

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
November 20, 2020
Virtual Meeting**

**Annual Report: Standards Committee
and Technical Subcommittees, Representatives**
(Prepared by Rebecca Wiederhold)

Membership

Rebecca Wiederhold (2016-2018; Co-Chair, 2018-2020)
Lindsay Wittwer (2016-2019; Co-Chair, 2019-2021)
Keith Chevalier (2017-2020)
Kira Dietz (2017-2020)
Elizabeth Dunham (2017-2020)
Jennifer Coggins (2018-2021)
Eric Sonnenberg (2018-2021)
Wendy Pflug (2019-2022)
Emily Toder (2019-2022)
Meg Tuomala, Council Liaison (2019-2022)

Ex Officio:

John Bence (Immediate past Co-Chair)
Dan Michelson (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Sue Luftschein (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Mark Custer (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Dara Baker (TS-GRD Chair)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Bethany Anderson (Rep to ICA-EGAD)
Michelle Ganz (Rep to ALA/CC:DA and MAC)
Sharry Watson (Rep from CCA CCAD)
Noah Lasley (Rep to NISO)

Incoming Members:

Kira Dietz (Co-Chair, 2020-2022)
Faith Charlton (2020-2023)
Rory Grennan (2020-2023)
Gina Strack (2020-2023)
Andrea McMillan (Early Career Member, 2020-2021)

COMPLETED PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

Governance

Standards Committee met via phone conference on monthly basis throughout the year and held a meeting at the Annual Conference via Zoom. See appendix A for Standards Committee meeting minutes for 2019-2020.

Technical Subcommittees and Task Forces

TS-GRD's goals for the subcommittee's work were impacted by the ramifications of the COVID-19 pandemic, but they have been working toward sending out a survey to assess community use of the *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* as currently established and plan to undertake an update of their microsite. See appendix B for their report.

TS-DACS' top priority for 2019-2020 was the new proposed Rights Statement for Archival Description, which had previously been submitted to Council in May 2019 and tabled pending revisions to the packet. TS-DACS sought additional comment on the change, revised the packet, and received unanimous support for the proposal from Standards Committee. It was submitted to Council for vote in December 2019 (Item IV.B, Council meeting minutes, December 3-5, 2019) and was rejected due to insufficient feedback from smaller institutions. TS-DACS submitted concerns to Council regarding the decision in March 2020. As a follow-up, a sub-group of TS-DACS, Council representation, and Standards co-chair met in April, resulting in an agreement to seek further community feedback. A survey was then sent to the community requesting comment on whether or not the new elements should be added as required. The survey closed on September 1 and will be acted upon in the upcoming year. Other minor changes are also pending submission to Standards Committee. Other significant work of the committee this year included the launch of a new web version of *DACS*, submission of comments to ICA-EGAD on RiC-O, updates for *DACS*-related education courses, updates to the microsite, and strengthened relations with the Description Section. See appendix C for full report.

TS-EAS met as an entire group three times in the year with subteams meeting monthly. EAC-CPF is currently undergoing a major revision with expected submission in 2021. The call for comments is expected to be sent out by the end of 2020. Utilizing an early-career member has been mutually beneficial. Other accomplishments for the year include release of a patch for EAD3, version 1.1.1, discussion of other minor changes to EAD3, preparation for an upcoming major revision of EAD3 including the harmonization of EAD and EAC-CPF, and the establishment of a new communications strategy, with a webinar in April. See appendix D for full report.

TS-AFG continued work updating the 2009 Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers with the aim of making it a joint US-Canada standard. Sections of the guidelines are in various states of progress and throughout Spring 2020 subcommittee members were in consultation with key government and expert organizations to help interpret new regulations and provide guidance to align the revised guidelines with allied standards. In August 2019 the group's security expert, Gregor Trinkaus-

Randall, passed away. Also, the terms of all subcommittee members expired in August 2020. See appendix E for full report.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force to revise Statement on Access posted *Guidelines on Access to Research Materials in Archives and Special Collections Libraries* received final approval from ACRL Standards Committee and the ACRL Board in January 2020. Their submission packet was received by Standards Committee in February and discussed in the monthly conference call. The vote to recommend approval was unanimous and the Task Force's co-chair worked with Standards co-chairs over the next few months to gather the remaining few pieces to complete the submission packet. An agenda item was submitted to Council in August 2020. See appendix F for the Joint Task Force's final report of work.

External representatives

See appendix G for report from the Representative to the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access and the Library of Congress MARC Advisory Committee. The external representative to ARMA seat remains vacant. See appendix H for report from the representative to ICA-EGAD and appendix I for report from the representative to NISO. A discussion was held during Standards annual meeting in August regarding SAA's participation in NISO. The current rep indicated that pertinent items rarely came up. General consensus of the group discussion was that if participation costs are not extensive we want to be in the loop for when relevant standards are up for discussion/vote in NISO.

Liaisons

The committee continues to use liaisons to SAA component groups for such purposes as calls for comments on draft standards, staying connected to groups that maintain standards, and bringing questions to co-chairs' attention.

Endorsements and comments

Standards Committee participated in the following external standards reviews this year:

Standards had received a submission packet from John Bewley and Elizabeth Surles, members of a working group from the Music Library Association containing an Appendix to the *Guidelines for Archival Description of Notated Music*, which was the result of significant collaborative work with members of TS-DACS. Standards members reviewed the packet and voted during the Annual meeting in 2019, unanimously in favor of endorsement. Standards submitted an agenda item for Council's December meeting, where the proposal was passed (Item II.C, Council meeting minutes, December 3-5, 2019).

Standards development and revision

Describing Archives: A Content Standard

- Website of new web version of *DACS* launched in January 2020.
- Sent a change request to Council to add rights statements for archival description to *DACS*. Item was rejected, due to insufficient comments from small institutions. (Item

IV.B, Council meeting minutes, December 3-5, 2019).

- Follow-up conversations between Council and TS-DACS took place between February and April 2020. TS-DACS is preparing for a revised submission, pending receipt and analysis of community feedback from a survey seeking input on the required status of the new element.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force to Revise Statement on Access: Guidelines on Access to Research Materials in Archives and Special Collections Libraries (Revision)

- Final draft of the guidelines submitted to RBMS Executive Committee in September 2019
- Approval from RBMS Executive Committee received in October 2019
- Submission of guidelines to ACRL Standards Committee, approval received in January 2020
- Approval of ACRL Board of Directors on January 24, 2020
- Submission packet provided to Standards committee in February 2020
- Discussion and vote at Standards conference call on February 14, 2020. Recommending approval.
- Final pieces of submission packet revised over the next few months with COVID-19 delays
- Agenda item submitted to Council in August 2020

Museum Archives Guidelines (Revision)

- On February 14, 2020, Standards co-chairs received a proposal for the review of an existing SAA standard from the Museum Archives Section's Standards and Best Practices Working Group, requesting approval to revise the Museum Archives Guidelines, originally endorsed by SAA Council in 2003.
- Standards Committee reviewed the proposal on February 20, 2020 and voted to approve the proposal but asked the working group to expand upon their plans for community feedback to reach a wider audience.
- Working group submitted revised plans for community feedback in March 2020
- Drafting first full version of the revised guidelines Summer 2020 (work on revised guidelines began in 2018 and were informed of standards procedures fall 2019.)
- Agenda item for Council to approve proposal forthcoming, delayed by COVID-19.

EAC-CPF (Revision)

- Since August 2019, EAC-CPF subteam of TS-EAS has met monthly to work on outstanding issues from the second phase of the two-tier EAC-CPF revision strategy.
- Face-to-face meetings held 9-12 March 2020 in Berlin.
- Second face-to-face was converted to virtual meetings over five days during SAA Annual.
- Target completion of EAC-CPF revision is the end of 2020. Community call for comments will follow.
- Release of new version is anticipated in 2021.

ONGOING PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

Continuous revision procedures

Discussions throughout the fall between the Standards Committee co-chairs and the co-chairs of TS-DACS and TS-EAS, as well as at the October 2019 Standards Committee meeting determined that the technical subcommittees have developed distinct workflows to address ongoing revision for their particular standards and have worked with Publications and Education to facilitate coordination. The only thing left to address was the major and minor changes. Standards co-chair and former liaison to TS-EAS Lindsay Wittwer and committee member and liaison to TS-DACS Kira Dietz drafted revisions to section V.E. Ongoing Revision of Standards in the Procedures for Review and Approval of an SAA-Developed Standard to incorporate the agreed upon definitions of major and minor changes, include examples of each type of change and detail distinct workflows to handle each change in November 2019. The revised section was put out for three rounds of comments and revisions to all the members of Standards, TS-DACS and TS-EAS (November 2019, December 2019, January 2020). The draft was finalized in February 2020. Preparing the submission packet and agenda item for Council was delayed due to COVID-19, it will be submitted in September 2020.

Standards Portal Review and Updates

Maintenance of the Standards Portal has been an ongoing concern for Standards Committee for several years due to the complexity of the review process and multiple identified issues related to the inclusion of links to external standards. A systematic review of the Portal began in October under the leadership of committee member Kira Dietz. Multiple discussions were had in the monthly conference call with review done between meetings. Members of the Records Management and Disabilities Sections also expressed interest in helping to broaden the Standards Portal's coverage of standards touching their professional areas. The initiative was essentially put on hold in the Spring due to COVID disruptions, but an Early-Career Member was requested for the 2020-2021 term in order to prioritize the Committee's review of the Portal, recommendations for improvements and development of a maintenance plan over the next year.

INITIATIVES ASSOCIATED WITH THE 2020–2022 STRATEGIC PLAN

Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists

Revision of the *Guidelines on Access to Research Materials in Archives and Special Collections Libraries* in collaboration with allied professionals at ACRL/RBMS with national reach strengthens the ability of those who manage and use archival material to better provide better access to the historical record (1.3).

The ongoing effort to add rights statements elements to the *DACS* standard will help promote the value of archives to other communities through opening archival descriptions for easier research and reuse and making more transparent our cultural heritage (1.1).

Goal 2: Enhancing Professional Growth

Assistance with the development of a supplement to *DACS* for the description of notated

music provides archivists with best practices for use in their work (2.2). All standards are added to SAA's standards portal, which provides members easy access to SAA standards and endorsements (2.2). Coordinated review and ongoing revision of the EAC-CPF standard ensures that we keep pace with technological change (2.3). Maintenance of EAS standards online and the recent publishing of a web version of *DACS* delivers professional tools in an accessible manner (2.3).

Goal 3: Advancing the Field

The recent partnerships between SAA and RBMS on joint task forces demonstrates leadership within the field in the development of new standards in the areas of reference and outreach, collection management, and education (3.1, 3.3). Standards' and its sub-committees' participation in comment periods for international standards development, including ICA's Records in Contexts products, also demonstrates a commitment to keeping pace with advances in the field.

Inclusion of early career archivists in Standards Committee and technical sub-committee membership supports the development of leadership skills (3.4).

Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs

Through the development and review of SAA standards and the endorsement process for external standards, member participation is a key focus of Standards' oversight, as we make sure appropriate effort has been made to hear all reasonable opinions and that these are considered and addressed before submitting standards to Council for consideration. Discussion between Standards co-chairs and our Council liaison this year has resulted in a working draft of a supplemental guideline for the consultation process (4.1, 4.2).

QUESTIONS AND CONCERNS FOR COUNCIL ATTENTION

The service terms for Standards' external rep to NISO and the rep to ALA/Description & Access and MAC both ended September 1, 2020 and we are not aware of new appointments to replace these two ex officio members of the committee. The Rep from CCA CCAD has also been inactive for a number of years. The committee simply wishes to remind the Council of this in case it is considered a priority to fill these roles.

SAA Standards Committee 2019-2020 Meeting Minutes

September 2019 Standards Committee Meeting (call)

September 19, 2019

9AM PT/10AM MT/11AM CT/12PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Meg Tuomala (Council liaison) |
| - Lindsay Wittwer | - Eric Sonnenberg |
| - Kira Dietz | - Elizabeth Dunham |
| - Wendy Pflug | - Keith Chevalier (TS-AFG) |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Emily Toder |
| - Sue Luftschein (TS-DACS) | - Jess Purkis (TS-EAS) |
| - Jennifer Coggins | - Noah Lasley (NISO rep) |

1. Annual Report
 - a. Due 1st week of October
 - b. 3 of 4 subcommittees have submitted their reports (TS-DACS confirmed they would submit their report ASAP)
 - c. Final reports needed from some external reps
2. Joint Task Force – Holdings Counts and Metrics
 - a. Approved at Council’s August meeting
 - b. In Standards Portal (post meeting update)
3. Joint Task Force – Statement on Access
 - a. Waiting for RBMS – meeting 9/24/19 – No changes expected
 - b. JTF slated to complete work by end of September (but can be extended if needed)
 - c. Standards – email vote or on Oct. call
4. TS-EAS
 - a. 3 new members
 - b. Setting up October meeting for all TS-EAS (individual teams will meet before)
 - c. Work w/ phase II of EAC-CPF revision is on-going and continuous on from the meeting they had in Austin (full day meeting)
5. TS-DACS
 - a. Comments on Records in Context – Ontology (RiC-O)
 - b. Versioning project for DACS complete – merged old/current versions of DACS
 - c. New required element was turned down in May and trying to get feedback to resubmit
 - d. Publications
 - i. Principles revised in May and wanted to get online in August
 - ii. Github workflow to produce single document
 - iii. Talked w/ SAA webmaster to get online—have a plan for moving forward
 - iv. Established working group to develop workflow/plan for getting DACS

online and print publication

6. TS-AFG
 - a. Gregor Trinkaus-Randall who was writing the security section passed away in August, no one has filled that seat yet
 - b. Michelle Pacifico is in charge of drafting/editing the guide
7. NISO
 - a. No updates
8. GitHub feedback for Meg
 - a. Meg's main questions
 - i. How is it going?
 - ii. Pros/Cons
 - iii. How it works with continuous revision
 - b. Feedback from group during call - Meg has more notes/need to ask TS-EAS for their feedback
 - i. Vastly superior tracking changes
 - ii. Can directly propose changes in Github
 - iii. Challenge for those who are unfamiliar with it – one barrier to use
9. Standards Housekeeping
 - a. Liaison assignments – move to email
 - b. Goals for year
 - i. Clean up Standards Portal
 - ii. Finally wrap up Major/Minor revisions
 1. Kira/Lindsay work with Meg
 2. Clarify definitions with TSs
 - c. Determine meeting time slot for monthly call

October 2019 Standards Committee Meeting (call)

October 17, 2019

9AM PT/10AM MT/11AM CT/12PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Eric Sonnenberg |
| - Kira Dietz | - Elizabeth Dunham |
| - Wendy Pflug | - Keith Chevalier |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Emily Toder |
| - Mark Custer (TS-EAS) | |

1. Update on status of JTF-Statement on Access
 - a. Materials go through RBMS/ACRL process first
 - b. Been approved by RBMS, going to ACRL
 - c. Then it comes to us for review
2. Report-outs from TS's and ex officios
 - a. TS-DACS call next Monday

- i. Rights statement pull request is coming to Standards this week; should be ready for Council
 - ii. Two small changes to crosswalks have been pending for awhile, not sure whether they need to go to Council. If so, they can be grouped with rights statements—Becca will follow-up with Lindsay/Meg
 - b. TS-EAS
 - i. One change coming to EAD3 schema: two minor bug fixes that don't change the documentation or tag libraries; should happen this calendar year
 - ii. Subgroup focus on outreach and maybe educational activities, which will include more communication with other groups
- 3. Major/minor progress
 - a. Info pending. Kira and Lindsay have a call next week to strategize
 - b. We're open to more helpers if anyone is interested
- 4. Liaison assignment discussion
 - a. We've filled in some of the vacancies
 - b. We'll try and get some info about how frequently some groups meet. Eric is taking on TS-EAS. Kira and Eric are open to Education Committee groups
- 5. Standards Portal maintenance planning
 - a. We found the old spreadsheet and list of possible issues
 - b. Notes on what's indicated
 - i. Some linked standards are behind a paywall
 - ii. Links to external standards that are out of date
 - iii. Lots of broken links—hopefully we can create a schedule for checking on that
 - iv. Out of date materials, like AACR2
 - v. Is the list of endorse things we don't control missing a lot? How do we decide what to put on it?
 - vi. Can we tackle this piece by piece between meetings? Lets move sections to Google Docs where committee members can comment and discuss issues at meetings

November 2019 Standards Committee Meeting (call)

November 21, 2019

9AM PT/10AM MT/11AM CT/12PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS) |
| - Lindsay Wittwer | - Eric Sonnenberg |
| - Kira Dietz | - Jennifer Coggins |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Michelle Ganz |
| - Sue Luftschein (TS-DACS) | - Elizabeth Dunham |
| - Mark Custer (TS-EAS) | - Emily Toder |

1. Update on standards in approval/endorsement process

- a. MLA DACS supplement – Council will vote Dec. mtg
 - b. DACS rights statements – Council will vote Dec. mtg
 - c. JTF-Statement on Access – still waiting for ACRL Standards/Board approval. Then we will vote and prepare an agenda item for Council
2. OAIS Reference Model revisions
- a. Undergoes revision every 5 years
 - b. Open for comment in the near future when it goes from CCSDS technical review to ISO for international review. We should keep an eye out to comment/participate
3. Report-outs from TS's and ex officios
- a. TS-DACS
 - i. No meeting since last Standards call
 - ii. Will make an update of all changes to DACS and work with publications going forward if things are approved at Dec. 5 meeting
 - iii. After that, will make recommendations on need of support from SAA on publishing standard to the web & making future updates
 - b. TS-EAS
 - i. No meeting since last Standards call
 - ii. Patch update to EAD3 requested. Patch is ready to go, but no confirmation on permission to roll it out (major/minor issue)
 - iii. Lindsay has been talking to Meg about how we can move forward until the formal process is in place, but we're waiting on some responses
 - iv. Four new members added to their group
 - v. Changing focus of one subgroup, hopefully documentation can be more automated and that group can focus more on outreach
 - c. TS-GRD
 - i. Emily has reached out and committee members are doing a book reading and working on a survey to send out to SAA members about usage of the guidelines since their adoption
 - ii. Quarterly calls
4. Major/minor status update
- a. Lindsay has drafted a revision of the “Ongoing review of the standard” (V.E) section of the standards review and approval protocol
 - b. Kira and Lindsay working through this draft
 - c. Major changes go through existing workflow; hopefully a short, one-page form for these minor changes
 - d. Council needs to approve protocol revisions, so we'll get a draft out to the committee as soon as possible
 - i. Draft to Standards and TSs
 - ii. Proposal to Council for a vote on changing protocol (may be able to happen via email)
5. Standards Portal review discussion, starting with sections 1-3
- a. Email leaders list about last updates to their standards so we can link to correct “last updated dates” or other relevant info for SAA developed standards (Kira)
 - b. For external standards, how much involvement do we want to have in keeping track of those? (for example, ISO-Michelle will look into this as ISO rep). Kira will check on her access to the microsite to see if she can start updating the links that we know

- need to be fixed.
- c. For joint & orphan standards, the recommendation to SAA has been to put some group in charge of those. Should there be an SAA group assigned to keep an eye on them, even if they aren't responsible to maintain? As we're reviewing sections going forward, we'll make sure to ID these items to send to Council
 - i. Kira will email Michelle and Emily to figure out a plan
 - d. Is it appropriate for this committee to make a recommendation on review cycles for maintenance? The protocols have guidance on this, but wouldn't cover external or joint standards
 - e. Review sections 4-6 & mark up Google docs for next meeting
 - f. Do some additional review of existing guidelines that note in-progress updates (i.e. <https://www2.archivists.org/groups/technical-subcommittee-on-archival-facilities-guidelines/archival-and-special-collections-facilities-guidelines-for-archi>) to see if we can update pages. Assigned to Kira

January 2020 Standards Committee Meeting (call)

January 16, 2020

8AM PT/9AM MT/10AM CT/11PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Eric Sonnenberg |
| - Lindsay Wittwer | - Jennifer Coggins |
| - Kira Dietz | - Meg Tuomala (Council liaison) |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Michelle Ganz |
| - Mark Custer (TS-EAS) | - Elizabeth Dunham |
| - Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS) | - Emily Toder |
| - Keith Chevalier | |

1. Update on standards in approval/endorsement process
 - a. EAD patch release – interim action by Council, approved
 - b. MLA DACS supplement – approved
 - c. DACS rights statements – did not pass Council. Recommended single-level optimum vs. required element. Have had conversation with Meg and plan to meet with a subset of Council to get further guidance/clarity on path forward
 - d. RiC-CM still beta version
 - e. JTF-Statement on Access – still waiting for ACRL Standards/Board approval. Then we will vote and prepare an agenda item for Council
2. Report-outs from TS's and ex officios
 - a. TS-DACS
 - i. Dan's working group has expanded on the rights statement, still scheduling Feb. 5th. Next Council meeting will be virtual on March 6th and will want an update
 - ii. Will have a call soon. No announcements
 - iii. DACS asking for input on the online hosted DACS. Hasn't been updated

since GitHub move. Anything more than minor textual changes difficult. GitHub not super edit friendly. Greg Wiedeman temporarily hosting. Developed SAA github.io, immediate push to the site. New versioning works. Given up on SAA support for online publishing of the standard. Want to launch. Meg says some feedback, mostly positive. Where hosted? Sustainability issue. Up to TS co-chairs to make recommendation to V.P. for appointments, someone who can take on the hosting/publication. Mark says they are doing something similar. Asks about accessibility (contrast may be an issue for visual impairment). Look into Wave. Maybe a start. Also consider screen reader issues. Want up-to-date version. Work with Matt Black on transition from old version. Dan will keep us posted on the launch, late January and will follow-up with ADA question.

- b. TS-EAS
 - i. Will be meeting on Feb. 4th—will start discussion about RiC-CM & RiC-O
 - ii. Next meeting in February. Did release patch 1.1.1. LC has already updated to use it
 - c. TS-AFG
 - i. Nothing new to report
 - d. JTF-Access
 - i. Co-chair has reached out to RBMS about final Board approval. No response yet.
 - e. TS-GRD
 - i. Not much to report. Preparing survey still
3. Major/minor status update
- a. Lindsay has documented movement on changes, provided comments and actions, kept in examples. From here, Lindsay will get Meg and Felicia to preview it and provide comments, then submit packet.
 - b. Some see adding optional changes as “major” being a stumbling block. It’s backwards compatible. Also feel examples don’t match the definitions. Lindsay cautions we don’t want to take control from Council, just streamline processes. More simplification in the future possible. May need to make change to language of definition.
 - c. Suggestion of possibly compiling all minor changes that have been submitted quarterly or annually for submission to Council as a batch.
 - d. Guidelines need to be flexible
 - e. Form will help keep track of individual changes. Request to allow just GitHub tracking to perform this function. But we need a signal to Standards that changes have been proposed and are ready for consideration. Perhaps a link to GitHub in the form is a good compromise. Let’s move forward with this method. Try it out. Revisit later if changes needed.
 - f. Major/minor definition. Lindsay will try to send to everyone then reach out to all of Standards for approval. Then to Meg/Felicia, followed by agenda item and packet prepared for Council.
4. Standards Portal
- a. Kira will reach out to Michelle and Emily to get started. Next steps include email to

leader list

February 2020 Standards Committee Meeting (call)

February 20, 2020

8AM PT/9AM MT/10AM CT/11PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Jennifer Coggins |
| - Lindsay Wittwer | - Michelle Ganz |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Emily Toder |
| - Sue Luftschein (TS-DACS) | - Wendy Pflug |
| - Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS) | - Noah Lasley (NISO rep) |
| - Eric Sonnenberg | - Meg Tuomala (Council liaison) |

1. From our Council rep: reminder to vote in 2020 election and encourage our colleagues and constituencies; 15-20% of membership tends to vote
2. Joint Task Force-Statement on Access
 - a. Michelle (co-chair RBMS-SAA joint task force) reported on submission packet and ACRL/RBMS approval process
 - b. Tone more like guidelines. Changed to *ACRL-RBMS/SAA Guidelines on Access to Research Materials in Archives and Special Collections Libraries*.
 - c. Vote: all in favor of recommending approval
3. Report-outs from TS's and ex officios
 - a. TS-DACS
 - i. Launched new website, well-received. Making sure links are updated
 - ii. Working group and Standards liaison are drafting a list of concerns about rejection of Rights Statement proposal by Council. Preparing for call with subset of Council members and Standards' Council liaison to determine how to move forward. That document will be completed soon
 - b. TS-EAS
 - i. Work continuing on major revision of EAC-CPF
 - ii. Would like to participate in a joint response (with Standards and TS-DACS) to upcoming release of RiC v0.2
 1. Not enough manpower to replicate last time's separate evaluations
 2. Council is fine with joint response
 - c. NISO
 - i. Little activity. Provided comment on International Records Management
 - d. TS-GRD
 - i. Group will be meeting in March and will provide an update at our next meeting
4. Major/minor status update
 - a. Do all changes have to go through community feedback?
 - b. Supportive of the document.
 - c. Difficulty of sending minor through even to Standards, will discuss in Feb. TS-EAS

- meeting. Changes and discussion already tracked in GitHub
- d. Prefer minor go just to Standards for quick response and documentation of acknowledgement
- e. Push for more leeway on patches in the future
- 5. Procedures discussion/Museum Archives Guidelines proposal review
 - a. On February 14, 2020 Standards co-chairs received a proposal for the review of an existing SAA standard from the Museum Archives Section, Standards and Best Practices Working Group, requesting approval to revise the Museum Archives Guidelines, originally endorsed by SAA Council in 2003. Will follow up on external consultation plan, then we will vote. Need to publish that they are doing a revision
- 6. Standards Portal review update

April 2020 Standards Committee Meeting (call)

April 30, 2020

10AM PT/11AM MT/12PM CT/1PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Eric Sonnenberg |
| - Lindsay Wittwer | - Jennifer Coggins |
| - Kira Dietz | - Elizabeth Dunham |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Wendy Pflug |
| - Sue Luftschein (TS-DACS) | - Meg Tuomala (Council liaison) |
| - Mark Custer (TS-EAS) | - Michelle Ganz |

1. Standards updates
 - a. Major/minor—notes and documentation all pulled together, incorporating TS feedback. Almost ready to move forward
 - b. Museum archives guidelines—Lindsay working on agenda item for Council approval of undertaking update to the standard
 - c. Standards Portal (Kira)
 - i. working on getting edit access
 - ii. some updating can begin right away
 - iii. drafting email to leaders
 - iv. requesting early career member so this can be focused on next year
2. Report-outs from TS's and ex officios
 - a. JTF-Access
 - i. Finalizing documentation for packet submission to Council
 - b. TS-EAS
 - i. Hosted an early career member this year and requested again next year
 - ii. Met in person March 9-12; major revision on track; expected submission of EAC-CPF in 2021
 - iii. Desire for combining RiC response efforts with Standards
 - c. TS-DACS
 - i. Agrees with joining forces on RiC response. DACS responded to previous

- version. Will want to look for RiC's response to earlier comments
- ii. Rights Statements discussion with subset of Council last week re: change requests. Takeaway: not acceptable amount of feedback from small institutions. Soliciting additional feedback for more clear support of proposal

June 2020 Standards Committee Meeting (Zoom call)

June 18, 2020
8AM PT/9AM MT/10AM CT/11PM ET

On call:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| - Becca Wiederhold | - Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS) |
| - Lindsay Wittwer | - Eric Sonnenberg |
| - Kira Dietz | - Jennifer Coggins |
| - Dan Michelson (TS-DACS) | - Michelle Ganz |
| - Sue Luftschein (TS-DACS) | - Wendy Pflug |
| - Mark Custer (TS-EAS) | - Elizabeth Dunham |

1. Updates

- a. Draft annual reports due to Lindsay by mid-July; liaisons to reach out to those not in attendance
- b. Scheduling Annual Standards meeting
 - i. Expect 2 hours via Zoom
 - ii. Will send out doodle poll for week before or after general Annual meetings
 - iii. Discussion topics
 - 1. TS and liaison group reports
 - 2. Standards Portal update
 - 3. Meg's working draft of community feedback guidelines
 - 4. Standards projects/goals for next year
 - 5. Other ideas?
- c. RiC-CM
 - i. v.0.2 expected sometime in the next few months
 - ii. Standards to lead a collaborative response
 - iii. One or two members each from EAS, DACS, & Standards. Let Becca know if you want to volunteer for this assignment
- d. Standards Portal
 - i. Records Management Section wants to help us add to Portal in their area
 - ii. Disabilities Section too

2. Report-outs from TS's and ex officios

- a. JTF-Access
 - i. No more group work; awaiting approval by Council
- b. TS-DACS
 - i. Drafting survey regarding rights statements. Expect to send out by Annual. Discussing ideas for publicizing/educating community about the desired change

- c. TS-EAS
 - d. TS-AFG
 - i. Work on the publication is ongoing
3. Major/minor status update
- a. Lindsay has been working on the continuous revision timeline and documentation
 - b. Asking how DACS and Publications are resolving revisions to standard
 - c. Will share with Kira, Becca, Meg to prepare for sending to Council
 - d. Expects resolution in the coming year
4. Early career member
- a. Joining committee this year
 - b. Standards Portal likely their special project

Standards Committee Annual Meeting Minutes

Friday, August 14th, 2020

1-3 PM CDT

Virtual meeting via Zoom

In attendance: Rebecca Wiederhold, Lindsay Wittwer, Kira Dietz, Meg Tuomala, Jennifer Coggins, Dara Baker, Dan Michelson, Matthew Gorham, Emily Toder, Gina Strack, Eric Sonnenberg, Michelle Ganz, Bethany Anderson, Michael Conyers, Faith Charlton, Noah Lasley, Melissa Bowling, Mark Custer, Wendy Pflug, Andrea McMillan, Rory Grennan, Karin Bredenberg, Sue Luftschein

Welcome and call to order

Introductions and new members

- New members: Gina Strack, Faith Charlton, Rory Grennan

Recognition of outgoing members

- Outgoing members: Keith Chevalier and Elizabeth Dunham

Standards Committee update (Becca Wiederhold, Lindsay Wittwer, Kira Dietz)

- **JTF-Access (Becca)**
 - Was worked on from 2017-2019, joint effort to update a statement on access to materials in special collections (last updated in 2009). Packet ready to go to Meg and Felicia and will be on its way to Council soon.
- **Museum Archives Guidelines (Lindsay)**
 - Museum Archives section revision of standards in the Standards Portal not updated since the 2000s. Lindsay has materials to send to Meg and Felicia to bring to Council.
- **Continuous revision/major/minor (Lindsay)**
 - Delayed by COVID, but Lindsay will be sending materials to Meg and Felicia next week. Goal to resolve by the end of the year.
- **Standards Portal (Kira)**
 - Kira has taken on this project and is gathering a team of volunteers. Will involve reaching out to groups that manage standards to find out status of standards. Will

also develop a sustainable plan for maintaining the portal going forward.

Council liaison update (Meg Tuomala)

- This year's virtual annual meeting had the highest registration numbers ever. Please complete the feedback survey if you attended the virtual conference. Feedback is anonymized and shared with the Program Committee. We will probably have a virtual meeting next year and retain some elements of the virtual meeting long-term.
- Council will be meeting more regularly this year (every other month) and will be meeting virtually. More opportunities to submit agenda items - if you have agenda items, send them at any time.
- There will be more listening sessions like the ones on Archives and Black Lives and on the budget. They plan to do one on membership and on the sustainability of component groups/sections. Expecting to have a listening session every other month (months when Council is not meeting). Feedback on listening sessions welcome!
- A few weeks ago we were looped in on a conversation about the development of a set of standards for accessioning. It's in the planning phases right now - they just received grant funding to develop the standard. Anticipating a 2-3 year time frame.

Constituent group & external representative updates

- **TS-DACS**

Dan M.:

- The new, user-friendly web version of DACS has launched. Positive feedback on its usability so far. Have been working with SAA Publications on creating the PDF and published print version of DACS. SAA Publications takes on creating the PDF and publication.

Matthew G.:

- Distributed a questionnaire about the proposed rights statement element as a means of gathering feedback. 101 responses in 2 weeks - much more than past calls for comments. 89% in favor of the required element. 64% academic institution respondents. Slight majority of respondents are from small institutions but it's almost an even split. Majority are lone arrangers or on staffs of 2-10 people. Please respond to the survey if you haven't already.

Dan M.:

- Draft Ontology for Records in Context: submitted comments.
- DACS part I course
- Twitter campaign in support of the new DACS principles - new user-friendly version of DACS has helped.
- **TS-EAS**
 - Mark C.: Patch release of EAD3 in December
 - Just wrapped up 11 meetings over the last few weeks
 - Call for comments on major revision of EAC-CPF coming up, hoping to have it approved in 2021.
- **TS-GRD**
 - Dara B.: 4 members on the committee but not as active this year given many

things going on for committee members. Have set up a meeting for end of this month to go over where they think they should be. Looking at their areas of focus - use of the guidelines, updating the microsite to include literature, an edited volume.

- **TS-AFG**
 - No report yet - will be shared when it is submitted.
- **NISO**
 - Noah L: Not much activity on SAA's behalf this year. This fall draft technical review for which SAA provided feedback, voted on standards.
- **ICA-EGAD**

Bethany A.:

- Became EGAD rep in January. Three products in progress: conceptual model for records in context, ontology, application guidelines. Version .1 of ontology was released on Github in January along with a converter. Version .2 of the conceptual model was made available as a preview at the same time.
- The group is currently working on releasing .2 of both the conceptual model and the ontology this fall. Open comment through 2021. Application guidelines haven't been worked on as much, as they depend on established ontology and conceptual model.

Becca W.:

- Have talked about pooling resources with TS-DACS, TS-EAS to develop feedback on the conceptual model.

- **ALA Description & Access/MARC**

Michelle G.:

- There was a lot of confusion and she wasn't added to their listservs for 6 months. Little to report. She is recommending not sending a representative to this group. There wasn't much relevant to archivists. She is rolling off the committee and does not believe someone else is replacing her.

SAA participation in NISO recommendation (Becca Wiederhold)

Becca W.:

- Is SAA's participation in NISO worth continuing?

Noah L.:

- Has been rep to NISO for two years. Inherited from Michelle Pacifico. Described as monitoring emails from NISO for standards that are pertinent to SAA and up for a vote. In 2018-2019 there were some, but in 2019-2020 there were very few that pertained to SAA's interests in any way. Those that do pertain, that he has voted on, he doesn't think SAA was the deciding vote.

Meg T:

- Council is looking critically at every line item in the budget given financial impact of the pandemic. We wouldn't want to be in a position of being unable to vote on something that's important to us and the membership cost isn't very high. Two relevant votes a year is pretty good - inclined to stick with it.

Michelle G.:

- Are we still involved with ISO? Was a rep to ISO and there was little activity.

General consensus: stick with NISO so we can vote when relevant standards come up or as archivists potentially propose new standards in NISO. Will explore allied organizations, potential joint memberships.

Community feedback guidelines discussion (Meg Tuomala)

TS-DACS indicated it would be useful to have guidelines for sending new standards out for member review and comment. This is a primary thing that Council looks at when reviewing a new standard and the review process it has gone through. Meant to complement the procedures managed by the SAA Standards Committee (which are also under revision). There's room for the procedures to be developed more. Meg drafted recommendations, which she shared before the meeting. We want to get as broad and diverse a sample in our member feedback as possible - types of institutions, types of institutions, etc.

Dan M.: Does this apply to major changes, annual reviews of standards?

Meg T.: Could apply to both, but some minor changes would not require member comment (e.g., bugs). Only necessary when the change is substantial.

Sue L.: We'll have to go back to the issue of major/minor changes to clarify when this is necessary.

Lindsay W.: Should be applied to major changes, and then we can determine if it needs to be adapted for minor changes.

Matthew G.: Was there any discussion around the format or mechanism by which feedback is solicited? (For example, endorsement letters, surveys, Github comments.)

Meg T.: This came up in a recent Council meeting but it wasn't considered in this context. Would be a good point to add. There's concern about documents or standards that receive little feedback. Sounds like the Google Form approach works well.

Dan M.: We get a better response rate when we ask the yes or no question "do you approve," but we get more useful feedback when we ask for comments.

Meg T.: Both types of feedback are necessary and useful - makes sense to pursue both.

Dan M.: Difficulty of making changes at the necessary pace, sustainability of procedures.

Karin B.: As we'll be collecting information we need to keep GDPR in mind and make sure we're compliant.

Lindsay W.: These guidelines are also useful for regular updates/revisions of standards, and as a template for groups needing to solicit feedback.

Meg T.: Important to get input and buy-in not only from expert users but novice users who will be using the standards. It's also helpful for spreading the word about new standards on the

way.

Matthew G: Can combine multiple methods of soliciting feedback - there can be comments in GitHub, responses via form, etc.

Meg T.: (In response to question about what is meant by “experts and super-users”) Can mean those we expect to use the standards heavily, people both in and outside archives with relevant expertise.

Concern about need for education around using Github if members will be expected to provide feedback via Github. Meg can suggest an education session on Github.

Kira D.: Dara asked in the chat “is there a desire to ensure organization diversity for comments; do we know what kind of institutions participate and how many are new commenters?” We would have to look back at past submissions, we would have to figure out a mechanism for determining this.

Dara: We aren’t commenting on behalf of our institutions necessarily, but we may respond differently based on the type/size of institution we work for.

Meg T.: Some feedback sent by a group on behalf of an institution, some feedback submitted by individuals. Ultimate goal: taking feedback into consideration, will go to Council and may eventually be posted to the Standards portal as a tool.

Becca W.: Could be good to include suggestions for multiple methods of outreach, sharing the call for comment.

Plan for new year (Lindsay Wittwer, Kira Dietz)

Lindsay W.:

- Kira and Lindsay will reach out to new members to have an introductory meeting next week.
- Plan to wrap up the major/minor revisions question this year and will begin review of the rest of the committee’s procedures to ensure it reflects current practices.

Kira D.:

- Plan to update the Standards portal (and perhaps develop a standards toolkit)
- Will work on appointing new liaisons
- Will send out a recurring meeting invitation
- Hope to review the committee’s digital records, records management practices

Lindsay W.: Will be in touch with everyone about deadline for annual report.

**Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on Guidelines for
Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD)**
August 2020

Membership

Dara Baker, TS-GRD chair
Dainan Skeem
Danielle Emerling
Elizabeth Russell

Activities

In Fall 2019, TS-GRD Chair Dara Baker relayed three concurrent projects of the technical subcommittee: sending out a survey to assess needs perceived with respect to updating the reappraisal/deaccessioning guidelines; reading member Laura Uglean Jackson's recently published *Reappraisal and Deaccessioning in Archives and Special Collections*; and updating their microsite. As of August 2020, these same activities are still underway, as all were impacted by the ramifications of the Covid-19 pandemic. TS-GRD was not able to meet during the 2020 SAA conference.

Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS)* July 2020

The Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS)* remains active and productive 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 2019-June 2020.

2019 Annual Meeting

TS-DACS held its annual business meeting on Friday, August 2 in Austin, TX. The subcommittee discussed accomplishments and setbacks from the previous year and reviewed upcoming projects, including an updated *DACS* publication; existing pull requests; next steps for the principles; and a discussion of how to encourage implementation of *DACS* and excitement about the new principles.

Change Requests

The approval of the revised *DACS* principles in early 2019 allowed TS-DACS to focus on the proposed Rights Statement for Archival Description¹ as the top priority change for 2019-2020. This change request had also been submitted to SAA Council in early 2019, but was rejected primarily due to problems with the submission packet.

After reaching out to commenters who had expressed concern about the original proposal and receiving additional support, TS-DACS submitted a revised submission packet to the Standards Committee in September 2019. Despite unanimous approval by the Standards Committee, SAA Council rejected the proposal in December 2019 on the grounds that sufficient comments were not received from small institutions.

During a TS-DACS conference call later in December, subcommittee members expressed concerns with Council's decision and the implications it would have on future development of the standard to Council Liaison Meg Tuomala, who recommended that the group compile the concerns and submit them to Council. This summary was sent to Council in March 2020 and was followed by an April meeting between the TS-DACS working group on the rights statement and several members of Council, during which all present agreed to conduct another call for feedback in order to ensure comments from institutions of all sizes. Council also agreed to develop a standard for community feedback that can be utilized by all committees seeking

¹ Also including a rights statement for archival authority records, the work on this change request began in 2017 when Alston Cobourn and Patrick Galligan submitted a proposal to TS-DACS to create a License for Archival Description section in Chapter 8. Based on community feedback and its own analysis, the subcommittee worked with the submitters to create the final January 2019 text.

such feedback. The subcommittee members put together a new call for comments, which will be distributed shortly after the annual meeting.

Despite the need to focus on the Rights Statement for Archival Description, additional progress was made on multiple smaller pull requests and issues, but were held back from submission to the Standards Committee pending their completion of revisions to the process for handling minor changes.

Publications

The most significant accomplishment of the year was the completion of a new process for publishing user friendly web, PDF, and print versions of the standard. After considering multiple options and consulting with SAA staff and our SAA Council liaison, the subcommittee decided to create a new website for the standard.

The January launch of the new [web version](#) brought the widely used version of the standard in alignment with the official text. Created by subcommittee member Greg Wiedeman, the new site pulls text directly from the GitHub repository, which eliminates the potential for error inherent in manual updates.

TS-DACS also worked with SAA Publications Editor Chris Prom (succeeded by Stacie Williams) to clarify that the subcommittee is responsible for maintaining the ability to generate structured text from GitHub on demand, while SAA Publications is responsible for applying the formatting necessary to create PDF and print versions of the standard.

Publicity & Outreach

We launched a Twitter campaign to share each principle with a statement of its importance following the creation of a Web-accessible copy of the new principles.

Companion Standards

After careful review of the draft ontology for Records in Contexts (RIC-O) from the International Council on Archives (ICA) Experts' Group on Archival Description (EGAD), TS-DACS submitted [public comments](#) to EGAD in September 2019. While recognizing the many strengths of the ontology, the comments expressed serious concerns with the development process, particularly the lack of communication and engagement with the international archival community.

Education

As part of our ongoing education efforts, members of the subcommittee began an analysis of the existing DACS Part II videos and identified learning objectives in advance of a new independent Part II course in development by SAA. The education working group also updated the documentation for the Part I course and updated the instructor guide. Ex officio chair Adrien Hilton and former chair Maureen Callahan proposed to SAA Education a workshop on the new DACS principles, based on workshops they have held for the New England Archivists

and the Society of California Archivists.

Microsite updates

The TS-DACS microsite has been updated to reflect the latest version of the standard, both on the standard Github version and the new web version.

Collaboration with Description Section

The subcommittee strengthened connections with the Description Section by including the section chair and designated liaison as *ex officio* members of TS-DACS and the co-chairs of TS-DACS as *ex officio* members of the Description Section Steering Committee.

Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS) July 24, 2020

Membership

2019-2020

- Karin Bredenberg, co-chair
- Mark Custer, co-chair
- Anila Angjeli
- Kerstin Arnold
- Lina Bountouri
- Florence Clavaud
- Wim van Dongen
- Alexander Duryee
- Jeremy Floyd
- Noah Huffman
- Silke Jagodzinski
- Clinton Johnson
- Joost van Koutrik
- Corey Nimer
- Jessica Purkis, early-career member
- Caitlin Rizzo
- Aaron Rubenstein
- Ailie Smith
- William Stocking
- Adrian Turner

Glenn Gardner and Gerhard Müller continue to serve as ex officio members and maintain the websites for EAD and EAC-CPF at the Library of Congress and the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin respectively. Both also participate in one of the TS-EAS subteams.

We also had three liaison positions this year: Michele Combs served as our EAS Section Liaison; Caitlin Wells served as our Collection Management Section Liaison and Eric Sonnenberg was our Standards Committee liaison.

For the upcoming year, we have four reappointments: Karin will continue to serve as our international co-chair, and Cory, Alex, and Ailie have also been reappointed. Additionally, we will be welcoming three new members to TS-EAS: Iris Lee, Anna McCormick, and Sara Schliep (early-career member).

General Meeting Schedule

TS-EAS continues to meet at SAA and to meet virtually as an entire group three times per year. Additionally, each of the working subteams sets their own meeting schedule throughout the year, with most meeting once a month.

Annual Meeting in Austin, 2019

TS-EAS scheduled two full-day meetings at SAA last year. The first was focused on the EAC-CPF major revision process, and the second day was devoted to additional TS-EAS

business.

The EAC-CPF team met on August 1 to discuss four major areas of the EAC revision: names, dates, identifiers, and assertion descriptions. Detailed minutes from that meeting are here https://github.com/SAA-SDT/TS-EAS-subteam-notes/blob/master/eaccpf-subteam/meeting-minutes/2019/f2f-meeting/20190801_EAC-CPF_minutes.pdf

TS-EAS met on August 2. In addition to continuing discussions about the Major/Minor revision process from the Standards Committee, as well as a Shared Schema approach to managing both EAD and EAC-CPF, the group approved two new significant changes for EAS: 1) The Documentation team submitted a proposal to change the mission of that group, which was accepted. Moving forward, this team will also focus on communication and training opportunities, and their new name is the Documentation and Outreach team. 2) Based on the report supported by the Functions team, the committee agreed to pursue adopting a new XML schema for Functions.

Highlights since Austin

- The committee participated in SAA's early-career member program this year. Jessica (Jess) Purkis assisted the co-chairs in planning meetings, posting minutes to GitHub, and much more. Jess also participated in the Schema subteam and contributed to the development of the Design Principles document. Given how well everything went, TS-EAS has decided to continue participating in this program, and we are thankful for SAA for setting it up.
- Continued to formalize how the committee works. With Jess's help, TS-EAS set up a shared directory in Google Drive for teams to share working documents. Jess also tested a workflow to convert Google Documents to Markdown, so that minutes taken in Drive could be submitted to GitHub once those notes were reviewed and accepted. TS-EAS is also documenting those processes, as well as other aspects of how the committee operates, in the TS-EAS handbook, which is published on GitHub: <https://github.com/SAA-SDT/TS-EAS-subteam-notes/wiki>
- Released a patch for EAD3, version 1.1.1, which corrected a bug that was present in the W3C XSD version of the schema since the original release of EAD3 1.0. Colleagues from the Library of Congress reported the issue in August, and after TS-EAS was able to get approval from Council to release the patch, we updated GitHub and the Library of Congress EAD3 website with that important fix in December.
- The EAC-CPF team, led by Jagodzinski, made significant progress in the EAC-CPF major revision. A very successful face-to-face meeting was organized and held in Berlin in early March, which took place over three and half days in two locations. Thanks to the decisions made during that meeting, we remain on schedule to release a new version of EAC next year, with a call for comments on track to go out before the end of 2020.
- The EAD team (formerly led by Huffman and currently led by Arnold) also continued to make a lot of progress throughout the year. In addition to approving and publicizing the

changes for EAD3 1.1.1, the group also discussed other bug reports and change requests. After careful consideration and community discussions, the team opted not to pursue a minor revision of EAD3 this year. Instead, their efforts have continued to focus on harmonizing EAD and EAC-CPF, while preparing for an EAD major revision process now that EAD3 is nearing 5 years old.

- Last, the newly expanded Documentation and Outreach team (led by Nimer and Turner) adapted very quickly to their new charge. In addition to maintaining TS-EAS's presence on the SAA microsite, this group also established a new communications strategy, which kicked off with a webinar, hosted in April. They also reached out to allied SAA Sections about TS-EAS's work.

Schedule for Annual Meeting in “Chicago”, 2020

- EAC-CPF revisions. Five separate meetings have been scheduled from July 27 - 31.
- TS-EAS also has five separate meetings, scheduled from August 3-7.
- Co-chair Mark Custer will participate in three different section meetings to provide an update regarding the work in TS EAS.
- Last, we will hold an open meeting on August 13 to provide an overview of our discussions and decisions from the previous two weeks.

Annual Report: Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines (TS-AFG) September 7, 2020

As of August 18, 2020, the extension for the continuing work of the TS-AFG had expired and the revised US-Canadian standard is still in partial draft. Michele Pacifico will discuss next steps with SAA and the Standard Committee later in September. Below is the Subcommittee Roster that has expired.

Last Name	First Name	Role	Term	Company
Pacifico	Michele	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Pacifico Archival Consulting
Wilsted	Thomas	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Wilsted Consulting
Fritz	Angela	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	University of Notre Dame
Graham	Fiona	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Canadian Council of Archives
Linden	Jeremy	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Linden Preservation Services, Inc.
Owings	David	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Columbus State University
Teixeira	Scott	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Hartman-Cox Architects
Trinkaus- Randall	Gregor	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners **deceased, 8/16/19

Summary of Standards Progress

Work continues on completing an updated draft of the 2009 Guidelines: *Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers*. Sections are in various state of progress and their status is detailed below. In addition to developing the new information, we are reformatting the publication for easier reading.

Updates to the 2009 standard are complex as the TS-AFG works to include new research and changes in related facility and preservation standards, and to evaluate contradictory guidance for archives and special collections. Pacifico has been working to communicate with NARA, Library Archives Canada, National Park Service, Library of Congress, the Image Permanence Institute, preservation and museum specialists, and others to obtain their interpretations of the new research and regulations. We are also working to make sure that SAA's guidelines do not

contradict any other national or international standard for archives.

The TS-AFG has also discussed various facility issues by email on topics including building insulation, air filtration, air exchanges, lighting, fire protection, finishes, and sustainability. Our respective facility projects continue to introduce new issues or changing requirements that we must consider for the archival facilities standard.

We don't have a date for publishing the next edition but we are working toward getting a complete draft to send out for peer review. Pacifico has been compiling a list of interested reviewers, which includes experts outside the SAA.

Next steps are to meet and discuss revisions to Section (or chapter) titles, new additions, and moving forward to complete all drafts.

Revised Standard - Section Updates:

- Introduction: requires first draft
- 1. Building Site: first draft by Scott; first editing by Michele; 2nd editing by all subcommittee complete; additional edits by David O.; final edits by Michele; ready for peer review.
- 2. Building Construction: first draft by Scott; first editing by Michele; needs to go to subcommittee for 2nd review.
- 3. Archival Environments: first draft by Fiona; first edit by Tom and Michele; further revisions by Fiona and Jeremy; needs updates to Air Filtration Table to reflect 2019 edition of ASHRAE chapter and 2nd editing.
- 4. Fire Protection: first draft by Michele; needed additional research; former author Nick Artim has agreed to review before it is sent to subcommittee.
- 5. Security: initial revisions by Gregor; needs further revision.
- 6. Lighting: requires complete redo.
- 7. Materials and Finishes: research completed by Michele; needs redo and discussion with sub-committee.
- 8. Storage Equipment: first draft by Michele; needs to go to subcommittee for review.
- 9. Functional Spaces: first draft by Michele; review by all subcommittee; additional edits by David; final draft ready for peer review. Preliminary agreement that this section should be renamed and moved to be section 3, after Building Construction.
- 10. Sustainability: new chapter requires first draft.
- 11. Prohibited Materials: reviewed by all subcommittee; initial review by experts from NARA and Canada; out for review by Library of Congress; ready for peer review.
- 12. Glossary: to be reviewed.
- 13. Bibliography: first draft by Tom W; Michele continues to add new citations to the working Bibliography; ready for peer review.

Summary of the TS-AFG activities from August 2019 to August 2020

August 2019:

- Instead of our annual Open Forum, the TS-AFG planned to host a combined meeting with the Preservation Section at the 2019 Annual meeting. We hoped to continue the dialogue about changing standards, update the membership on our progress, and solicit feedback and peer reviewers. Michele was not able to attend the 2019 annual meeting. Jeremy Linden

planned to represent TS-AFG, but at the last minute was unable to attend. Michele prepared a PowerPoint presentation that summarized the subcommittee's work to date and outlined the challenges of revising the standard to reflect new science and sustainability issues. Eve Neiger coordinated and Janet Carleton presented the TS-AFG PowerPoint to the Preservation Section.

- Sadly, Gregor Trinkaus-Randall passed away on August 16, 2019. Gregor was a valuable long-standing member of the TS-AFG, the original author of the Security section, and drafted some revisions to the revised Security section.

February 2020:

- Michele Pacifico updated Keith Chevalier, our Standard Committee representative, and Chris Prom on the progress of the standard.

March 2020:

- Michele met with Joan Bacharach of NPS at the March 2020 Building Museums Conference in NY. Joan coordinates the updates and revisions to the NPS *Museum Handbook*. One of our sub-committee's challenges is to make sure that the SAA standard is up-to-date, and that if we provide recommendations that are not in step with other "standards", that ours are correct and we can justify any differences.
- Michele met with fire protection engineers from Fireline to discuss new fire protection research for cultural heritage facilities. Fireline agreed to assist with the development of the section on Fire Protection. Michele had follow-up conversations with Fireline in June.

May 2020

- NEDCC contacted Michele about their updates and revisions to the Preservation Leaflet *Preservation Leaflet 2.1: Temperature, Relative Humidity, Light, and Air Quality: Basic Guidelines for Preservation (1999)*. Michele provided comments to their draft and had a conference call with staff to discuss current research and the approach being taken by the TS-AFG in its future guidelines. NEDCC agreed to peer review the updated standard guidelines and coordinate information.
- Michele corresponded with the head of Preservation and the lead chemist at Library of Congress about the TS-AFG draft Prohibited Materials and Material and Finishes sections. Follow up is needed after revisions are made to the Materials and Finishes section.
- Michele corresponded with SAA about some potential leftover money in the Spacesaver Fund. Spacesaver provided a \$15,000 grant in December 2006 to help fund the 2009 SAA Standard: *Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects and Engineers*. Tom Wilsted and I thought that the remaining grant money was used in 2013 to fund the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facility Guidelines' meeting in Washington, DC on August 26-27, 2013. We asked SAA if the TS-AFG will be able to use the remaining funds for the revised publication, perhaps for copy editing or other needed expenses.
- Michele Pacifico updated Keith Chevalier, our Standard Committee representative, on the progress of the standard.

July 2020

- Scott Teixeira has been nominated as a fellow of the AIA. Michele assisted in providing past reviews of the 2009 standard. Teresa Brinati assisting in providing the digital art of the 2009 standard for Scott's submission.

SAA-ACRLRBMS Joint Task Force to Revise Statement on Access
Submission of final draft of
**ACRL-RBMS/SAA Guidelines on Access to Research Materials in
Archives and Special Collections Libraries**
(Prepared by Michelle Ganz and Elizabeth Call, Co-chairs)

Task Force Members: Liz Call (RBMS) Co-Chair Michelle Ganz archivist for William McDonough (SAA) Co-Chair Lydia Tang (RBMS) Heather Oswald (SAA) Kathryn Kuntz (RBMS) Cheryl Oestreicher (SAA)

III.B.1. Full text of the proposed standard.

See attached document

III.B.2: Introductory narrative

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force to Revise the Statement on Access to Research Materials in Archives and Special Collections Libraries (hereafter “Task Force”) is responsible for reviewing and revising a Joint Statement that was last released by the two organizations in 2009. The Task Force should recommend any and all revisions that would bring the Statement up to date, and should consider two points raised by the SAA Committee on Public Policy:

Born-digital materials. The last revision of the Joint Statement (2009) was approved prior to the growth of the use of digital forensics software in cultural heritage institutions. (See, for example, *Digital Forensics and Born-Digital Content in Cultural Heritage Collections*, by Kirschenbaum, Ovenden, and Redwine, 2010, and the development of the revised OAIS reference model, 2012.) Software used by creators often collects additional information about the document without the creator being aware of its collection. This information can be retrieved by the use of digital forensics software. The Committee suggests that input on the Joint Statement be collected from individuals who are familiar with the capture of born-digital documents to ensure that the general tenets of the Joint Statement are revised to adapt to an increasingly digital world.

Existence of research materials. Point 2, regarding Intellectual Accessibility, states that a repository “should inform researchers... of the collections in its custody.... The existence of original research materials should be reported, even if they are not fully accessible.” However, Point 1 on Responsibility states that a repository “should not... conceal the existence of any body of materials... unless required to do so by law, institutional access policy, or donor or purchase stipulation.” This last qualifying phrase established a seemingly contradictory standard wherein legal, institutional, or donor restrictions could eclipse a researcher’s right to basic knowledge about the existence of materials as stipulated in Point 2. The Committee suggests that the Joint Statement be revised to clarify this issue.

General Notes:

- Due to the cross-repository nature of the Task Force, the co-chairs wanted to make sure everyone’s voice was heard and addressed. Co-Chairs communicated regularly to make any decisions as a team.
- The Task Force met online for editing sessions and conference calls to discuss complex

issues.

- The majority of the work was accomplished working collaboratively on an online document.
- There were a lot of discussions around the need for a standard like this. Ultimately, we decided that it is better to have more standards that may overlap slightly than to leave a gap in the approved documentation.
- Major changes were made to how the document was laid out and a lot of the concepts originally under their own headings were moved to a new, comprehensive introduction.
- Each task force member was assigned a section of the document to be in charge of. Revisions and questions were discussed and agreed upon as a group.

Assignment of sections

- Lydia: Section 2: Intellectual Accessibility and conferring with Responsibilities re: overlap/inconsistency
Liz: Policies and Citations
- Michelle: Restrictions and Copyright
Kathryn: Responsibilities (and Introduction)
- Cheryl: Fees and Services Heather: Digital

Timeline:

- First meeting: December 2017
- Materials Submitted:
 - Interim report January 2019 ALA midwinter and SAA mid-winter council meeting
 - Final draft submitted to RBMS Executive Committee: September 2019
 - Final draft voted and approved by RBMS Executive Committee: October 2019
 - Final draft submitted to ARCL Council: November 2019
 - Approved January 2020
 - Final draft submitted to ARCL Standards Committee: January 2020
 - Final draft submitted to SAA Standards Committee: February 2020
 - Final draft submitted to SAA Council: PENDING STANDARDS VOTE

III.B.3. Documentation of the consultation process.

- Open calls for comment:
 - Call for Comment through the SAA 2018
 - Open meeting for SAA 2018
 - Open call for comment through RBMS/ARCL 2019
 - Open meeting at ALA midwinter 2019
- No comments were received from the open calls or meetings.

III.B.4. Maintenance and review plan.

- The Joint Task Force recommends that these Guidelines be reviewed every three years. As new accessibility tools become available and understandings of disability change it is important that the Guidelines reflect those developments. Future Task Forces should consider

- Who the intended audience of the statement is for - archives/special collections professionals, researchers/public, administrators, all?
- Whether this document is about policies, philosophies, and/or practical implementation
- How this document enhances professional understanding and practice on access, or whether there are other resources which may be more helpful or that should be referenced

General administrative notes:

- Communications occur through the SAA email listserv system for both the SAA and non-SAA components
- SAA needs an annual status report for Task Forces with multi-year charges
- The updated document needs to go through the RBMS/ACRL and SAA approvals processes
- A tracked changes copy of the document will need to be submitted with the final packet to SAA

Timeline for submission:

- ACRL/RBMS approvals happen first then the SAA approvals
- Open calls for comment occur prior to the RBMS, SAA, and ALA annual meetings
- Updated document, with outside approvals, must be submitted to the SAA Standards Committee for approval through the online submission process
- If Standards has no change requests the document is then sent to Council with the Standards committee recommendations and the RBMS/ACRL recommendations
- If Council has no change requests the new document is approved and added to the Standards Portal

Issues:

- Having a single landing page for the Statement would be helpful. The statement was slightly different to begin with on both the SAA and RBMS sides. It would be ideal if one could be the “repository of record” for the Statement to work from.
- It would be great to consider migrating the working document to GitHub for version control, similar to DACS. It wasn’t clear how old this document is, why it was created, and how it has evolved over time.

Annual Report: SAA Representative to CC:DA ALA 2019-2020

Recommendations:

My recommendation is that we no longer send an SAA rep to this group. The work only affects archivists in very niche areas of the field. While I found the conversations interesting there was little, if anything, that I could contribute as an archivist and even less that was worth passing on to SAA members.

There were a lot of issues on-boarding me as the SAA rep and it took almost a year before I finally got added to all the lists.

If there's a systems or cataloging archivist amongst the membership it might be worth it to reach out and see if they would like to see us continue to be part of this, but I'm hard pressed to find real value (although it did give me fun stuff to talk to my librarian cataloger friends about).

See note below for more information:

Good morning CC:DA,

In early May an email was sent to ALCTS, LITA, and LLAMA members who had expressed an interest in assisting with the transition to Core. I volunteered and was appointed to the Standards Working Group. The working groups will help determine where committees and interest groups will "live" in Core.

CC:DA will continue, but we have an opportunity to do some introspection and possibly make changes. As Chair of CC:DA, I have been asked to complete a survey on behalf of CC:DA by July 22. Here are the questions I am asking you to think about prior to Wednesday's discussion on upcoming work for CC:DA:

Regarding your group's current charge, how well does it fit your work? Are there things you would add or subtract as we re-form the groups in Core?

Are you reaching the audience that you want to? Who is missing from your audience and why do you think you're not able to reach them? Consider these questions in the context of a new division that unifies ALCTS, LITA, and LLAMA members and groups.

Are there additional resources you don't currently have (such as more volunteers, interns, or specific expertise) that you need to do this work well? If yes, please elaborate.

Does your group or activity need to continue? (Response choices edited to remove "yes... but we need help gaining traction" and "no")

Yes, our work is proceeding effectively.

Yes, however we believe our charge and purpose is closely aligned with other group(s) within ALCTS, LITA, LLAMA and would like to talk with them about potentially merging.

Thank you, Amanda

2020 Midwinter Meeting Agenda

We are going to try something new at Saturday's CC:DA meeting. In addition to our regular minute-taking practices which include audio recorders and our interns taking copious notes, there will be a Google document that anyone in attendance can add notes to if they wish. Our interns will still compile the official minutes after the meeting. The Google document will provide another "recording method." The address for the Google document is:

<https://tinyurl.com/CCDA2020MW>

Committee on Cataloging: Description & Access 2020 Midwinter Meeting Agenda

Saturday, January 25, 1:00-5:30 pm Pennsylvania Convention Center, Room 108-B

1. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair (1:00, 5 min.)
2. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group (1:05, 5 min.)
3. Adoption of agenda: Chair (1:10, 5 min.)
4. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2019 Annual Meeting: Chair (1:15, 5 min.)
5. Report from the Chair (1:20, 5 min.)
6. Report of the ALA Representatives to the North American RDA Committee: Hearn and Bourassa (1:25, 20 min.)
7. Report from the PCC liaison: Allgood (1:45, 10 min.)
8. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Polutta (1:55, 20 min.)
9. Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables (Wiggins: 2:15, 20 min.)
10. Report on the CC:DA Virtual Participation Task Force: Guajardo (2:35, 10 min.)
11. Report on the CC:DA 3R Task Group: Maxwell (2:45, 15 min.)
12. Break (3:00, 15 min.)
13. Report on the CC:DA Procedures Review Task Force: Myers (3:15, 20 min.)
14. Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit changes: Hennelly (3:35, 30 min.)
15. Update on Code of Ethics for Catalogers: Chair (4:05, 10 min.)
16. Upcoming work for CC:DA: Chair (4:15, 60 minutes)
17. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair (5:15, 15 min.)

Monday, June 27, 8:30-11:30 am Pennsylvania Convention Center, Room 111-B

Notice: The CC:DA meeting usually held Monday morning is cancelled

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2020 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
January 25, 2020**

UNOFFICIAL Draft

Members present:

Amanda L. Ros, Chair
Daniel Jergovic
Teresa M. Keenan
Tim Kiser
Kathryn Lybarger
Calli Neumann
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann
Emily Thaisrivongs
Glen Wiley
Kumiko Reichert, Intern
Richard Guajardo, Webmaster

Karen Stafford, ARLIS/NA
Weatherly Stephen, SAA
Ryan Tamares, AALL
Donna Wells, ATLA

Ex-officio representatives present:

Dominique Bourassa, NARDAC
Stephen Hearn, NARDAC
Melanie Polutta, LC
Nathan Putnam, OCLC
Jay Weitz, IFLA Cataloging Section Liaison

ALA Liaisons present:

Felicity Dykas, ALA/ACRL
Peter V. Fletcher, ALCTS/CRS
Richard Hasenyager, Jr.,

ALA Liaisons, cont.

ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC
Timothy Ryan Mendenhall, ALCTS/MIG
Honor Moody, ALA/ACRL/RBMS
Andrea Morrison, ALA/GODORT
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM
Jia Xu, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons present:

Everett Allgood, PCC
Thomas M. Dousa, CLA
Leoma Dunn, SLA
Mary Huisman, MusLA
Heidi G. Lerner, AJL
Kelley McGrath, OLAC
John Myers, [CC:DA liaison to] MAC
Diane Napert, ARSC
Jahala Simuel MedLA

Notes:

I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have been rearranged in order to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.

II. While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the process of transcription is laborious. Only in some cases are exact quotes included.

III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of the actual voting members rather than of representatives/liaisons of particular agencies or groups. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives/liaisons to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.

IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and nonvoting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.

V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

3R Project = RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign Project

AALL = American Association of Law Libraries

AAP = Authorized access point

ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate

ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries

AFOS = Acquisitions Fiscal and Oversea Support Division

AJL = Association of Jewish Libraries

ALA = American Library Association

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

AP = Application profile

ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America

ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections

BIBFRAME = Bibliographic Framework Initiative

BSR = BIBCO Standard Record

CaMMS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

CC:AAM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials

CC:DA = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing

CCM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee

CIP = Cataloging in Publication

CLA = Catholic Library Association

COIN = Cooperative and Instructional Program Division

CRS = ALCTS/Continuing Resources Section

CSM = Classification and Shelving Manual

CSR = CONSER Standard Record
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
DCRM(C) = Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)
EURIG = European RDA Interest Group
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
FRBR-LRM = IFLA's *FRBR-Library Reference Model*
FRBRoo = FRBR-object oriented
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
IFLA-LRM = IFLA-Library Reference Model
ISNI = International Standard Name Identifier
ISSN = International Standard Serial Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (up to 2016)
LC = Library of Congress
LC/NAF = LC/NACO Authority File
LC-PCC PSs = Library of Congress Policy Statements
LCDGT = Library of Congress Demographic Genre Terms
LCGFT = Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms
LCMPT = Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
MAGIRT = Map and Geospatial Information Round Table
MAC = MARC Advisory Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MIG = ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group
MulDiCat = IFLA's *Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing Terms and Concepts*
MusLA = Music Library Association
NAR = Name Authority Record
NHP = Non-human personage
NARDAC = North American RDA Committee
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
OMR = Open Metadata Registry
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PSD = Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
PTC = Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division
RSC = RDA Steering Committee
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RDF = Resource Description Framework
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SAA = Society of American Archivists
SCA = PCC Standing Committee on Applications
SCS = PCC Standing Committee on Standards
SCT = PCC Standing Committee on Training
SES = String encoding scheme
SHM = Subject Heading Manual

SLA = Special Libraries Association
URI = Uniform Resource Identifier
VES = Vocabulary encoding scheme
WCAG = Web Content Accessibility Guidelines
WEMI = Work/expression/manifestation/item, the FRBR group 1 entities

Saturday, January 25, 1:00–5:30 p.m.
Pennsylvania Convention Center, Room 108-B

1474. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Amanda Ros, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at TIME, and welcomed voting members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members.

1475. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

The **Chair** invited committee members, liaisons, and representatives to initial a roster sheet and audience members to sign a separate attendance sheet.

1476. Adoption of agenda: Chair

The **Chair** asked for any changes to the agenda.

The **Chair** invited a motion to adopt the agenda. **Kiser** moved, Jergovic seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

1477. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2019 Annual Meeting: Chair [Minutes of the meeting held at the 2019 ALA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC, January 22, 2019] [LINK](#)

The **Chair** explained that a draft of the minutes had been distributed to CC:DA prior to this meeting. Member's suggestions have been incorporated into the document.

The **Chair** asked for any changes to the minutes. None were posed. The **Chair** invited a motion to accept the minutes as final. **Kiser** moved, **Wiley** seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

1478. Report from the Chair [[Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions, July-December 2019](#)]

The **Chair** reported on CC:DA activities since ALA Annual:

-

The **Chair** invited a motion to confirm the activity of CC:DA between July and December 2019. **Kiser** moved, **Wiley** seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

1479. Report of the ALA Representatives to the North American RDA Committee: Hearn and Bourassa [[Report on NARDAC and RDA-Related Activities, June-December 2019](#)]

Bourassa reported on NARDAC activities:

- Library of Congress representative: Melanie Polutta -- new LC member of NARDAC
- Thomas Brenndorfer: in last term serving until end of 2021.
- Attending monthly meetings, using basecamp and google drive for communications
- Try to involve the community as much as possible.
- Major project: suitability of RDA unconstrained elements to user-friendly element labels for display; enlisted help of 3R Task force; prepared report, discussed in Santiago meeting; will continue to work on project.
- RSC has started the broad community discussion of proposals.
Additional layer between CC:DA and RSC means that calls for comments need to be backed up further in order for communities to have time to respond.
Comment periods in October-Thanksgiving and over the Christmas-New Years holidays this year.

Will need to rethink efficient communications between constituent communities as there will be ongoing documents for review; RSC will be meeting 4 times a year. Previously 6-week period in the summer was reserved for comments.

Heard responses from Canadian Committee on Cataloging and Library of Congress but not listed in online comments: wonders how to allow for the recording of responses from

“Curator” proposal was other project treated. Worked with ARLIS/NA and CC:DA -- tried to tweak the proposal; decided not to move proposal forward. Plan to continue work on this proposal

Worked in developing local policies -- Hearn was co-chair of [data provenance](#); Polutta co-chair of [element labels](#)

Hearn reported on RSC activities:

Met in October in Santiago, Chile; Kate James finished her term as RDA examples editor, Honor Moody examples editor effective January 1, 2020

Beacher Wiggins of the LC finished his term as NA representative to RDC; Meredith Fletcher of Libraries and Archives in Canada is new NA representative.

New WG on Application Profiles,

Standing WGs: Technical WG (Damian Iseminger is NARDAC rep); Translations WG

RSC not accepting major change proposals, but is accepting editorial revisions; this part of the 3R text stabilizations

Official change over December 15, 2020,

Countdown clock for sun setting current RDA standard will begin sometime after that date, not yet specified.

New section in RDA for string encoding schemes (SES), which are local and need to be integrated

somehow in the RDA toolkit, possibly in the resource area

RSC is considered another Collective Agent entity for conferences, meetings, etc.; this is an ongoing discussion, no decision has been made.

RSC reviewed a paper on work boundaries; could become part of Guidance section in RDA

RDA implementation scenarios discussed as well. Different implementations types, eg., Linked Data implementations no yet present in beta Toolkit; may be in a February release.

Paper on Excerpts from Other Expressions as a new Expression type

RSC wants to move to four meetings per year; three asynchronous; one in-person; with major changes incorporated four times a year; details of this not worked out in re. procedures.

Draft operations documents were discussed in Santiago.

ALA Publishing will offer a series of Orientation Webinars from last year, as well as some new Webinar opportunities. Two pre-conference workshops given by RSC yesterday, 1/24.

RSC Face-to-face meeting will be Jerusalem this year.

Important to think about implications of change of meetings; how much community response will the RSC need; does not imagine that the pace will be the same as the historic 6 week period

Ros: interested in Stephen's concluding point about community response to change in RSC schedule; noted that this would be apt topic of discussion for Item 16 (Upcoming work for CC:DA); part of general wave of change in traditional CC:DA *modus operandi*.

Allgood PCC liaison: Inability to see other community responses does seem like having less transparency about decision making; would like to have some kind of back and forth about how this develops

Bourassa (NARDAC): Doesn't transmit all comments as is, but condenses them; so not everyone can see CC:DA/PCC/CCC responses as written; what level of granularity does RSC want to see

Glennan (RSC chair):

RSC doesn't have access to these comments either; issue of how NARDAC communicates these is for NARDAC to decide

RSC is looking at ways to streamline process so that the process is less formal and requires less overhead to maintain; have talked about ways to give +1 or equivalent to support other community responses; would like to see shared comments; hoping for an iterative commenting process so that when the RSC meets it is better able to make decisions

RSC willing to accept proposal at any time to be added to a future meeting; unlike the past where you needed to wait until the specific window for proposal submission

Bourassa: NARDAC can also share proposals with ORDAC/EURIG etc in advance of moving

forward to start dialogue earlier

Ros: Would it be appropriate for Ros as a chair to reach out to CCC to share comments?

Bourassa: NARDAC not in a position to determine procedural aspects of other communities

Myers: Historically, CC:DA articulated official position of ALA to JSC; if we are looking to crafting more fluid and informal response structure; would need to go to ALCTS/potential successors to redefine CC:DA role

Bourassa: That's why we had Amanda transmit comments, but there should be a role for CC:DA to set forth official ALA responses as well.

Myers: dual role as (1) presenter of official ALA responses to proposals ; (2) conduit through which feedback is transmitted to NARDAC

1480. Report of the PCC liaison: Allgood [[PCC Report for CC:DA at ALA Midwinter, Philadelphia, Pa., Jan. 2020](#)]

Allgood discussed highlights from his report posted on the CC:DA website. A fuller report is available from the PCC web page at <https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/>

PCC guidelines on minimally punctuated records now effective; FAQ coming soon

Standing Committee on Applications; prepared regex document for removing punctuation in records using MarcEdit

Standing Committee on Standards

- revised explanatory text and guidelines for additional context

- compiled information about MARC authority fields awaiting implementation

- Task group on language codes being formed, to explore using ISO-639-3 Language Codes, which are more comprehensive than current MARC language code

- Looking into use of Wikidata for both authority and bib records

- Task group has completed training slides on minimally punctuated records

Sinopia Training shared with LD4P community for feedback, modules under review,

LRM Training Group has complete 12 training modules on IFLA LRM; hopes to finalize these at midwinter and release as soon as possible.

URI training group: training covers 5 topics; currently training intended only for PCC URIs in MARC Pilot participants only, but plan to roll out more broadly eventually

Something something LDAC

Thurstan Young: Hasn't seen communication about how training on [MPR?] will be rolled out

Allgood: Assume it is forthcoming

1481. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Polutta [[Library of Congress](#)]

[Report\]](#)

Polutta discussed highlights from her report posted on the CC:DA website. A fuller report is available at <https://www.loc.gov/ala>

The report includes information about the following:
Several staffing changes

Polutta intentionally confined her comments to descriptive cataloging issues.

LCC Policy Statements Project. PTPC put together a statement document in October 2019, for discussion at PoCo; approved at PoCo and now on PCC website. Four task groups on Aggregates, Diachronic Works, Data Provenance, and Element Labels (LC and PCC co-chairs)

Goal of the project: maintaining status quo in cataloging
Application profile [basic requirements for PCC about what RDA options to apply]
Policy statements
“Policy guidelines” [describe implementation in MARC and (eventually) BIBFRAME and Sinopia.

-- Monthly bulletins will be issued to PCC with questions/proposals: there will be tight deadlines for responses.

-- Name authority changes:
Kyiv instead of Kiev
French Admin 1-level territory changes (from 2016) are being worked on
Norwegian Admin 1-level territory changes (changing Jan 2019); changes will be made in sync with Norwegian changes.

LoC will not be generating “minimal punctuation” guidelines but will accept punctuation-less records into its system.

MARC-RDA working group in progress; examining MARC to see if any changes need to be made in relation to 3R RDA.

BIBFRAME continues work; close to achieving BIBFRAME-to-MARC converter.

Fletcher: Will LC look at Moscow/St. Petersburg

Polutta: Kiev was Russian transliteration; change made at request of Ukrainian Govt to reflect romanization of Ukrainian for Kyiv; not applicable to Moscow, etc

1482. Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables: Wiggins [[Proposal on Changing Procedural Guidelines for Proposed New or Revised Romanization Tables](#)]

Proposal: Wiggins first reached out to effective units/divisions in LoC and now is sharing the

proposal with the colleagues outside of the organization.

No formal documentation discovered in LoC files, but assumes that CC:DA is the body within ALA that has a say in the treatment of Romanization.

Proposal is to constitute a consultative body composed of LC staff, ALA staff, and staff from other stakeholder bodies to deliberate on reviewing proposals for Romanization Tables, on which there is currently a moratorium.

Proposal, has set deadline: hopes to have consultative body in place by end of February.

Wiggins: thinks that Romanization not really needed; surprised by responses that Romanization is vital; has also heard about the need to better represent native scripts in bibliographical records.

Rendall: Glad to see that LC is taking a look at this and is willing to reconsider when romanization is required

Wiggins: questions about how much romanization is really required, especially as we move forward into linked data environments

Maxwell: Issue of how to romanize vs when to romanize seem to be two separate issues that should be considered separately; historically supposed to be a collaborative project. glad that this will continue, but we do need the tables

Hearn: Subject access and added access points likely to be the place where you want and need a romanization standard going forward.

Allgood: From a legacy standpoint, romanization a necessity not a preference; if we have a frameworks that can handle vernacular scripts, you may still need them in order to roundtrip data from BF to MARC, etc.

Young (BL): designation of what script was used in certain circumstances, e.g., lack of use of 880 in roundtripping, if added to 241 may lead to lossy conversion

Wiggins: Data will be lost as we move forward, and we need to accept that

Myers: seems to remember that CC:AM languages did their thing and CC:DA everything else; for this proposal, thinks ALA will have to devise mechanism for appointing a person to new group

Wiggins: Is asking named organizations to provide appropriate names

Charles Riley: one thing that seems to have been forgotten is engagement with scholarly community, including 90 day review period, does not want to see this aspect lost

Wiggins: wouldn't know, since this all happened before things got to LC, so is interested in how this did work

Rendall: in the past started with closed LC process; then went to CC:DA who assessed, opened up for comment; may or may not receive any, possibly some amendment of table, acceptance then back to LC

Wiggins: future doesn't need to be the same as past, but would like to see some sort of productive procedures

Ros: Committee may get to this today, and start formulating something, not clear that this needs to wait until Annual to discuss further; thanks former CC:DA chairs who contributed to this discussion.

1483. Report on the CC:DA Virtual Participation Task Force: Guajardo [LINK?]

Guajardo reported the following:

Working on implementation of Zoom software with ALCTS who is helping to facilitate the roll out; WebEx still available as back up

Implemented a web scheduling tool that allows you to schedule a specific hour, creating a link for distribution to committee members; may not be easily implementable for CC:DA, will address later ALCTS wants to be keeper of any recordings; committees are being asked to use Zoom account for their meetings

Screen sharing functionality easy to use, especially for switching presenters; multiple chat functions for those attending from open office or other public environment, or may not have a mic so may need to rely on chat; chat can also help reluctant individuals to comments; may also be used to share links, e.g., to agenda or to other referenced materials

Works well across time zones and devices

Does not advise using mobile applications while driving

All virtual likely to be easier to implement than partial live/partial remote meeting

Software challenges: implementation: meetings are 1 hour by default, not possible to schedule 2 back to back meetings without special dispensation; currently ALCTS office member required to attend, this seems unsustainable

Other potential challenges for remote/live combo meetings: internet connectivity isn't always consistent from place to place/room to room, etc., might need one or more laptops for committee member to use, much like we currently use microphones

Completely virtual meetings seem easier

Hearn: Can be hard to tell who is speaking when multiple people are in a room

Moody brought up the case where multiple people are together on one connection (such as in a conference room together for convenience).

Morrison asked whether a long meeting could be split over several days

Guajardo: currently can only schedule meetings for two weeks out

1484. Report on the CC:DA 3R Task Group: Maxwell [LINK?]

Maxwell reported the following:

charge: providing feedback to NARDAC on RDA Toolkit and text.

Since annual, activities have been:

-- Commented on unconstrained elements

examined ca. 1,000 elements to assess if they are adequate, accurate, and user-friendly.

Discusses whether or not there was a preference for labels in verbal (i.e., using verbs) or nominal (i.e., using nouns) forms.

-- helped CC:DA prepare proposal for a change to RDA (1st proposal for a change since 3R):

ARLIS/NA: RDA "curators" role at work and item level.

Forwarded to NARDAC, who did not move forward.

Activity provided NARDAC insight on how this process may look in future.

-- Commented on changed proposal in corporate bodies (distinguishing corporate body from place

where it worships) in order to

Current version: “corporate body is a local place of worship,” There was worry that the language was too Christian-/Western-focussed.

Proposed change: “corporate body that is a congregation that uses a place of worship”
No formal response set forth but discussed.

Maxwell noted that the Task Group seems to be functioning as a sounding board for NARDAC on certain proposals.

Bourassa: contacted TaskForce, Tom from CLA, and Heidi from the AJL: received comments from all the groups contacted. Thus, communication was to communities directly interested in/impacted by change. This expedited and “streamlined” the discussion.

Brenndorfer: NARDAC decided, in the case of religious corporate bodies, to define them as: “A religious body that congregates at a place for activity”, which qualifies as a neutral way of characterizing such bodies: he noted that “activity” in this case means “religious activity” but “religious” wasn’t included to avoid needless repetition of this adjective in the definition.

Stafford: Some concerns from her community about how the proposal process will move forward.

Bourassa: Some feeling that NARDAC shouldn’t develop the proposals but that they should come from the different communities; specific issues with curator proposal; label less important than the domain and range; multiple issues, didn’t have a quorum when discussing this, and didn’t feel that they could move forward; NARDAC needs to determine how to handle some of these processes

Proposal tabled at NARDAC, not at RSC, so isn’t done.

Hearn: Did gain valuable experience in determining what a proposal should look like, making it easier in the future

Bourassa: Have received other proposals, have told people both no, not at all and also, some parts are good, other parts not so much

Hearn: Will work on communicating back the outcomes

Maxwell: would have been helpful if this had been communicated early

Bourassa: Did respond to ARLIS/NA,

1485. Report on the CC:DA Procedures Review Task Force: Myers [[Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access Procedures](#)]

Myers reported the following:

1486. Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit changes: Hennelly [LINK?]

Hennelly reported the following:

Has a stunning visual presentation:

Had hoped to have major release one before MW, but instead mini release soon:

- fix italics issue
- clean up linking practices (using citation numbers in some links [nb: citation number will be incorporated into URL])
- fix issues with user-created content features (i.e., bookmarks, notes, and document tools)
- cleanup Citation Numbering practice
- improvements to search (improve bugs to wildcard searching)

VPAT report that beta Toolkit meets accessibility standards

Will add improved submenus in top navigation bar.

There is a new guidance page on RDA Implementation Scenarios: includes images

2020 Release schedule

- Next full release expected in April/May
- Possible release in August/September (50% possibility right now: would like to release part of Policy Statement or Translation to
- December 15 release will include the switchover to the Beta Site as official RDA site.

The Switchover means that the Beta site moves to access.rdatolkit.org

Original Toolkit will move to original.rdatoolkit.org

links to the original site will not break.

Countdown Clock

- will not start with December Release
- Countdown requires approval from RSC and RDA Board to begin
- Countdown clock will run for one year.

Delay meant to provide flexibility to communities/agencies completing translations, policy statements, and application profiles.

Will announce probably a month before Countdown begins.

Policy Statements

- PS writes and 3R Dev Team meet monthly
- Analysis, planning and writing of PS is underway
- Coordination of Application Profile development
- Sample Policy Statement on Beta Site expected in Spring (no later than the Fall).

Translations are continuing:

- Most teams still working on RDA REference translations
- Finnish team now translating RDA Instructions
- Norwegian team about to start instruction translation (are finishing up boilerplate translations); Italians finishing up Reference translation
- Flow of files for translation controlled by RSC and ALA Publishing.
- Hope for partial translation on Beta Site in April (probably Finnish).
-

3R Orientation Webinars

Five webinars repeated from last year:

representative expressions and manifestation statements

Fictitious persons/Non-human performers

Nomens

New Approaches:

- more practical application of new RDA concepts
- Simplifying tools and focusing exercises
- Offering a range of events/ resources with different pricing points
- Pre-conference Event (half day, using exercises on paper instead of RIMMF, deemed successful)
- *New* online workshop series this Spring, led by Kate James. 30-45 minutes sessions once a week

Several print products under development:

- Introducing RDA (Chris Oliver) [in Spring?]
- Glossary [In Spring?]
- RDA Essentials (Thomas Brenndorfer)
- RDA Workbook (Kate James)
- Handbook of RDA (Robert Maxwell)

Relationship matrix

- doesn't work properly and is difficult to update (Takes a day to update)
- new approach using filtering at the element list found on the Entity page.
- has implications for Visual Browser)

Considering changing the element list view on each entity page so that there are radio buttons for attributes and relationships to allow users to limit the elements listed. This will require additional tagging in the back end, but may better support a visual browser in lieu of a relationship matrix

Maxwell: browsing implies wandering around, so how did I get to this?

Should work, but can't really mock up for static display

Myer: Likes the attribute/relationship break out in the element list

1487. Update on Code of Ethics for Catalogers: Chair [LINK?]

Ros to read report from Karen Snow

Goal to post draft for comment by April 2020; will likely leave it up for one month, revise in May, and present at CaMMS Forum at Annual;

Ros was a working group chair and may be able to answer some questions, but wasn't a member of the steering committee
WGs: Staffing and working conditions [plus a bunch more]

Members from international English speaking communities

Bourassa: Should CC:DA respond formally?

Ros: Steering committee would welcome both individual and committee responses, feels that CC:DA formal response would have greater impact

Bourassa: In the past there have been TF with very fast turn arounds

Maxwell: seems like an important, even foundational document, we should have more than two weeks to read, respond

Ros: Would CC:DA consider establishing a task force in advance so that it could start work as soon as the draft is posted?

Myers: Do we propose and populate right now while we are all here?

Hearn: What is process after Annual?

Ros: understanding is that once the draft is presented for further feedback, ideally final draft to be presented in August or September

Allgood: As a descriptive cataloging committee, at the very least would want to approve the document

Maxwell: Predicts that result of straw poll will be yes, but that TG should be review

Bourassa: Agrees

Straw poll 1: form task force to comment on various drafts: Yes

Straw poll 2: now or later, for all activities related?

Reminder that membership is at the discretion of the TF force,

Poehlmann: Moves to establish a task force to provide feedback to the draft code of ethics.

Lybarger seconded. Passed unanimously.

Bourassa: Anyone present may give their names to Ros today, do not need to be member of CC:DA

1488. Upcoming work and plans for CC:DA: Chair

- 1. How CC:DA might review its own procedures**
- 2. information and opinions for effecting proposal to NARDAC**
- 3. New Romanization tables procedures/group**
Reaching out to CC:AM to form joint Task Force

Maxwell: supports this;

Myers: existing procedures for proposing new romanization tables (via Glennan):

http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpsd/romguid_2010.html

Rendall: Believes that Beecher knows about this, so that we don't need to tell him about it; thinks Beecher may be more interested in what CC:DA/ALA do

Young: Should feedback to Wiggins include assessment of impact on legacy data

Myers: This is already covered and could be carried forth as is

Ros: will attend CC:AM Sunday morning and reach out to chair

1489. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and

adjournment: Chair

Myers: MAC will meet tomorrow; report is forthcoming.

The next meeting will be held in Chicago, Illinois at the 2020 ALA Annual Conference, on the following dates:

Saturday, June 27

Monday, June 29

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at **TIME**

Annual Report: ICA Expert Group on Archival Description (EGAD) August 2020

Prepared by Bethany Anderson, Steering Committee Member, ICA EGAD, and SAA representative to ICA EGAD

Since 2012, the International Council on Archives (ICA) Expert Group on Archival Description (EGAD) has been developing a standard for archival description that will replace the current ICA standards: ISAD, ISAAR, ISDF, and ISDIAH.

The standard under development, Records in Contexts (RiC), will have three parts when completed:

- Conceptual Model (RiC-CM)
- Ontology (RiC-O)
- Application Guidelines (RiC-AG)

The first draft of RiC-CM was released for public comment in September 2016. Comments were received from sixty-two individuals and groups representing 19 countries. 200 pages of comments were compiled and reviewed by EGAD. Since 2016, the group has been working on a second draft of RiC-CM and an alpha RiC-O version.

In addition to holding biweekly teleconference meetings, EGAD held a face-to-face meeting 1-3 October 2019 at Windsor Castle. At the Windsor meeting, EGAD decided to release version 0.1 of RiC-O by early December 2019. Because RiC-CM provides the intellectual foundation for RiC-O but version 0.2 RiC-CM was not yet ready for release, a “preview” version of RiC-CM was released in conjunction with RiC-O. There were also important elements of RiC-CM that needed to be completed in order to complete the RiC-O version 0.1, including finalizing attributes. RiC-O v0.1 and a preview of RiC-CM v0.2 were released for public review on 12 December 2019:

- RiC-CM preview version 0.2: https://www.ica.org/sites/default/files/ric-cm-0.2_preview.pdf.
- RiC-O version 0.1 on GitHub: <https://github.com/ICA-EGAD/RiC-O>.

RiC-CM and RiC-O v0.2 will be released early fall 2020 for public comment and feedback through early 2021. Work on RiC-AG is contingent on RiC-CM and RiC-O being stable, with no additional major work on it anticipated until stable version 1.0 release of RiC-O and RiC-CM.

**Annual Report: SAA Representative to
National Information Standards Organization (NISO)
August 2020
(Prepared by Noah Lasley, SAA Representative)**

Below is the annual report that lists the actions taken with the National Information Standards Organization (NISO) on behalf of SAA from its representative to NISO, Noah Lasley. This report covers the period August 2019 through August 2020. I abstained from voting or did not vote on NISO actions that were not directly related to archival issues.

01 – 2019 November 12

Posted to SAA Announcements and SAA Metadata and Digital Object listservs on Monday, 2019 September 30

Subject: ISO/DTR 22038, Presentation of rights information on digital collections

Below is information about ISO/DTR 22038, the content of which is up for approval. I have attached the draft of the document here.

Please respond to me directly if you have questions or comments about this ballot and how SAA, a voting member of NISO, should vote. See below for the voting options and those voting options that require comments. Voting closes November 12, 2019.

Thank you.

Noah Lasley, SAA Representative to NISO.

Ballot Title: ISO/DTR 22038, Presentation of rights information on digital collections

Question: Do you agree with the content of ISO/DTR 22038?

Closing Date: Tuesday, 12 November 2019 @ 11:59 pm EST

Description: ISO/DTR 22038, Information and documentation - Presentation of rights information in digital collections

This document provides guidelines for digital collections to effectively present rights information to their end- users.

Your voting options are:

Approve - Comments optional

Approval with comments - Comments required Disapprove - Comments required

Abstain from voting - Comments optional

Received feedback from representative from Metadata and Digital Objects group, Noah Lasley voted to APPROVE on 2019 November 12.

02 – 2019 December 5

Ballot Title: ISO/DIS 30300, Records management - Core concepts and vocabulary

Posted to SAA Announcements listserv on Tuesday, 2019 September 30. Also Cross-posted to Records Management mailing list

Below is information about ISO/DIS 30300, the technical content of which is up for approval. I have attached a copy of this draft international standard here.

Please respond to me directly if you have questions or comments about this ballot and how SAA, a voting member of NISO, should vote. See below for the voting options and those voting options that require comments. Voting closes December 5, 2019.

Thank you.

Noah Lasley, SAA Representative to NISO.

Ballot Title: ISO/DIS 30300, Records management - Core concepts and vocabulary

Question: Do you approve the technical content of ISO/DIS 30300?

Closing Date: Thursday, 5 December 2019 @ 11:59 pm EST

Description: ISO/DIS 30300, Information and documentation - Records management - Core concepts and vocabulary

This document contains the terms and definitions of the concepts used in ISO/TC46/SC11 products related to records management. It does not limit the definition of new terms in ISO/TC46/SC11 products.

Your voting options are:

Approve - Comments optional

Approval with comments - Comments required Disapprove - Comments required

Abstain from voting - Comments optional

IMPORTANT COPYRIGHT NOTICE

Permission is granted by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) to electronically reproduce this working draft International Standard for purpose of review and comment related to the preparation of the U.S. position, provided this notice is included. All other rights are reserved.

Received feedback from Records Management Section and included in my vote. Noah Lasley voted APPROVAL WITH COMMENTS on 2019 December 5. Attached feedback from Records Management in vote.

03 – 2020 March 31

Ballot Details: Establishment of new WG to revise ISO/TR 18128: 2014

Ballot Question: Do you approve the establishment of a new WG to revise ISO/TR 18128?

Ballot Description: ISO/TC46/SC11 resolves to disband AHG5 and form a joint Working Group with ISO/TC262 Risk management and ISO/IEC/JTC1/SC27, Information Security, Cybersecurity

and Privacy protection subject to their agreement, to work on the revision of ISO/TR 18128:2014, Information and documentation - Risk assessment for records processes and systems based on the recent revision of ISO 31000: 2018, Risk management - Guidelines and request a call for experts.

- Question 1 (Q1): Do you approve of the establishment of a new WG to develop the revision of ISO/TR 18128: 2014, Information and documentation – Risk assessment for records processes and systems?
- Question 2 (Q2): Do you wish to nominate an expert to participate in the revision of ISO/TR 18128?
- Question 3 (Q3): Do you approve of the appointment of Ms. Anahí Casadesús de Mingo as convener of the WG?
- Question 4 (Q4): Do you approve of the appointment of Mr. Paul Henry as the project leader of this WG?

You have three options for each question:

Yes (Comment optional) No (Comment optional)

Abstain from voting (Comment optional)

Ballot Options: Voting Closes: Tuesday, 31 March 2020 @ 11:59 pm EDT. Up to 4 options may be chosen. You may change your vote at a later time, as long as the ballot is open.

- Q1-Yes, Agree to new WG
- Q1-No
- Q1-Abstain from voting
- Q2-Yes, we wish to nominate an expert
- Q2-No
- Q2-Abstain from voting
- Q3-Yes, Agree with Ms. Anahí Casadesús de Mingo as convener
- Q3-No, Do not agree with Ms. Anahí Casadesús de Mingo as convener
- Q3-Abstain from voting
- Q4-Yes, Agree with Mr. Paul Henry as project leader
- Q4-No, Do not agree with Mr. Paul Henry as project leader
- Q4-Abstain from voting

Noah Lasley voted for the following options on 2020 March 20:

- Q1-Yes, Agree to new WG
- Q2-No
- Q3-Yes, Agree with Ms. Anahí Casadesús de Mingo as convener
- Q4-Yes, Agree with Mr. Paul Henry as project leader

04 – 2020 April 7

Ballot Question: Do you have any comments on the TC46 Business Plan?

Ballot Description: ISO TC 46 Business Plan

Noting that the Business Plan needs to be updated at least every 3 years, ISO/TC46 issues a call for comments on the ISO/TC46 Business Plan last version (2016). The comments will be addressed by the TC46 president and committee manager and an updated version will be submitted for approval before publication.

Ballot Options: Voting Closes Tuesday, 7 April 2020 @ 11:59 pm EDT. You must choose

exactly 1 option. You may change your vote at a later time, as long as the ballot is open.

- Yes
- No
- Abstain

Noah Lasley voted NO (no comments on Business Plan) on 2020 March 20.