

**Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
December 3-5, 2019
Chicago, Illinois**

**Annual Report: Standards Committee
(Prepared by John Bence and Rebecca Wiederhold, co-chairs)**

Membership

John Bence (2014-2018; Co-Chair, 2017-2019)
Rebecca Wiederhold (2016-2018; Co-Chair, 2018-2020)
Julia Lipkins Stein (2016-2019)
Lindsay Wittwer (2016-2019)
Keith Chevalier (2017-2020)
Kira Dietz (2017-2020)
Elizabeth Dunham (2017-2020)
Jennifer Coggins (2018-2021)
Eric Sonnenberg (2018-2021)
Bertram Lyons, Council Liaison (2016-2019)

Ex Officio:

Caitlin Christian-Lamb (Immediate past Co-Chair)
Adrien Hilton (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Dan Michelson (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Katherine Wisser (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Dara Baker (TS-GRD Chair)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Daniel Pitti (Rep to ICA-EGAD)
Michelle Ganz (Rep to ALA/CC:DA and MAC)
Sharry Watson (Rep from CCA CCAD)
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Noah Lasley (Rep to NISO)
Vacant (Rep to ARMA)

Incoming Members:

Lindsay Wittwer (Co-Chair, 2019-2021)
Wendy Pflug (2019-2022)
Emily Toder (2019-2022)
Meg Tuomala (Council liaison, 2019-2022)

COMPLETED PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

Governance

Standards Committee met via phone conference on a roughly monthly basis throughout the year and held an in-person meeting at the Annual Conference in Austin, TX. See appendix G and appendix H for Standards Committee meeting minutes for 2018-2019.

Technical Subcommittees and Task Forces

TS-GRD refined their vision for the subcommittee's work to include an upcoming survey of SAA membership in order to ascertain community use of the *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* as currently established. See appendix D for full report.

TS-DACS submitted a final draft of revised *DACS* principles for community comment in August 2018, then addressed that feedback with final revisions. Standards Committee approved the changes in March 2019, and submitted to Council for the May meeting, where the revisions were approved. TS-DACS will now focus on publicizing the principles. A change request for the addition of rights statement elements for archival description was developed throughout 2018 and community feedback sought. The proposal was approved by Standards in the March conference call, then submitted to Council in May, where a vote was tabled pending further information. A revised proposal addressing community feedback and the impact of the *DACS* versioning project on the proposal will be forthcoming. A new versioning system for *DACS* was developed with the support of an SAA intern, with project completion in July 2019. TS-DACS also performed an extensive review of the Music Library Association's companion standard to *DACS*. See appendix C for full report.

TS-EAS continued the use of teams to support the work of the far-reaching charge of the subcommittee, expanding to seven teams. Among several accomplishments this year are the publication of the EAD3 Implementation Survey, completion of Phase 1 revision of EAC-CPF with updated schema and tag library released in 2018, and a reconciliation review of EAD3 and EAC-CPF. See appendix G for full report.

An extension for the continuing work of TS-AFG was approved by Council in February 2019. All sections are in draft with some ready for peer review. Progress of the work was communicated at a combined meeting with the Preservation Section business meeting at annual. See appendix B for full report.

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force for the Development of Standardized Holdings Counts and Measures for Archival Repositories and Special Collections Libraries (JTF-HCM) obtained RBMS Executive Committee approval in January 2019 and ACRL Board of Directors' approval in April. The JTF-HCM submitted a packet to SAA Standards for the June 2019 conference call, where it was approved. An agenda item was drafted and submitted to Council for vote at Annual, where it was approved (Item II.C, Council meeting minutes, August 1, 2019).

SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force to revise Statement on Access posted *Guidelines on*

Access to Research Materials in Archives and Special Collections Libraries to SAA and RBMS lists in September 2018 for open commentary. The draft was sent to RBMS Executive Committee for review in June 2019. Feedback was given and incorporated into the draft. Another open call was sent to SAA and RBMS lists in July 2019. RBMS Executive gave approval on September 24, 2019. At the time of this writing, ACRL Standards Committee and ACRL Board approval is being sought, after which a submission packet will be submitted to SAA Standards committee. We expect to review the guidelines and hold a vote at our October meeting, after which an agenda item will be sent to Council, likely in time for their December meeting. See appendix K for report of work.

The question of ongoing maintenance and development of jointly developed standards remains and is a priority for 2019-2020.

External representatives

See appendix I 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 F for report from the representative to NISO and appendix J for report from the representative to ICA-EGAD.

Liaisons

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

ENDORSEMENTS AND COMMENTS

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

In November 2018, Intellectual Property Working Group submitted a packet to Standards to request SAA endorsement of a new external standard *Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for Software Preservation*, collaboratively developed by the Association of Research Libraries, the Center for Media and Social Impact of American University, and the Program on Information Justice and Intellectual Property at American University Washington College of Law. Standards reviewed the documentation and voted in favor of endorsing the code. An agenda item was submitted to Council for their February meeting, at which the *Code* was formally endorsed (Item II.C, Council meeting minutes, February 11, 2019)

In June 2018, Standards was approached by John Bewley and Elizabeth Surles, members of a working group from the Music Library Association. The working group had developed a supplement to DACS for noted music materials. Endorsement was sought as a precursor to publication of the supplement, but further review was needed given the external nature of the proposed standard. TS-DACS conducted a peer review of the supplement after the 2018 annual meeting, requesting significant revision. The MLA working group revised the standard with multiple rounds of feedback from TS-DACS and revision by the working group, notably removing the DACS-related aspects into an Appendix to the *Guidelines for Archival Description of Notated Music*. Following a successful subsequent review by TS-

DACS, Standards received a new submission packet, reviewed by Standards members prior to their meeting at Annual. Standards voted unanimously in favor of endorsement. Standards will draft an agenda item for Council's December meeting. Standards has been in touch with SAA Publications throughout the process. TS-DACS intends to create documentation to guide the examination of future companion standards, based on this experience. See appendix A for submission packet.

STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT AND REVISION

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

- Final draft made available for comment on May 24, 2018. No substantive comments received.
- RBMS Executive Committee approved the *Guidelines* in January 2019.
- ACRL Board of Directors approved it in April 2019.
- Submission packet sent to Standards in June 2019, reviewed and approved same month
- Council voted to approve the *Guidelines* at Annual in August 2019 (Item II.C, Council meeting minutes, August 1, 2019)

Task Force to Revise Best Practices on Accessibility: Guidelines for Accessible Archives for People with Disabilities

- Review of two standards: *Best Practices for Working with Archives Researchers with Physical Disabilities* and *Best Practices for Working with Employees with Physical Disabilities*. Reworked into a single document: *Guidelines for Accessible Archives for People with Disabilities*
- Submission packet sent to Standards in November 2018, approved in February 2019
- Council voted to approve the *Guidelines* in February 2019 (Item II.D, Council meeting minutes, February 11, 2019)

Describing Archives: A Content Standard

- Council approved the revised Preface and Statement of Principles for *DACS* (Item IV.C.1, Council meeting minutes, May 20-22, 2019)
- Sent a change request for adding rights statements for archival description to *DACS* to Council. Item was tabled pending more information about requiring these elements. (Item IV.C.2, Council meeting minutes, May 20-22, 2019) TS-DACS is preparing for a revised submission, in light of the progress of the DACS Versioning Project.
- DACS Versioning Project was completed during July 2019, providing unique identifying numbers for each version of *DACS* in GitHub.
- See appendix C for complete report

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

- Draft of the guidelines posted to SAA and RBMS lists in September 2018

- RBMS Executive Committee review in June 2019. Feedback was given and incorporated into the draft
- Another open call sent to SAA and RBMS lists in July 2019
- RBMS Executive Committee gave approval in September 2019
- Now being reviewed by the ACRL Board for approval
- Standards expects to receive a submission packet in October 2019

ONGOING PROJECTS AND ACTIVITIES

Continuous revision procedures

Building on Last year's efforts to clarify understanding of the continuous revision procedures with TS-DACS and TS-EAS, the technical subcommittees submitted examples of major and minor changes for their respective standards as well as proposed maintenance plans to facilitate coordination with other SAA groups like Publications and Education. Based on this documentation and further discussions over the past year, Standards and the technical subcommittees determined minor changes are changes that do not put the current application of the standard in non-compliance, while any changes that do make an existing application non-compliant are considered major. Over the next year, Standards, TS-DACS and TS-EAS will work to define specifically what that means for each respective standard to ensure there are clear expectations and workflows that are in compliance with the approval process.

Art and Rare Materials BIBFRAME Ontology Extension Working Group

Standards received a proposal from ACRL/RBMS seeking SAA participation on a BIBFRAME ontologies extension project to address specific needs for description of art, rare and archival materials. Standards submitted a request to Council that SAA participate in this working group. Council voted to issue an open call for volunteers to serve as SAA representatives in the working group (Council meeting held November 2-3, 2018, Item IV.C). Representatives from SAA's volunteer pool were appointed in February 2019.

Initiatives associated with the 2018–2020 Strategic Plan

Goal 1: Advocating for Archives and Archivists

The inclusion of SAA members on a BIBFRAME ontologies project working group collaborating with members from library organizations RBMS and ARLIS/NA promotes the value of archives in the greater cultural heritage institutions community (1.1). Development of the Holdings Counts Measures standard in collaboration with allied professionals with national reach strengthens the ability of those who manage and use archival material to articulate the value of archives (1.4).

Revision of two accessibility standards into the updated *Guidelines for Accessible Archives for People with Disabilities* ensures more complete accessibility of the historical record (1.3).

Goal 2: Enhancing Professional Growth

The revision of the *DACS* principles allows the standard to align with current archival theory

and practice (2.2). Continued efforts to support and share *DACS* and *EAD3* documentation through the continuous revision model delivers these standards to membership via affordable methods and helps to keep pace with technological change (2.3).

Revision of the accessibility guidelines provides archivists with updated 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).

Goal 3: Advancing the Field

The current partnership 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 the best possible effort has been made to consider all reasonable opinions are considered and addressed before submitting standards to Council for consideration (4.2).

Updating accessibility guidelines assists the association in meeting members' needs by fostering an inclusive work environment (4.3).

QUESTIONS/CONCERNS FOR COUNCIL

The external representative to ARMA International remains vacant pending additional research regarding a 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between SAA and ARMA International (item D.3, Council meeting minutes, August 12–13, 2013). In 2016-2017, our Council liaison reported to Standards Committee that SAA staff would investigate this matter. The committee simply wishes to remind the Council of this in case it is considered a priority.

Respectfully Submitted,
John Bence and Rebecca Wiederhold, Co-Chairs, 2018-2019

Tuesday, July 23, 2019 at 12:39:48 PM Eastern Daylight Time

Subject: [External] Form submission from: Proposal for Endorsement of an External Standard

Date: Friday, June 21, 2019 at 5:28:58 PM Eastern Daylight Time

From: dev-admin@commonplaces.com on behalf of Music Library Association
Working Group for Archival Description of Music Materials, via SAA
Performing Arts Section

To: Bence, John

Submitted on Friday, June 21, 2019 - 5:28pm

Submitted by user: surlese@gmail.com

Submitted values are:

Name of submitting group: Music Library Association Working
Group for Archival Description of Music Materials, via SAA
Performing Arts Section

Date submitted: June 21, 2019

--Contact Person--

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Surles

Position Title: Archivist

Institution: Institute of Jazz Studies

Address 1: Dana Library

Address 2: 185 University Ave.

City: Newark

State/Province: New Jersey

Zip/Postal Code: 07102

Country: USA

Daytime Phone: 973-353-5180

Email: elizabeth.surles@rutgers.edu

Title of Standard: Guidelines for Archival Description of Notated Music Type of Standard: Convention and/or Rules

Topic(s): Arrangement and Description

Maintaining Organization(s): The Music Library Association's Archives and Special Collections Committee is responsible for maintenance of the Guidelines. SAA's Performing Arts Section is in support of the Guidelines and their endorsement, although the Section is not responsible for their maintenance or creation.

Link(s): The Guidelines are currently unavailable online, but the MLA Archives and Special Collections Committee website is located at the following URL:

<https://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/members/group.aspx?id=120372>. The Guidelines will be available through the Committee's website at this URL, published as an open access PDF-A document in MLA's online digital repository, Humanities Commons CORE (<https://hcommons.org/core/>). In addition, the Guidelines will be available through MLA's Online Publications website:

<https://www.musiclibraryassoc.org/page/mlapublications>.

Description of Standard: The Guidelines supplement DACS and provide best practice conventions for archival description of notated music.

Effect/Impact of Standard: The Guidelines are practical for a range of professionals, from archivists with limited knowledge of music to music librarians with limited knowledge of archives. In short, anyone with descriptive responsibility for archival collections with notated music will benefit from implementing the Guidelines.

Use of Standard: The Guidelines are currently unpublished, but after releasing the draft for comment in early 2018, the Working Group has already received one request to use the draft in a graduate level course on archival description.

Review/Revision Procedures:

The MLA Working Group for Archival Description of Music Materials provided the SAA Standards Committee with a detailed account of the review, comment, and revision process preceding the submission of the Guidelines for evaluation. In addition to substantial revisions made to incorporate feedback from TS-DACS, the Working Group also made revisions based on nearly 150 comments received during a public comment period from February to April 2018.

The MLA Archives and Special Collections Committee will be responsible for future updates and will review the Guidelines upon publication of new editions of DACS, excluding minor revisions in GitHub, or every three years as necessary. In addition, the Committee will review the Guidelines for potential revision at the request of any SAA component group, including the Performing Arts Section and TS-DACS. Should revision be necessary, the MLA Archives and Special Collections Committee will be responsible for initiating a working group to make the revisions.

Related Standards: DACS

File attachment:

<https://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/webform/Guidelines%20for%20Archival%20Description%20of%20Notated%20Music.docx>

The results of this submission may be viewed at:

<https://www2.archivists.org/node/15790/submission/25493>

Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines 2018-2019 Annual Report

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

Re: Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee

Date: July 14, 2019

Below is the annual report for the TS-AFG, 2018-2019

As of 2018, the extension for the continuing work of the TS-AFG had expired and the revised US- Canadian standard was still in draft. Michele Pacifico requested an extension until 2020. Council approved the extension in February 2019. The roster is below.

Last Name	First Name	Role	Term	Company
Pacifico	Michele	Co-Chair	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Pacifico Archival Consulting
<u>Wilsted</u>	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
<u>Graham</u>	Fiona	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	
Linden	Jeremy	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Image Permanence Institute, Rochester Institute of Technology
<u>Owings</u>	David	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	
Teixeira	Scott	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Hartman-Cox Architects
<u>Trinkaus-Randall</u>	Gregor	Committee Member	5/3/2017 - 8/18/2020	Massachusetts Board of Library Commissioners

Michele Pacifico attended the Standards Committee meeting on August 14, 2018 and reported on the progress of the Archival Facilities Guidelines.

2018: The TS-AFG hosted an Open Forum at the 2018 Annual meeting in Washington, DC. Michele Pacifico showed a PowerPoint presentation on the subcommittee's work to date and on the challenges of revising the standard to reflect new science and sustainability issues. Jeremy Linden reported on changes to other standards that apply to archival facilities. The Open Forum was well attended with approximately 40 people at the session.

On May 1, 2019: Michele Pacifico updated the TS-AFG, Chris Prom, Teresa Brinati, and the Standards Committee on the progress of the standard. Below is a summary of the TS-AFG work as of May 1, 2019.

1. SAA renewed our appointments for another 2 years.
2. Michele will not be at SAA this year. Instead of our usual Open Forum, we have combined our update with the Preservation Section to discuss sustainability, archives, and archival facility standards. Jeremy will be representing us and this session will be the foundation of the book's section on sustainability. (see description below)
3. Michele met with Joan Bacharach of NPS at the March 2019 Building Museums Conference in NY. Joan coordinates the updates and revisions to the NPS *Museum Handbook*. NPS Chapter 9 on Fire Protection was recently reissued. I've attached a copy. I sent Joan an email with questions and requested clarifications in issues in their new chapter. I hope to meet with Joan later in May to discuss their new chapter and their plans for updates to the chapters on the Museum Environment and Storage. 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 these are correct and we can justify any differences. I plan to have the SAA section on Fire Protection completed this month for your review.
4. Michele has been discussing various facility issues with Scott and Jeremy, and other outside experts, 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.
5. A revised ASHRAE standard for archives is expected in June and will provide updated and useful guidance on archival environments. Jeremy serves on the committee revising the ASHRAE standard.
6. Scott completed a draft of Section 1 and Michele is reviewing and editing this work.
7. Section 9 on Functional Spaces is almost ready for your review. David provided some additional updates on accessibility to this section in October. I encourage David and Angela to take a fresh look and see if we are missing any information and to check my editing work.
8. Michele continues to add new citations to the working Bibliography. I will send it to the subcommittee for review and suggested additions.

May 16, 2019: Teresa Brinati notified Michele that the SAA book store is almost out of copies of the 2009 standard. Since publication of the revised standard not close to completion, Teresa will order a small print run for the coming year.

Update of TS-AFG as of July 10, 2019:

1. Work continues on completing a draft of the Guidelines. All sections are in draft; some are ready for peer review. Other sections will be completed in the next few months. In addition to developing the new information, we are reformatting the publication for easier reading.
2. There have been a number of delays with member illness and work issues. This is further complicated because for some areas there is little new research to guide us.

Pacifico has been working to communicate with NARA, Library Archives Canada, National Park Service, the Image Permanence Institute, preservation and museum specialists, and others to get 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.

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

August 3, 2019: The TS-AFG is hosting a combined meeting with the Preservation Section at the 2019 Annual meeting. Jeremy Linden will represent the TS-AFG. We hope to continue the dialogue about changing standards and update the membership on our progress and solicit feedback. The joint meeting announcement reads:

If you are planning to attend this year's SAA meeting in Austin, TX, please save a slot on your schedules for our annual Preservation Section Business meeting on Saturday, August 3rd from 1-3 pm (room TBA).

This year we are teaming up for a joint session with the Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TSAFG). Join us for a presentation and facilitated discussion on the current state of sustainable practices throughout the cultural heritage community. The program will begin with brief announcements and updates from the Preservation Section, TSAFG, the SAA Foundation, and representatives from NEH and NHPRC.

Sustainability and Cultural Heritage - The State of SAA and the Allied Professions

The last decade has seen a dramatic increase in the advent of sustainable practices throughout the cultural heritage community, ranging from redefined standards and best practices to broaden discussions and understanding of what sustainability means in the context of collecting organizations including archives, museums, and libraries. This session will:

- Outline recent changes to standards and best practices documents in the interest of sustainable preservation practices;
- Introduce current sustainability activities from among the cultural heritage professional organizations, including AIC, AAM, AASLH, as well as allied professions such as ASHRAE,
- Discuss broadened, more inclusive understandings of sustainability in cultural heritage (it's not just about being green!)
- Identify sustainability recommendations and practices in the forthcoming, updated *Archival and Special Collections Facilities Guidelines*;
- and examine SAA's own current efforts toward understanding sustainability within the profession.

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

**Technical Subcommittee on
Describing Archives: A Content Standard (TS-DACS)
2018-2019 Annual Report
September 2019**

The Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) has had an active and productive year in fulfillment of its charge to oversee the timely and ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS). This report covers the period August 2018-July 2019.

2018 Annual Meeting

TS-DACS convened to discuss various ongoing projects including the process by which change requests happen; versioning *Describing Archives: A Content Standard*; and review of a companion standard proposed by the Music Library Association. The sub-committee also discussed committee function and roles of members; documenting the work of the sub-committee; and a DACS part II workshop proposal to SAA Council.

Change requests:

- In May 2019, the Society of American Archivists Council approved the revised Principles for Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) as submitted by the Technical Subcommittee on DACS and recommended by the SAA Standards Committee.
- TS-DACS sent a change request implementing a new rights statement for archival description element to Standards in January and then on to SAA Council in May. Council rejected this change request. TS-DACS is revising supporting material for clarity and working with Standards on developing a plan for moving it forward with the expectation that the versioning project (discussed below) will help make the change more palatable.

DACS Versioning Project

Since 2013, DACS has been revised on a continuing basis, and changes to the standard have been documented on the TS-DACS [Github site](#) since 2016. Since the continuing revision process was implemented, members of the DACS user community have expressed concern that their repositories' descriptive records might fall out of DACS compliance during the period after DACS is updated and repositories complete the necessary work to update their records to reflect a revision. To help alleviate this concern, TS-DACS decided to develop and implement a versioning system for DACS.

To implement the versioning system, TS-DACS hired a DACS Versioning Project Assistant, Sabrina Unrein. Sabrina is an MLIS student at Syracuse embarking on a new career in libraries and archives after previously working as a software developer. She is also interning at CNN's Video Archives. Supervised by a TS-DACS working group, Sabrina completed the project during July 2019.

Under the new versioning system, each version of DACS receives a unique identifying number and is documented as a release on Github, and each time a revision to DACS is made, a new version of the standard will be released with a new version number. A DACS user could therefore declare that their records are compliant with a previous version of DACS while updating their repository's records to reflect a revision, after which their records would become compliant with the newly updated version of DACS.

Education:

- DACS Part II was approved by SAA and the first workshop took place in April at the Society of California Archivists meeting. The contents of the course are still in the process of being finalized by SAA.
- A new iteration of the Revised Principles Workshop was also presented at the Society of California Archivists Meeting in April.

Extensive Feedback on MLA

The review of the Music Library Association's companion standards took a significant amount of time by the sub-committee. This was the first time the sub-committee undertook the process of reviewing a companion standard. Following several rounds of feedback and revision, a DACS-specific portion of the document was spun off as an appendix and TS-DACS recommended that the Standards Committee endorse the appendix as a supplement to DACS. TS-DACS will use this experience to create documentation to guide the examination of future companion standards.

TS-DACS Review of RiC-O

The Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD) produced a draft conceptual model and ontology for description, RiC-O (Records in Contexts Ontology). TS-DACS scheduled a conference call for August to discuss the Ontology and gather feedback to share with EGAD.

Updated Microsite

The TS-DACS microsite has been updated to include current members, a link to the twitter account, and information about TS-DACS purpose and committee responsibilities.

Renamed files in Github, developed procedures for serialization from Github repository

Started Twitter handle

TS-DACS is now interacting with archivists on twitter @TS_DACS

2019 Annual Meeting

In Austin, TS-DACS met to review progress during 2018-2019 (as outlined above) and discuss plans for the coming year. Identified priorities included completing a workflow with SAA staff for publishing regular updates to DACS, launching a publicity and outreach program around the new principles, continuing revision of the DACS Part I and II workshops, and submitting a reworked change proposal for the new rights statement for archival description element.

Technical Subcommittee on Guidelines from Deaccessioning and Reappraisal 2018-2019 Annual Report

Chair: Dara A. Baker, Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library
Members: Danielle Emerling, West Virginia University Libraries
Elizabeth Russell, Providence Archives
Dainan Skeem, Brigham Young University

The members of the TS-GRD spent this year on a number of different areas. Dainan Skeem's institution, BYU, began implementation of reappraisal and deaccessioning based on the Guidelines. We have been watching for, and recently ordered, copies of the for TS-GRD Chair, Laura Uglean Jackson's edited book *Reappraisal and Deaccessioning in Archives and Special Collections*, published by Rowan and Littlefield in 2019. Note: No members of the current TS-GRD were asked to participate or otherwise involved in the publication.

The TS-GRD held a conference call on July 16, 2019. TS-GRD members Dara Baker and Danielle Emerling met up at the spring 2019 MARAC conference in West Virginia in April. Dara Baker and Dainan Skeem met with Standard Chair, Rebecca Wiederhold at SAA in Austin. It has been difficult to assure that all TS-GRD members are in the same place at the same time considering our geographic distribution.

The members of the TS-GRD were unable to attend the 2018 SAA meeting in Washington, D.C. Our annual report was submitted but we were not present to give the report. TS-GRD Chair, Dara Baker, communicated with outgoing Standard Chair, John Bence, regarding the direction of the subcommittee, and received useful information in the lead up to SAA 2019 in Austin, TX. A meeting with incoming senior Standards Chair, Rebecca Wiederhold, at SAA in 2019 has clarified for TS-GRD members our goals for the coming year and our relationship with the Standard Committee.

The TS-GRD feels that our biggest issue is lack of knowledge about the technical subcommittee. SAA accepted 2 panels at the conference on the topic, and without the need for panel proposals to seek section or committee support, and with no members on the Program Committee for 2019, this information was not known to the TS-GRD until well after the program was made public. In future, the TS-GRD will be working with Standards to gain better information on SAA related activities related to the topics covered by the TS-GRD. We would like our Subcommittee to be seen as a resource for subject matter expertise on the topic(s).

For year three, the TS-GRD will be focused on putting out a survey for SAA membership and across the profession to determine use of the Guidelines and general understanding of deaccessioning and reappraisal. We will read and review Jackson's recent work, update the microsite, and continue to survey the literature on the topic. The TS members agree that understanding the community's knowledge and implementation of the Guidelines is important to future work on these critical concepts for the profession.

Technical Subcommittee on Encoded Archival Standards 2018-2019 Annual Report

Membership (2018-2019)

Katherine Wisser, co-chair
Karin Bredenberg, co-chair
Anila Angjeli
Kerstin Arnold
Erica Boudreau
Lina Bountouri
Florence Clavaud
Mark Custer
Wim van Dongen

Alexander Duryee
Regine Heberlein
Noah Huffman
Silke Jagodzinski
Joost van Koutrik
Cory Nimer
Aaron Rubenstein
Ailie Smith
William Stocking
Adrian Turner

Glenn Gardner and Gerhard Mueller 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.

Three new members will be joining the subcommittee for the 2019-2020 year: Caitlin Rizzo, Jeremy Floyd and Clinton Johnson. Kathy Wisser will be stepping off as co-chair and Mark Custer has been appointed the new co-chair. The subcommittee has also applied for an Early Career Member (Jessica Purkis, 1 year appointment).

Subcommittee Overview

2018-2019 was the third year of TS-EAS. The subcommittee is charged with the development and maintenance of the encoding standards in support of archival descriptive practices. To tackle this far-reaching charge, the subcommittee used the annual meeting in 2016 to devise a strategy and develop priorities. This resulted in the creation of a series of teams. The first year of this strategy (2016-2017) gave us a better view of how this work should progress, so the 2017-2018 year was more productive. As work has gotten underway, additional initiatives have also created ad hoc teams to tackle that work. There are seven active teams and volunteers from the committee lead those teams:

- EAD Team (Huffman)
- EAC-CPF Team (Jagodzinski)
- EAC-F Team (van Koutrik)
- Related Standards (Heberlein)
- Schema Team (Custer)
- Documentation Team (Nimer)
- Shared Schema (Arnold), Ad Hoc

Boudreau continued to serve as secretary and assisted the co-chairs with subcommittee documentation and meetings. As she is cycling off the subcommittee, a new secretary will be sought from the membership.

Individual teams met as necessary to complete the initiatives of the team. The whole committee has quarterly meetings. Over the 2018-2019 period, the committee met in August at the annual

meeting in Washington DC, and met virtually in October, February and May. These meetings support the team structure and ensure that all members of the committee are aware of the various efforts underway.

Accomplishments

Below are listed the accomplishments reported by teams:

- Continued development and deployment of GitHub repositories for team work and standards maintenance was completed, including a 1-hour tutorial for the subcommittee with Carl Wilson, Technical Lead for the Open Preservation Foundation.
- Publication of the EAD3 Implementation Survey (EAD Team) Available here: http://www.loc.gov/ead/EAD3_Implementation_Survey_Results_and_Discussion_20190320.pdf
- Drafted a proposed annual calendar for managing minor revisions to EAD (EAD Team)
- Completed Phase 1 revision of EAC-CPF (Schema 2010 Version Revised); the updated schema and tag library were released in December 2018. Began phase 2 revision of the standard, including significant planning for additional face-to-face meeting in Austin in August 2019 and Berlin in March 2020.
- Applied for funding from SAA Council for support of the face-to-face meeting in Berlin 2020 (not supported); additionally, applied for funding from ICA for support.
- Reworked the implementation survey for EAD3, which will be distributed in July 2018-September 2018.
- Developed and discussed the justification of EAC-F, based on use cases, literature, and external expert perspectives; strategy for schema development will be outlined at August 2019 annual meeting.
- Established an ad hoc shared schema team that conducted a review of elements and attributes in EAD3 and EAC-CPF to generate a recommendation for the subcommittee on a strategy for reconciliation between the standards in areas where appropriate.
- The Documentation team developed policies regarding the relationship between the subcommittee and translation efforts for the various tag libraries.
- Completed reports on models for related data standards and developed a set of recommendations for the subcommittee to review.

Annual Meeting Objectives

Based on the success of the longer meeting format in 2018, TS-EAS has requested a similar timeframe this year. This will allow for basic team reporting and updates from project, strategic planning for the 2019-2020 year, and a large block of time to address identified problems that impact the standards under the subcommittee charge. Issues that will be covered at the meeting:

- EAC-CPF revisions
- Shared schema report and proposal
- EAC-F proposal
- Community outreach proposal
- Review and additions to the new TS-EAS Handbook
- Committee self-study

**SAA Representative to the
National Information Standards Organization (NISO)
2018-2019 Annual Report**

To: SAA Standards Committee
From: Noah Lasley, SAA Representative to NISO
Re: Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee
Date: September 18, 2019

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 2018 to September 18, 2019. I abstained from voting or did not vote on NISO actions that were not directly related to archival issues.

1 – 2018 November 6

Sent to SAA Announcements Community on 2018 October 19

Subject: Call for experts – ISO/TC 46/SC 10/WG 7 "Requirements for materials related to preservation"

Below is information about the call from ISO/TC46/SC10/WG7 for experts to help on ISO/NP 23404, Information and documentation - Papers and boards used for the conservation - Measurement of the impact of conservation materials on paper cellulose. A summary of the requested action from NISO is attached. Please respond to me directly if you have questions or comments about this ballot and how SAA, a voting member of NISO, should vote. Additionally, please let me know as soon as possible if you would like to be nominated as an Expert for this project as it must be approved by the Standards Committee and the SAA President/Council. See below for the voting options and those voting options that require comments. Voting closes November 6, 2018.

Thank you,
Noah Lasley, SAA Representative to NISO

Ballot Title: SHORT-TURN AROUND: Call for Experts ISO/TC46/SC10/WG7

Question: Do you wish to nominate an expert to participate on the revision of ISO/NP 23404?

Closing Date: Tuesday, 6 November 2018 @ 11:59 pm EST

Description: ISO/TC46/SC10/WG7 is asking for experts to help on ISO/NP 23404, Information and documentation - Papers and boards used for the conservation - Measurement of the impact of conservation materials on paper cellulose.

You have three options for the above question:

Yes (Comment
required) No
(Comment optional)

Abstain from voting (Comment optional)

Received no nominations, Noah Lasley voted NO on 2018 November 6.

2 – 2018 December 7

Ballot Question: Do you agree on the proposed resolution 03/2018?

Ballot Description: ISO CD 19580, Information and documentation -- International archives statistics, was automatically deleted due to exceeded limit dates. WG 12 asked SC 8 secretariat to reinstate the project and SCC will submit a new proposal on ISO/CD 19580 with its justification. In accordance with clause 2.1.6.2 of ISO/IEC Directives Part 1, canceled projects may only be reinstated with the approval of the ISO Technical Management Board.

Proposed Resolution 03/2018 by correspondence ISO/TC 46/SC 8 requests its secretariat to initiate a 12-week NP ballot on ISO CD 19580 when SCC (Canada) submits the proposal with its justification to SC 8 secretariat no later than 2018-12-17. When the proposal is approved, SC 8 will request its secretariat to submit the voting results to TMB for approval.

ISO/TC 46/SC 8 agrees the project shall be assigned to WG 12 and appoints Ms. Irene van Bavel as the convenor of the group when the TMB approves the reinstatement of the project.

You have three options for the above question:

Yes (Comment

optional) No

(Comment optional)

Abstain from voting (Comment optional)

Voting Closes: Monday, 10 December 2018 @ 11:59 pm EST

Noah Lasley voted YES on 2018 December 7.

3 – 2018 December 7

Ballot Title: Approval of Proposed New Work Item: Recommended Practices Around Content Platform Migrations **Ballot Question:** Do you approve of a Proposed New Work Item:

Recommended Practices Around Content Platform Migrations?

Closing Date: Friday, 14 December 2018 @ 11:59 pm EST

Ballot Description: This ballot is to approve a proposed new work item on the development of a Recommended Practice for activities around content platform migrations.

Members have thirty (30) days to vote on the work item. Your vote options are: Yes (approve the project), No (do not approve the project), or Abstain (from voting). Comments are required for No votes. If you would like to nominate someone to participate on the Working Group (if the project is approved), please provide a name and contact information in your comments. NISO Working Group participation is not limited to NISO members.

As online content is primarily made available via the Web, content platforms are now a typical way to provide libraries and their patrons access to scholarly content. Content platforms may

be developed by publishers themselves, or they may be licensed from third parties who specialize in this type of software. Publishers continuously work to upgrade the platforms based on feedback from customers and end-users, and in response to an ever-changing internet and technology landscape. As a result, publishers will periodically move their content from one platform to another.

The goal is to create recommended practices around platform migrations which would provide a standard process and recommendations to all parties dealing with online content platforms, which would improve communication both before, during and after migration. Streamlining the process will benefit everyone in a smoother overall transition.

The proposal was approved by the Information Policy & Analysis Topic Committee on November 9, 2018, and is now being sent to the NISO voting membership for agreement.

In order for this item to be approved, a minimum of 10% of NISO's Voting Members must express interest in this work item.

Noah Lasley voted YES on 2018 December 7.

[4 – 2019 January 11](#)

Sent to SAA Announcements Discussion 2019 January 11

Below is information about ISO/CD 30300, which is up for approval to be circulated as a DIS (Draft International Standard). I have attached the draft of this 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 Thursday, January 24, 2019.

Thank you,
Noah Lasley, SAA Representative to NISO.

Ballot Title: ISO/CD 30300, Records Management - Core concepts and vocabulary **Question:** Do you approve the circulation of the draft as a DIS?

Closing Date: Thursday, 24 January 2019 @ 11:59 pm EST

Description: ISO/CD 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.

You have four options for the above question:

Approval (Comment optional)

Approval with comments (Comment required)

Disapproval (Comment required)

Abstain from voting (Comment optional)

No feedback received. Noah Lasley voted YES (approve without comment) on 2019 January 23.

5 – 2019 January 16

Sent the following to SAA Announcements List and Metadata and Digital Objects Section on 2019 January 16:

Below is information about ISO/CD 22038, which is up for approval to be circulated as a DIS (Draft International Standard). I have attached the draft of this 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 Thursday, January 31, 2019.

Ballot Title: Ballot on approval of ISO/CD 22038 as a DIS

Question: Do you approve the circulation of the draft as a DIS?

Closing Date: Thursday, 31 January 2019 @ 11:59 pm EST

Ballot Description: ISO/CD 22038, Information and documentation -- Description and presentation of rights information

This document provides ways for digital collections to effectively present rights information to their end-users. Digital collection here refers to a service providing resources in digital form, especially resources in libraries, museums, archives or other organizations that offer similar resources to their patrons. Rights information here refers to the intellectual property rights and related access/usage rights concerning the resources.

You have four options for the above question:

Approval (Comment optional)

Approval with comments (Comment required)

Disapproval (Comment required)

Abstain from voting (Comment optional)

Received one comment from Matthew Miguez supporting this ballot. Noah Lasley voted YES (approval without comments) on 2019 January 30.

6 – 2019 April 2

Ballot Title: ISO/NP 24083, Information and documentation - International archives statistics

Ballot Question: Do you approve, disapprove, or abstain on this NP for ISO/NP24083 for International archives statistics?

Ballot Description: In accordance with resolution 03/2018 (by correspondence), SC 8 approved to reinstate ISO CD 19580 (Information and documentation -- International archives statistics) canceled in 2017. The project has been given a new reference number, ISO 24083, and submitted to ISO/CS for NP ballot.

Ballot Options: Up to 2 options may be chosen. You may change your vote at a later time, as long as the ballot is open.

Approve (Comment Optional)

Disapprove (Comment Required)

Abstain due to lack of consensus (Comment Optional)
Abstain due to lack of national expert input (Comment Optional)
Draft document will be registered as a new project in the committee program (stage 20.00)
(Comment Optional)
Draft document can be registered as a Working Draft (WD - Stage 20.20) (Comment Optional)
Draft document can be registered as a Committee Draft (CD - Stage 30.00) (Comment Optional)
Draft document can be registered as a Draft International Standard (DIS - Stage 40.00)
(Comment Optional)
Abstain from voting (Comment Optional)

Noah Lasley voted to Approve and for the draft document to be registered as a new project in the committee program (stage 20.00) on 2019 April 2.

7 – 2019 May 7

Sent the following to SAA Announcements List on 2019 May 2:

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

Below is information about ISO/FDIS 15511, Information and documentation - International standard identifier for libraries and related organizations (ISIL), which is up for approval as a final draft. I have attached the draft to this post. Please respond to me directly if you have questions or comments about this draft 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 on May 7, 2019.

Thank you. Noah Lasley, SAA Representative to NISO.

Ballot Title: ISO/FDIS 15511, Information and documentation - International standard identifier for libraries and related organizations (ISIL)

Ballot Description: This document specifies the International Standard identifier for libraries and related organizations (ISIL), which comprises a set of standard identifiers used for the unique identification of libraries and related organizations such as museums and archives with a minimum impact on already existing systems.

Closing Date: Tuesday, 7 May 2019 @ 11:59 pm EDT

Question: Do you approve the technical content of the final draft?

Voting options:

Approve - Comments optional

Approval with comments - Comments required

Disapprove - Comments required

Abstain from voting - Comments optional

Noah Lasley voted to Approve the technical content of the final draft.

**2018 October 15
Standards Committee conference call**

Attendees:

John Bence (Co-Chair)
Becca Wiederhold (Co-Chair)
Noah Lasley (Rep to NISO)
Dan Michelson
Karin Bredenberg (TS-EAS Co-Chair)
Kira Dietz
Elizabeth Dunham
Jennifer Coggins

Continuous Revision Planning Draft

- Vision for developing continuous revision procedures: to be more responsive to technological change. Discussed definition of major and minor changes.
- Compliant is a heavy word. Adding optional elements would probably still be considered major.
- Major change—Something that alters the application or interpretation of the standard
- Minor changes—Things like fixing links, adding resources, correcting typos.
- Prior to the meeting, the group began collaborating on a document to suggest what constitutes major vs. minor changes. John will share our starting point with TS-DACS and TS-EAS to get the conversation started for more complicated use and ask for examples from the TS's and insight for other nuances.
- Major revisions will then still have to go through Standards/SAA Council but where do minor changes go? Probably notification but no approval required. This is a next step conversation.

BIBFRAME ARM ontology extension

- BIBFRAME is a possible replacement for MARC21. There is a group creating ontologies to extend BIBFRAME for specific use cases. Standards was approached about including SAA members on the ontology extension group to represent archives, as they are looking at art and rare materials.
- John submitted agenda item for Council's November meeting, including background information and charter. Also suggested a name for someone Council may appoint as chair, with open call for SAA members to join group—probably two year term. John will send out more info as it is finalized. As a new group, the chair would likely be ex officio liaison to Standards Committee.

JTF-Holdings Count Metrics update

- JTF-Holding Count Metrics moving along. Seeking approval from RBMS/ACRL first, then will go to Standards. Probably in a few months.

2018 December 10 Standards Committee conference call

Attendees:

John Bence (Co-Chair)
Becca Wiederhold (Co-Chair)
Keith Chevalier
Kira Dietz
Jennifer Coggins
Lindsay Wittwer
Eric Sonnenberg

Review of submission packet from Task Force to Revise Best Practices on Accessibility

- Submission packet from the Task Force to Revise Best Practices on Accessibility was reviewed by committee members prior to the call.
- Liked the addition of core values and combining the guidelines with the resources list.
- Discussion about the somewhat aggressive maintenance plan (review every three years) and goal of making it a “living document.” We recommend restricting the “living” portion to the resources list, the remainder of the document staying on the same approval process for future changes.
- No group is assigned to maintain the guidelines. We will make a suggestion in our recommendation to Council.
- Action item: John will work with the task force leader to identify a section that might be appropriate, run it past them before making our recommendation to Council.
- Vote: All were in favor of recommending approval with the suggestion that Council appoint a group to maintain it.

Review of SAA’s Intellectual Property Working Group proposal for external endorsement

- Submission packet from IPWG’s proposal for endorsement of an external standard (Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for Software Preservation) was reviewed by committee members prior to the call.
- A note of concern is that there is no maintenance plan. Will note in recommendation to Council
- Casework is closely followed. Much like a white paper.
- Vote: All in favor of recommending approval to Council.

Other Items

- Update on DACS principles revision progress. We’ll be discussing in our January call once we receive final revised documentation.
- Update on RBMS-JTF Holdings Counts Metrics. RBMS approvals come first. They will be voting at ALA Midwinter; then it will go to ACRL’s committee, then their executive, then will come to us. Maybe in the Spring.
- Update on Council meeting

- SAA participation in BIBFRAME ARM ontology approved. Open call for volunteers rather than appointing our suggested chair/rep.
- Council revised our committee's by-laws to include responsibility to keep the Standards Portal up-to-date. We will get clarification from our Council rep on how to handle standards that are not SAA owned or are jointly owned with an outside group.
- Major/minor revision planning. We need to put more into our definitions of major and minor revisions for standards before our next call.
- Next meeting likely January 28th

2019 August 2 Standards Committee annual meeting, Austin, TX

Attendees:

John Bence (Co-Chair)	Bethany Anderson (ICA-EGAD)
Becca Wiederhold (Co-Chair)	Wendy Pflug (incoming Standards member)
Lindsay Wittwer (incoming Co-Chair)	Emily Toder (incoming Standards member)
Kira Dietz	Meg Tuomala (incoming Council liaison to Standards)
Jennifer Coggins	Mark Custer
Eric Sonnenberg	Chris Prom
Kathy Wisser	Adrien Hilton
Dan Michelson	Michelle Combs
Michelle Ganz	Maristella Feustle
Karin Bredenberg	Rachel Vagts
Daniel Pitti (ICA-EGAD)	

Introductions

Report outs from representatives

- TS-EAS
 - 3rd year combined as TS-EAS
 - Tried out several models and have settled on a team-based approach to address standards and projects
 - Developed and deployed GitHub
 - Publication of EAD3 implementation survey
 - Contributed info to Standards about minor/major revisions/drafted continuous revision calendar
 - Planning for face-to-face meeting for major CPF revisions in Berlin
 - Developed and discussed justification for Function description standard (EAF)
 - Documentation team working on relationships with subcommittee and translation efforts
- TS-DACS
 - After a final round of revisions, revised principles were submitted and approved by Standards and Council
 - Collected and shared feedback on MLA Supplement to DACS over several rounds. Learned a lot about what it takes to develop format-specific supplements
 - Microsite and Google Drive management
 - Rights Statement change request (8.2) submitted; rejected by Council; under revision for resubmission
 - Hired contract person to develop versioning and numbering system for DACS version releases, including changelog
 - Cleanup of GitHub files

- DACS workshop which had been consolidated to one-day led to lack of time for DACS Part II. Submission for a stand-alone DACS Part II workshop
- Upcoming focus on publicizing the principles
- Outstanding change requests
- Early process of review for RiC Ontology
- ICA-EGAD
 - Began working on RiC several years back, building of ICA standards
 - Three intended products: conceptual model, ontology, and application guidelines
 - First draft of conceptual model in 2016 which received a lot of feedback, hoping to move forward with it
 - Ontology Alpha is out for comment, some of which is dependent on conceptual model being finalized. Hoping for stable draft soon.
 - Pitti would like to make arrangements to have Anderson take over the IGA liaison role to Standards
- ISO
 - No activity this year, despite request
 - May need to re-evaluate
- ALA-CC:DA
 - Call for comment on proposal to add elements to RDA. Voted to be sent with minor revisions.
 - RDA Beta Toolkit Training Task Force is beginning to do work
- SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force to Revise Statement on Access
 - RBMS needs to evaluate first and there is some minor revision taking place. Then it is expected to come to Standards.
 - It would be useful to have some documentation on the order of operations for joint task forces
 - Was supposed to disband now, but is still going through the process and will continue to work on things

MLA DACS supplement discussion & vote

- Publications is on board
- Multiple rounds of feedback have been submitted and used to revise
- Good collaboration with an external group and example of how to make this process work
- Maintenance plan is included. Should Standards have a rep or contact person to channel the work through at SAA?
 - Consider using the executive director
- Vote: All in favor of recommending approval to Council.

Ongoing review procedures discussion

- Communication of changes needs to be addressed for every situation
 - DACS version will help with that effort
- RiC Conceptual Model has an entity that covers this

- Joint task forces have previously changed their output (“Guidance” to “Standards”), so there may be a need for standardized language?
 - How much authority in naming something can be delegated to Standards
- Getting Council to delegate authority for minor changes to Standards would make the process easier. Standards can then decide whether to delegate (allow the TS to handle it and help with communication) or review
- From a Pubs Board perspective, what is considered minor from a Standards perspective probably doesn’t trigger the need to reprint--conversation needs to continue. Knowing when the changes have aggregated to a certain point is more important.
- TS-EAS calendar is something we should refine for use for rolling review of changes
- Other/more conversations need to take place between Pubs Board, people responsible for overseeing the changes, and Education. Standards is in a position to facilitate that.
 - Early in the new year would be a time to pursue that discussion

New business

- For Standards: audit of where we should have representation and where we already do. May need to fill gaps or make changes to liaison assignments.
- BibFrame Ontology working group is on-going (but does not have website--action item)
- Question—Would it be appropriate for this group to set a standard for what a committee, section, group, etc. web page should contain? In particular, contact information. No, but we can talk to Council.
- Updates to Standards Portal
- Microsite needs love.

**SAA Representative to both the American Library Association
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (ALA CC:DA) and the
Library of Congress MARC Advisory Committee (MAC)
2018-2019 Annual Report
(Submitted by Michelle Ganz)**

ISO 5127 rep

A few months after I was appointed ISO decided to disband the 5127 working group. I was moved to the general ISO rep for SAA. There have been no emails or activities 2018-2019.

Repeated attempts to reach out to ISO did not yield any information. After reaching out to the past ISO rep and SAA it was decided to continue with the things as they are 2019-2020.

ALA CC:DA Report

I was appointed to both committees August 2018; was not added to the listserv for the Library of Congress MARC Advisory Committee until June 2019.

Notes:

July 29, 2019

Call for comment on Proposal to add the elements “curator agent of work” and “curator agent of work of” to RDA. This is the first thing that is a voting item. Sent out call for comment. Received 2 yesses. Voted that the proposal may succeed and is perfect: CC:DA will vote to send the proposal to NARDAC as is.

July 26, 2019

CC:DA RDA Beta Toolkit Training Investigation Task Force has been finalized. The task force membership is:

- Glen Wiley, Chair
- Adam Baron
- Felicity Dykas
- Peter Fletcher
- Jeannette Ho
- Andrea Morrison

The charge as approved at CC:DA’s meeting at ALA Annual is “Form a task force to investigate RDA Toolkit Beta training”.

CC:DA/ARLIS-3R Task Force/2019/1 July 22, 2019

Subject: Proposal to add the elements “curator agent of work” and “curator agent of work

of” to RDA

Abstract

Add the agent element sets “curator agent of work” and “curator agent of work of” to RDA to describe curators who play a role at the work level. Modify the labels and definitions of the element sets “curator agent” and “curator agent of” to clearly distinguish curators who play a role at the item level from those who play a role at the work level.

Background

- The RDA Toolkit includes the element “curator agent” defined as “An agent who conceives or manages the aggregation of an item in an exhibition or collection.” While there is a need for an element curator as an item to agent relationship (for instance, for special collections), the art community believes that being able to show a relationship between curators that have relationships to works in addition to those who have relationships to items is crucial.
- Curators’ roles have recently been defined as follows: “to conceive, select and organize presentations of their chosen material in order to provide access to the visiting public.” (Adrian George, “Introduction” in *The Curator’s Handbook*, Thames and Hudson, 2015, page 8). Any “work” that comes out of an exhibition is dependent on the curator’s intellectual contributions. The relationship is not between an agent and an item but between an agent and the work that is published as a result of an exhibition (most commonly, the exhibition catalog). For this reason, the art community believes that a new element should be added to RDA to relate curators to the work to which the exhibition gives rise.
- The “organizer agent” is a shortcut—the agent’s responsibility is for an event that “gives rise to a work,” but the event itself is not a work. The exhibition curator proposal takes the same shortcut, i.e., it does not entail defining the exhibition event as a work.
- It has been suggested that art catalogers use the element “organizer agent,” which does have a domain of “work,” to describe this sort of relationship. However, these two terms are not equivalent. While exhibitions may have an “organizer,” who manages the logistics of transporting pieces, etc., the curator is recognized as playing a different role by the art community. The curator is the person who determines themes, interprets material, and accordingly selects objects to be put on display; they thus have an impact on what works are reproduced in the catalog, the themes that are analyzed in the textual content of the catalog, etc.
- Using the term editor agent of text to describe the relationship between the exhibition curator and the catalog is not adequate since the exhibition curator is not always the agent who edits the catalog.
- The element “collector agent” cannot be used to describe an exhibition curator since it shows a relationship between an item and an agent and not all exhibition curators are

collectors.

- The element “collection registrar agent,” which is defined as “An agent who is a curator who lists or inventories items in a collection aggregate” cannot be used to describe the curator of an exhibition since it shows a relationship between an item and an agent and does not involve conceiving, selecting, and organizing the exhibition or collection for presentation.
- Some languages use different terms for curators who play a role at the item level from those who play a role at the work level. In French, for instance the curator of an item is a “conservateur,” while the curator of an exhibition is a “commissaire d’exposition.”
- Using \$e curator in bibliographic records describing exhibition catalogs is already common practice in OCLC demonstrating the need of the art community to accurately describe the relationship between a curator of an exhibition and the work it gave rise to.
- The fact that agents may have relationships with different resource entities is well documented within RDA. For example, RDA has an element for restorationist agent of expression and restorationist agent of item. Therefore, we believe that something similar could be done for curators while still following RDA principles.

Recommendation

- Create new element labels, definitions, and instructions for “curator agent of work” and “curator agent of work of” to describe curators whose role are restricted to “curation” and “exhibition” or “collection” at the work level. The labels follow the models of the elements “related agent of work” and “related agent of work of,” and the definitions follow the model of the definitions for “organizer agent” and “organizer agent of.”
- Add the narrower agent elements:
 - curator collective agent of work
 - curator corporate body of work
 - curator family of work
 - curator person of work
 - curator collective agent of work of
 - curator corporate body of work of
 - curator family of work of
 - curator person of work of
- Modify the labels and definitions of the element sets “curator agent” to “curator agent of item,” and “curator agent of” to “curator agent of item of” to distinguish these elements that describe relationships between items and agents from the new curator elements proposed to describe relationships between works and agent. The following elements will need to be modified:
 - curator agent
 - curator collective agent
 - curator corporate body

- curator family
- curator person
- curator agent of
- curator collective agent of
- curator corporate body of
- curator family of
- curator person of

Proposal

curator agent of work

Definition and Scope

An agent who conceives, selects, and organizes a presentation of materials from a collection or displayed in an exhibition that gives rise to a work.

Element Reference

Domain

Work

Range

Agent

Alternate labels

has curator agent of work

curator of work

Prerecording

Recording

Record this element as a value of Agent: **appellation of agent** or as an IRI.

Recording an unstructured description

Record an unstructured description for a related agent as a value of Agent: **name of agent**.

For general guidance on unstructured descriptions, see Recording methods. **Recording an unstructured description.**

Recording a structured description

Record a structured description for a related agent as a value of Agent: **access point for agent**.

For general guidance on structured descriptions, see Recording methods. **Recording a structured description.**

Recording an identifier

Record an identifier for a related agent as a value of Agent: **identifier for agent**.

For general guidance on identifiers, see Recording methods. **Recording an identifier.**

Recording an IRI

Record an IRI for a related agent as a real-world object.

For general guidance on IRIs, see Recording methods: **Recording an IRI.**

Related Elements

For broader elements, see Work: **related agent of work**.

For the inverse of this element, see Agent: **curator agent of work of**.

curator agent of work of

Definition and Scope

A work that involves a responsibility of an agent for conceiving, selecting and organizing a presentation of materials from a collection or displayed in an exhibition that gives rise to a work.

Element Reference

Domain

Agent

Range

Work

Alternate labels

is curator agent of work of

curator of work of

Prerecording

Recording

Record this element as a value of Work: **appellation of work** or as an IRI.

Recording an unstructured description

Record an unstructured description for a related work as a value of Work: **title of work**.

For general guidance on unstructured descriptions, see Recording methods. **Recording an unstructured description**.

Recording a structured description

Record a structured description for a related work as a value of Work: **access point for work**.

For general guidance on structured descriptions, see Recording methods. **Recording a structured description**.

Recording an identifier

Record an identifier for a related work as a value of Work: **identifier for work**.

For general guidance on identifiers, see Recording methods. **Recording an identifier**.

Recording an IRI

Record an IRI for a related work as a real-world object.

For general guidance on IRIs, see Recording methods: **Recording an IRI**.

Related Elements

For broader elements, see Agent: **related work of agent**.

For the inverse of this element, see Work: **curator agent of work**.

Make the following change to element labels

curator agent of item

Definition and Scope

An agent who conceives or manages, administers, or organizes the inclusion the aggregation of an item in a collection or an exhibition or collection.

Element Reference

Alternate labels

has curator agent of item

curator of item

curator agent of item of

Definition and Scope

An item that involves a responsibility of an agent for conceiving or managing, administering, or organizing the inclusion the aggregation of an item in a collection or an exhibition or collection

Element Reference

Alternate labels

is curator agent of item of

curator of item of

Clean text

curator agent of item

Definition and Scope

An item that involves a responsibility of an agent for managing, administering, or organizing the inclusion of an item in a collection or an exhibition.

.

Element Reference

Alternate labels

has curator agent of item

curator of item

curator agent of item of

Definition and Scope

An item that involves a responsibility of an agent for managing, administering, or organizing the inclusion of an item in a collection or an exhibition.

Element Reference

Alternate labels

is curator agent of item of

curator of item of

June 15, 2019:

The following announcement was posted today on the RSC website:

Representatives of the RDA Steering Committee and of the Organizer Group of the Annual

BIBFRAME Workshops in Europe (among them Library of Congress/NDMSO, LD4P, and Share-VDE) began a conversation at the 2019 ALA Annual Conference in Washington, D.C. about the relationship and interoperability between RDA and BIBFRAME. The group identified short-term and longer-term tasks to pursue and will continue to meet and discuss. More information will be shared as it becomes available.

LoC MAC Report

September 2018:

The draft agenda for the October 2018 meeting of the RDA Steering Committee (RSC) is now available. The RSC will meet October 22-26, 2018 in Montréal, Québec, Canada at the McGill Library.

June 2019:

An addendum to MARC Update No. 28 (May 2019) is now available on the MARC website (<https://www.loc.gov/marc/>). The addendum consists of changes to the MARC 21 formats resulting from revised decisions made regarding the outcome of MARC Proposal No. 2019-01, which came about after the publication of Update No. 28. A full accounting of those changes can be found in the STATUS/COMMENTS section at the head of the proposal. The addendum also includes a fast-track change resulting from MARC Fast-Track Proposal No. 2019-FT01.

In brief, the addendum changes are the following:

- Define \$7 in field 856 in all five MARC 21 formats.
- Rescind defining field 540 in the Holdings format and define \$f, \$g, \$q, \$2 in Holdings field 845 instead.
- Fast-track change: Define code "b" for Belt in Sound Recording field 007/01.

The changes are indicated in **red** along with the other new changes in Update No. 28. The "Format Changes for Update No. 28 (May 2019)" appendixes in each format have been updated to reflect the changes. The addendum changes are listed under the heading: "Update 28 Addendum Changes (July 2019)" in each appendix. To access the change appendixes, and for more information about format documentation, see:

<http://www.loc.gov/marc/status.html>.

Users may need to refresh pages on their browsers to see the changes.

July 2019:

TECHNICAL NOTICE: Additions to Source Codes for Vocabularies, Rules, and Schemes

Network Development and MARC Standards Office

Library of Congress

The source codes listed below have been recently approved. The code will be added to the applicable Source Codes for Vocabularies, Rules, and Schemes lists. See the specific source code lists for current usage in MARC fields and MODS/MADS elements.

The codes should not be used in exchange records until 60 days after the date of this notice to provide implementers time to include newly-defined codes in any validation tables.

Classification Scheme Source Codes

The following source code has been added to the Classification Scheme Source Codes list for usage in appropriate fields and elements.

Addition:

gccn - Government of Canada catalogue number (Library and Archives Canada)

Geographic Area Code and Term Source Codes

The following source code has been added to the Geographic Area Code and Term Source Codes list for usage in appropriate fields and elements.

Addition:

cagraq - Codes d'aires géographiques pour les régions administratives du Québec (Montréal: Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec)

Standard Identifier Source Codes

The following source code has been added to the Standard Identifier Source Codes list for usage in appropriate fields and elements.

Addition:

margaz - Marine Gazetter (Marineregions.org)

The Library of Congress, Network Development and MARC Standards Office provides information about existing and newly assigned MARC codes on its Web site (www.loc.gov/marc/) as well as notices such as these to subscribers to its MARC listserv.

ICA Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD)
Society of American Archivists
2019 Annual Meeting
(Prepared by Daniel Pitti, Chair, 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, 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. Public comments were received from sixty-two individuals and groups representing 19 countries. When compiled, there were over 200 pages of comments. Since 2016, the EGAD has been working on a second draft of RiC-CM and an alpha RiC-O version.

The EGAD met in Paris in May 2018, and Seitenstetten, Austria in December 2018. The bulk of both meetings focused on RiC-CM. Florence Clavaud (Archives nationales de France) is leading the development of RiC-O. In December 2018, she issued a call for reviewers of an alpha version, and then later extended the call until the June 2019. RiC-). See <https://www.ica.org/en/ric-o-extended-call-for-reviewers> for additional details.

The second draft of RiC-CM is well underway. The high-level descriptive entities are established. Particularly challenging has been work on Activity (or Function), Rule and Mandate, and the distinguishing information in a Record from the physical Instantiation of the information. The EGAD hopes to have a second draft of RiC-CM completed fall 2019.

ACRL/RBMS-SAA Joint Task Force to Revise Statement on Access 2018-2019 Annual Report

Task Force Members: Liz Call -- Special Collections Outreach Librarian, University of Rochester (RBMS) Co-Chair Michelle Ganz archivist for William McDonough (SAA) Co-Chair Lydia Tang - Special Collections Archivist-Librarian at Michigan State University (RBMS) Heather Oswald - Manager, Public Services at Harvard Business School (SAA) Kathryn Kuntz- Special Collection Supervisor- Davenport Public Library (RBMS) Cheryl Oestreicher: Head of Special Collections and Archives, Boise State University (SAA)

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

Submitted to Standards Committee: May 2019 Final draft submitted to SAA Council and ARCL Council: July 2019 Interim report January 2019 ALA midwinter and SAA council meeting (also in Jan.) Draft by August 2018 Open commentary in September 2018

- Call for Comment through the SAA
- Open meeting at SAA 2018
- Open call for comment through RBMS/ARCL
- Open meeting at ALA midwinter 2019

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.