadcast of a webinar hosted by NCompass Live, a production of the Nebraska Library Commission (144 live attendees, 231 views of recording as of July 17, 2017).
- The draft standard was submitted on June 9, 2017 to the RBMS Executive Committee, ACRL Standards Committee, and SAA Standards Committee to begin the review and approval process through both SAA and ACRL/RBMS.
- Publicized submission of draft standard to RBMS and SAA mailing lists and all commenters who provided an email address.

- Developing list of post-task force action items for .

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS
- The matter of the creation of a national survey instrument and data repository has been raised by archivists and special collections librarians in each comment period and the open meetings at ALA and SAA. The Task Force urges SAA and RBMS to continue this successful collaboration to find a solution to meet this need as repositories begin adopting the standard.
- Strong interest remains from Task Force members and archivists and special collections in contact with the Task Force about future related initiatives. Post-task force action items will need to be delegated to appropriate SAA and RBMS component groups. At this time, the Task Force intends to relay potential future and ongoing activities on the SAA side through the Reference, Access, and Outreach Section. Individual members are also interested in continuing to work on some of these initiatives. These initiatives are wide-ranging in size and scope and include: creating a two page document to introduce the standard and serve a marketing function; soliciting and sharing templates for data collection for a variety of tools (spreadsheet, SpringShare LibInsight, Aeon, etc.); soliciting and sharing case studies on implementation and assessment; offering workshops (in-person and online); creating an annual survey; identifying a potential data repository; finding a stable online home for related resources.

To: SAA Standards Committee

From: Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines (TS-AFG)

Re: Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee

Date: July 19, 2017

Below is the annual report for the TS-AFG, 2016-2017

As of 2016 the extension for the continuing work of the TS-AFG had expired and the revised US-Canadian standard was still in draft. Michele Pacifico attended the Standards Committee meeting at the annual meeting on August 2, 2016. After discussion at the Standards Committee meeting it was agreed that the TS-AFG would request SAA Council to extend the TS-AFG to August 2018 and to recruit new members, as some of the original subcommittee members had retired.

The TS-AFG hosted an Open Forum at the 2016 Annual meeting. Michele Pacifico showed a PowerPoint presentation on the subcommittee's work to date and on the challenges of revising the standard to reflect new science and sustainability issues. It drew approximately 25 SAA members and much discussion. At the forum, several SAA members expressed interest in participating in the work of the subcommittee.

On October 11, 2016, the Standards Committee submitted a formal request to the SAA Council to extend the TS-AFG to August 2018 and it was approved.

By May 2017, a new TS-AFG was established with both former and new members. Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted agreed to continue as co-chairs. The new membership is listed below.

Last Name	First Name	Role	Term	Company
Pacifico	Michele	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Pacifico Archival Consulting
Wilsted	Thomas	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Wilsted Consulting
Fritz	Angela	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	University of Notre Dame
Graham	Fiona	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	

Linden	Jeremy	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Image Permanence Institute, Rochester Institute of Technology
Owings	David	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	
Teixeira	Scott	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Hartman-Cox Architects
Trinkaus-Randall	Gregor	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2018	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners
Christian-Lamb	Caitlin	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co-chair)	8/6/2016 - 8/18/2018	Davidson College
Hintz	Carrie	Ex Officio (Standards Committee Co-Chair)	8/22/2015 - 7/29/2017	Emory University
Lyons	Bertram	Council Liaison	8/6/2016 - 8/15/2019	AVPreserve

Emails have been sent to the new TS-AFG to update them on the work of the subcommittee. The entire subcommittee will not be attending the 2017 SAA Annual Meeting so arrangements will be made for a conference call in September to begin work on a new draft of the standards. Michele will meet in person with those subcommittee members in Portland. Once the draft is completed, it will need to be vetted by multiple groups, reviewed by the Standards Committee, and then develop final revisions. We hope to again have a copy editor and someone to format our charts. Michele Pacifico will be meeting with Chris Prom and Teresa Brinati during the 2017 Annual meeting to discuss the publication details.

The TS-AFG will again host an Open Forum at the 2017 Annual meeting on Thursday, July 27 from 12:15 to 1:30. In addition to Michele presenting an overview of the work on the SAA Standard, new TS-AFG member Jeremy Linden will present on IPI's research on collections preservation environments. We hope it is as successful as our previous forums. Michele will again use the forum to solicit interest in the guidelines and the subcommittee. The open forum announcement that was sent out to SAA lists reads:

Join us for an open forum to update colleagues on the developing joint US/Canadian facility standard. Michele Pacifico, co-chair of the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines

2

The subcommittee currently has no funding for the revised publication. We used the remaining funds leftover from our 2007 Spacesaver grant to fund the subcommittee's 2013 meeting. To date our attempts at additional grants have not been successful.

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

3

CATEGORY/ TYPE	NAME	DEVELOPED BY	YEAR OF SAA ENDORSEMENT (E) [External Standard Other (EXO) added to website in 2012]	SAA LINK	EXTERNAL LINK	QUESTIONS/ NOTES	ACTIONS TO TAKE	JL RECOMMENDATION	MP RECOMMENDATION
Administration and Management									
Guidelines	ACRL/RBMS Guidelines Regarding Security and Theft in Special Collections	RBMS Security Committee	Council Approved Endorsed May 2012	http://www2.archivists.committee/acrl/bms-guidelines-regarding-security-and-theft-in-special-collections	https://rbms. info/standards/index.shtml Attachment Link works to PDF (MP)	Endorsed by SAA		Approve	Approve
Best Practices	ISO 16363:2012–Space Data and Information Transfer Systems–Audit and Certification of Trustworthy Digital Repositories	International Organization for Standardization	Council Approved, Endorsed Aug. 6, 2012	http://www2.archivists.committee/iso-163632012-space-data-and-information-transfer-systems-audit-and-certification-of-trustworthy-dig	http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=56510	Standard must be purchased. Also links to Minnesota Historical report on the subject.		Review	Review all ISO standards
Arrangement and Description									
Technical Standards	Australian Government Locator Service Metadata Standard (AGLS)	Maintained by the National Archives of Australia	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/australian-government-locator-service-metadata-standard-agls	http://www.agls.gov.au	Updated 2010		Review	Review
Technical Standards	Dublin Core Metadata Element Set (DCMES)	Dublin Core Metadata Initiative	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/dublin-core-metadata-element-set-dcmes	http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dces/	1/23/17, 15 core metadata elements approved, NISO TC46,ISO/FDIS 15836-1		Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	eXtensible Markup Language (XML)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) XML Core Working Group.	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/extensible-markup-language-xml	https://www.w3.org/XML/		Update external link to: https://www.w3.org/standards/techs/xml#w3c_all	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	eXtensible Stylesheet Language Transformations (XSLT)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) XSLT Working Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/extensible-stylesheet-language-transformations-xslt	https://www.w3.org/TR/xslt		Update external link to: https://www.w3.org/standards/techs/xslt#w3c_all	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/metadata-encoding-and-transmission-standard-mets	http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets/			Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/metadata-object-description-schema-mods	http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/	Current and updated		Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	MPEG Multimedia Content Description Interface (MPEG-7)	Moving Picture Experts Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/mpeg-multimedia-content-description-interface-mpeg-7	http://mpeg.chiariglione.org/standards/mpeg-7/mpeg-7.htm		Update external link to: http://mpeg.chiariglione.org/standards/mpeg-7	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Open Archival Information System (OAIS)	Council of the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-archival-information-system-oais	https://public.ccsds.org/pubs/650x0m2.pdf	2012 publication - current?	Check for most up-to-date link	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Open Archives Initiative Object Re-use and Exchange (OAI-ORE)	OAI-ORE Executive	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-archives-initiative-object-re-use-and-exchange-oai-ore	http://www.openarchives.org/ore/	current?		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Open Digital Rights Language (ODRL)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) ODRL Community Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-digital-rights-language-odrl	https://www.w3.org/community/odrl/			Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Preservation Metadata Implementation Strategies (PREMIS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/preservation-metadata-implementation-strategies-premis	http://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/	Updated versions, 2016		Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	Public Broadcasting Core Metadata Dictionary (PB Core)	Corporation for Public Broadcasting	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/public-broadcasting-core-metadata-dictionary-pb-core	http://pbcore.org			Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	Qualified Dublin Core (QDC)	Dublin Core Metadata Initiative	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/qualified-dublin-core-qdc	http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/	Updated 2014, complements DC	Check for most up-to-date link	Review	Review
Technical Standards	Visual Resources Association Core Categories (VRA Core)	VRA Core Oversight Committee	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/visual-resources-association-core-categories-vra-core	http://core.vraweb.org			Approve	Approve
Conventions and/or Rules	Anglo-American Cataloging Rules, 2nd edition, Revised (AACR2)	American Library Association	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/anglo-american-cataloging-rules-2nd-edition-revised-aacr2	http://www.aacr2.org	Replace with RDA?		Review	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	Cataloging Cultural Objects: A Guide to Describing Cultural Works and Their Images (CCO)	Visual Resources Association	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/cataloging-cultural-objects-a-guide-to-describing-cultural-works-and-their-images-cco	http://cco.vrafoundation.org	Appears to be current.		Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	Categories for the Description of Works of Art (CDWA)	J. Paul Getty Trust and College Art Association	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/categories-for-the-description-of-works-of-art-cdwa	http://www.getty.edu/research/publications/electronic_publications/cdwa/index.html			Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD)	International Federation of Library Associations	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/functional-requirements-for-authority-data-frad	http://www.ifla.org/publications/ifla-series-on-bibliographic-control-34	2009 publication		Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)	International Federation of Library Associations	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records-frbr	http://www.ifla.org/publications/functional-requirements-for-bibliographic-records	1998 publication		Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data (FRSAD)	International Federation of Library Associations	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/functional-requirements-for-subject-authority-data-frsad	http://www.ifla.org/node/1297	2010		Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families [ISAAR(CPF)]	International Council on Archives	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/international-standard-archival-authority-record-for-corporate-bodies-persons-and-families-isaarcpf	[Broken link] http://www.ica.org/en/10203/standards/isaar-cpf-international-standard-archival-authority-record-for-corporate-bodies-persons-and-families-2nd-edition.html		Find link	Review	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	International Standard Archival Description (General) [ISAD(G)]	International Council on Archives	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/international-standard-archival-description-general-isadg	[Broken link] http://www.ica.org/en/10203/standards/isaar-cpf-international-standard-archival-authority-record-for-corporate-bodies-persons-and-families-2nd-edition.html	Link takes you to ISAD (G) and other ICA resources.	Find link	Review	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD)	International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) Cataloguing Section and ISBD Review Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/international-standard-bibliographic-description-isbd	http://www.ifla.org/publications/international-standard-bibliographic-description	2011 publication		Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	International Standard for Describing Functions (ISDF)	International Council on Archives	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/international-standard-for-describing-functions-isdf			Find link	Review	Review

Category	Standard	Organization		archivists.org link	External link	Notes	Notes 2	Status 1	Status 2
Conventions and/or Rules	Natural Collections Descriptions (NCD)	Biodiversity Information Standards, also known as the Taxonomic Databases Working Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/natural-collections-descriptions-ncd	https://github.com/tdwg/ncd	Modified 2009- current?		Approve	Modified 2009 - current?
Conventions and/or Rules	Resource Description and Access (RDA)	American Library Association	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/resource-description-and-access-rda	http://www.rdatoolkit.org	Requires purchase of subscription		Approve	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	Rules for Archival Description (RAD)	Canadian Committee on Archival Description of the Canadian Council of Archives with the National Archives of Canada	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/rules-for-archival-description-rad	http://www.cdncouncilarchives.ca/archdesrules.html		Check for most up-to-date link. Is this current?	Review	Review
Conventions and/or Rules	SPECTRUM	Collections Trust/Collections Link and Arts Council England	EXo	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/spectrum	[Broken link]	Will be updated in March 2017	Update link to: http://collectionstrust.org.uk/spectrum/	Review	Approve
Taxonomies	Art & Architecture Thesaurus (AAT)	Getty Research Institute	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/art-architecture-thesaurus-aat	http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/aat/index.html			Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Book Industry Standards and Communications (BISAC)	Book Industry Study Group, Inc.	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/book-industry-standards-and-communications-bisac	[Broken link] http://bisg.org/404.asp?404:http://www.bisg.org:8400/what-we-do-0-136-bisac-subject-headings-list-major-subjects.php		Check for most up-to-date link	Review	Review
Taxonomies	Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC)	OCLC	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/dewey-decimal-classification-ddc	http://www.oclc.org/dewey.html			Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	GEOnet Names Server (GNS/GNIS)	National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/geonet-names-server-gnsgnis	[Broken link]: http://earth-info.nga.mil/gns/html/	Current and updated	Update link to: http://geonames.nga.mil/gns/html/	Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Getty Thesaurus of Geographic Names (TGN)	Getty Research Institute	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/getty-thesaurus-of-geographic-names-tgn	http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/tgn/index.html	Current and updated		Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Library of Congress Classification (LCC)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/library-of-congress-classification-lcc	http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/lcc.html			Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Library of Congress Subject Headings (LCSH)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/library-of-congress-subject-headings-lcsh	http://authorities.loc.gov		Update link to: http://id.loc.gov	Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	MARC Code List for Relators	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/marc-code-list-for-relators	http://id.loc.gov/vocabulary/relators.html	2014		Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)	US National Library of Medicine	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/medical-subject-headings-mesh	https://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/	Last reviewed 2017		Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	NASA Thesaurus	NASA Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/nasa-thesaurus	https://www.sti.nasa.gov/sti-tools/#.WIkQaBjMxxg	Updated 2012		Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Sears List of Subject Headings	H. W. Wilson Company/EBSCO Publishing	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/sears-list-of-subject-headings	https://www.ebscohost.com/academic/sears-list-of-subject-headings	2014. Requires purchase, $165.00		Review	Review
Taxonomies	The International Plant Names Index (IPNI)	the Index Kewensis (IK), the Gray Card Index (GCI) and the Australian Plant Names Index (APNI).	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/the-international-plant-names-index-ipni	http://www.ipni.org	Updated 2015		Review	Approve
Taxonomies	Thesaurus for Graphic Materials (TGM)	Library of Congress, Prints and Photographs Division.	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/thesaurus-for-graphic-materials-tgm	http://www.loc.gov/pictures/collection/tgm/			Approve	Approve
Taxonomies	Union List of Artist Names (ULAN)	Getty Research Institute	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/union-list-of-artist-names-ulan	http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/vocabularies/ulan/index.html			Approve	Approve
Digitization									
Technical Standards	ANSI/NISO Z39.88 - The OpenURL Framework for Context-Sensitive Services (OpenURL)	OCLC	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/ansiniso-z3988-the-openurl-framework-for-context-sensitive-services-openurl	[Requires login]: http://www.niso.org/login?back=http%3a%2f%2fwww.niso.org%2fapps%2fgroup%2fworkgroup%2fd2fd2f%2fdownload.php%2f8636%2fThe%20OpenURL%20Framework%20for%20Context-Sensitive%20Services.pdf	Approved 2005 ANSI	MP is SAA rep to NISO and can open this document.	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Australian Government Locator Service Metadata Standard (AGLS)	National Archives of Australia	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/australian-government-locator-service-metadata-standard-agls	http://www.agls.gov.au	2010		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Dublin Core Metadata Element Set (DCMES)	Dublin Core Metadata Initiative	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/dublin-core-metadata-element-set-dcmes	http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dces/			Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	eXtensible Markup Language (XML)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) XML Core Working Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/extensible-markup-language-xml	https://www.w3.org/XML/	Website Updated 2016		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	eXtensible Stylesheet Language Transformations (XSLT)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) XSLT Working Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/extensible-stylesheet-language-transformations-xslt	https://www.w3.org/TR/xslt	Has this been updated since 1999?	Update external link to: https://www.w3.org/standards/techs/xslt#w3c_all	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Metadata Encoding and Transmission Standard (METS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/metadata-encoding-and-transmission-standard-mets	http://www.loc.gov/standards/mets/	Updated website 2016		Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/metadata-object-description-schema-mods	http://www.loc.gov/standards/mods/	MODS schema updated 2015		Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	MPEG Multimedia Content Description Interface (MPEG-7)	Moving Picture Experts Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/mpeg-multimedia-content-description-interface-mpeg-7	http://mpeg.chiariglione.org/standards/mpeg-7/mpeg-7.htm		Update external link to: http://mpeg.chiariglione.org/standards/mpeg-7	Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Open Archival Information System (OAIS)	Council of the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-archival-information-system-oais	https://public.ccsds.org/pubs/650x0m2.pdf	Check for most up-to-date link		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Open Archives Initiative Object Re-use and Exchange (OAI-ORE)	OAI-ORE Executive	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-archives-initiative-object-re-use-and-exchange-oai-ore	http://www.openarchives.org/ore/	Current and updated		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Open Archives Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH)	OAI-ORE Executive	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-archives-initiative-protocol-for-metadata-harvesting-oai-pmh	http://www.openarchives.org/pmh/			Approve	Review

Category	Name	Organization		Link (archivists.org)	Link (external)	Notes 1	Notes 2	Status 1	Status 2
Technical Standards	Open Digital Rights Language (ODRL)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) ODRL Community Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/open-digital-rights-language-odrl	https://www.w3.org/community/odrl/	Reports dated 2012 to 2015		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Preservation Metadata Implementation Strategies (PREMIS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/preservation-metadata-implementation-strategies-premis	http://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/			Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	Public Broadcasting Core Metadata Dictionary (PB Core)	Corporation for Public Broadcasting	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/public-broadcasting-core-metadata-dictionary-pb-core	http://pbcore.org			Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	Qualified Dublin Core (QDC)	Dublin Core Metadata Initiative	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/qualified-dublin-core-qdc	http://www.dublincore.org/documents/dcmi-terms/	Still need to list in addition to DC?	Check for most up-to-date link	Review	Review
Technical Standards	Text Encoding Initiative (TEI)	Text Encoding Initiative Consortium	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/text-encoding-initiative-tei	http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml	Current publications		Approve	Approve
Technical Standards	Visual Resources Association Core Categories (VRA Core)	VRA Core Oversight Committee	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/visual-resources-association-core-categories-vra-core	http://core.vraweb.org			Approve	Review
Guidelines	Principles to Guide Vendor/Publisher Relations in Large-Scale Digitization Projects of Special Collections Materials	Association of Research Libraries	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/intellectual-property-working-group/principles-to-guide-vendorpublisher-relations-in-large-scale-digitization-projects-of	[Old link]: http://www.arl.org/publications-resources/search-publications/search/summary		Check for most up-to-date link	Approve	Review
Best Practices	ISO 16363:2012--Space Data and Information Transfer Systems--Audit and Certification of Trustworthy Digital Repositories	International Organization for Standardization	Council Approved, Endorsed Aug. 6, 2012	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/iso-163632012-space-data-and-information-transfer-systems-audit-and-certification-of-trustworthy-dig	http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=56510	Standard must be purchased		Approve	Review all ISO
Best Practices	Well-intentioned Practice for Putting Digitized Collections of Unpublished Materials Online (W-iP)	OCLC Research	Council Approved, Endorsed Aug. 22, 2011	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/intellectual-property-working-group/well-intentioned-practice-for-putting-digitized-collections-of-unpublished-materials-	http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/rights/support.html	Revised 2010		Approve	Review
Ethics, Values, and Legal Affairs									
Guidelines	ACRL/RBMS Guidelines Regarding Security and Theft in Special Collections	RBMS Security Committee	Council approved, Endorsed May 2012	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/acrlrbms-guidelines-regarding-security-and-theft-in-special-collections	[Broken link]: https://rbms.info/standards/index.shtml Attachment link works (MP)	Update link		Approve	Approve
Guidelines	Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for Academic and Special Libraries	Association of Research Libraries	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/intellectual-property-working-group/code-of-best-practices-in-fair-use-for-academic-and-special-libraries	http://www.arl.org/focus-areas/copyright-ip/fair-use/code-of-best-practices#.WlgDVxJMxq	Published 2012		Approve	Approve
Guidelines	Principles to Guide Vendor/Publisher Relations in Large-Scale Digitization Projects of Special Collections Materials	Association of Research Libraries	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/intellectual-property-working-group/principles-to-guide-vendorpublisher-relations-in-large-scale-digitization-projects-of	[Old link]: http://www.arl.org/publications-resources/search-publications/search/summary	Published in 2010. Outdated? More recent guidance?		Approve	Review
Guidelines	Statement on the Fair Use of Images for Teaching, Research and Study	Visual Resources Association	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/intellectual-property-working-group/statement-on-the-fair-use-of-images-for-teaching-research-and-study	http://vraweb.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/01/VRA_FairUse_Statement_Pages_Links.pdf	Check for most up-to-date link		Approve	Approve
Best Practices	Well-intentioned Practice for Putting Digitized Collections of Unpublished Materials Online (W-iP)	OCLC Research	Council Approved, Endorsed Aug. 22, 2011	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/intellectual-property-working-group/well-intentioned-practice-for-putting-digitized-collections-of-unpublished-materials-	http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/rights/support.html	Endorsed 2011. Is there more recent guidance?		Approve	Review
Preservation									
Technical Standards	eXtensible Markup Language (XML)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) XML Core Working Group.	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/extensible-markup-language-xml	https://www.w3.org/XML/	Update external link to: https://www.w3.org/standards/techs/xml#w3c_all		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	eXtensible Stylesheet Language Transformations (XSLT)	World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) XSLT Working Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/extensible-stylesheet-language-transformations-xslt	https://www.w3.org/TR/xslt	Update external link to: https://www.w3.org/standards/techs/xslt#w3c_all		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	MPEG Multimedia Content Description Interface (MPEG-7)	Moving Picture Experts Group	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/mpeg-multimedia-content-description-interface-mpeg-7	http://mpeg.chiariglione.org/standards/mpeg-7/mpeg-7.htm	Update external link to: http://mpeg.chiariglione.org/standards/mpeg-7		Approve	Review
Technical Standards	Preservation Metadata Implementation Strategies (PREMIS)	Library of Congress	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/preservation-metadata-implementation-strategies-premis	http://www.loc.gov/standards/premis/			Approve	Approve
Best Practices	ISO 16363:2012--Space Data and Information Transfer Systems--Audit and Certification of Trustworthy Digital Repositories	International Organization for Standardization	Council Approved, Endorsed Aug. 6, 2012	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/iso-163632012-space-data-and-information-transfer-systems-audit-and-certification-of-trustworthy-dig	http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_catalogue/catalogue_tc/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=56510	Standard must be purchased		Approve	Review all ISO
Records and Information Management									
Technical Standards	Australian Government Locator Service Metadata Standard (AGLS)	Maintained by the National Archives of Australia	EXO	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/australian-government-locator-service-metadata-standard-agls	http://www.agls.gov.au	2010		Approve	Review
Reference and Access									
Guidelines	ACRL/RBMS Guidelines Regarding Security and Theft in Special Collections	RBMS Security Committee	Council Approved Endorsed May 2012	http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/acrlrbms-guidelines-regarding-security-and-theft-in-special-collections	https://rbms.info/standards/index.shtml	Endorsed		Approve	Approve

TS-EAS Report, Standards Committee
July 25, 2017

Membership 2016-2017
Katherine Wisser, co-chair
Karin Bredenberg, co-chair
Anila Angjeli
Erica Boudreau
Lina Bountouri
Florence Clavaud
Mark Custer
Wim van Dongen
Regine Heberlein
Noah Huffman
Silke Jagodzinski
Joost van Koutrik
Aaron Rubenstein
Michael Rush
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard
William Stockting
Ruth Tillman
Adrian Turner
Stefano Vitali

Subcommittee overview

2016-2017 was the first year of TS-EAS. The subcommittee is charged with the development and maintenance of the encoding standards in support of archival descriptive practices. In order to tackle this far-reaching charge, the subcommittee used the annual meeting in 2016 to devise a strategy and develop priorities. The technical subcommittee devised a series of teams to deal with the various standards in the charge. Seven teams were formed at that meeting and volunteers from the committee took lead:

- EAD Team (Rush)
- EAC-CPF Team (Jagodzinski)
- EAC-F Team (van Koutrik)
- Schema Team (Custer)
- Documentation Team (Tillman)
- Collaboration with other standards Team (Heberlein)
- RiC Team (Angjeli)

Additionally, a secretary (Boudreau) was recruited from the membership to work with the co-chairs on subcommittee documentation and meetings. Members then signed up to work on

various teams. Each team also had a co-chair member to support any needs the team might have.

Accomplishments

Below are listed the accomplishments reported by teams:

- Submitted TS-EAS feedback on draft of Records in Context (RiC) in 2016.
- Established GitHub repositories for EAD3 and EAC-CPF standards maintenance and bug reporting.
- EAD Team resolved feature requests and bug reports submitted through the GitHub repository
- Completed an implementation survey for EAD3
- Collected feedback and comments on open and outstanding EAC-CPF issues and uploaded those in GitHub
- Significant research for the justification of EAC-F, based on use cases and literature
- Preparing a release of EAD3 1.1 for community testing
- Website revisions completed at the Library of Congress and Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin (by Glenn Gardner and Gerhard Müller respectively)
- Issue webpage created and available in GitHub

Annual Meeting objectives

Each team has considered the priorities established during the 2016 meeting, accomplishments of the year, initiatives currently underway, and priorities for the next year to be discussed in the annual meeting 2017. Additionally, the subcommittee will devote some of the meeting time to conduct a self-reflection on the team structure and strategies for being more productive in the next year. Decision points that will be covered at the meeting:

- Revision of EAC-CPF
- EAG as a part of the TS-EAS charge
- Approach for EAC-F and development of examples to assist in determining that approach; development of tag library aligned with ISDF within the protocols of existing tag libraries.
- Proposal for schema and tag library maintenance strategies