

Society of American Archivists Standards Committee Annual Report, 2015– 2016

Membership

Meg Tuomala (2013-2016; Co-Chair, 2014–2016)
Carrie Hintz (2014-2017; Co-Chair, 2015-2017)
John Bence (2014-2018)
Hillary Bober (2014-2017)
Kathryn Bowers (2013–2016)
Caitlin Christian-Lamb (2014-2017)
Beth Davis-Brown (2013–2016)
Christiana Dobryzinski (2015-2018)
Anna Naruta-Moya (2015-2017)

Tim Pyatt, Council Liaison (2013–2016)

Ex Officio:

Anila Angjeli (TS-EAC-CPF Co-Chair)
Hillel Arnold (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Maureen Callahan (TS-DACS Co-Chair)
Terry Catapano (SDT Chair)
Emily Gustainis (JTF-HCM Co-Chair)
Laura Uglean Jackson (TS-GRD Chair)
Bill Landis (JTF-PSL Co-Chair)
Cory Nimer (Rep to CC:DA and MAC)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Daniel Pitti (Rep to ICA-EGAD)
Genevieve Preston-Chavez (Rep to NISO)
Michael Rush (TS-EAD Co-Chair)
Amy Schindler (JTF-PSM Co-Chair)
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard (Rep from ICA-EGAD)
William Stockting (TS-EAD Co-Chair)
Sharry Watson (Rep from CAA CCAD)
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Katherine Wisser (TS-EAC-CPF Co-Chair)
Vacant (Rep to ARMA)

Incoming members:

Lindsay Dumas (2016-2019)
Julia Lipkins Stein (2016-2019)
Rebecca Weiderhold (2016-2018)

Michelle Pacifico, ex-officio (Rep to NISO)
Weatherly Stephens (Rep to CC:DA)

Incoming Chair:

Caitlin Christian-Lamb (Co-Chair, 2016-2018)

Completed projects and activities

Governance

Revisions to standards procedures

Revised the Standards Review and Development Procedures to include a new procedure to fast track best practices and guidelines developed by Council-appointed expert groups. Revision was approved by Council July, 2016.

Technical Subcommittees and Task Forces

In August of 2015 Council chartered the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Standards to replace TS-EAD, TS-SDT, and TS-EAC-CPF. The group was charged with the ongoing maintenance of EAD and EAC-CPF, including all schemas and related code, as well as the development of future companion standards, including Encoded Archival Context – Functions.

After lengthy discussions and based on the feedback of the Standards community, Standards drafted a revised charge for the group which was submitted to Council and approved November 2015. Standards co-chairs, Council representative Tim Pyatt, and chairs of the Technical Subcommittees developed appointment recommendations for TS-EAS, which Standards submitted to SAA Vice President in February of 2016; appointments were formally made in April of 2016.

External representatives

The external representative to ARMA seat remains vacant.

Liaisons

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

The committee also began using liaisons to each published standard and/or standard under review or development to help with the development, drafting, and review of standards. Each member of the committee serves as a liaison to one or more standards, acting as the main point of contact between the committee and the technical subcommittee, task force, or other component group responsible for the standard. This structure facilitates active communication between the groups and the committee, and helps the committee manage ongoing work, due dates, deliverables, and the overall workflow and procedures for the development and review of standards.

Endorsements and comments

Standards Committee participated in the following standards reviews this year:

External standards and documentation

The standards committee was asked to endorse the Role Delineation Statement developed by the Academy of Certified Archivists as an external standard. After discussion within Standards and with representatives of SAA Council this issue was referred back to Council.

Standards development and revision

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

Additionally, the technical subcommittee on archival facilities guidelines (TS-AFG) continues to work on a draft of a revision of that standard, and the technical subcommittee on Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning (TS-GRD) has completed a draft of the guidelines and is soliciting feedback.

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

- Development of standard underway
- Charge and committee terms extended until August 2017
- See appendix 1 for complete report

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

- Development of standard underway
- Charge and committee terms extended until August 2017

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

- Approved by Council in November 2014; JTF members appointed in spring 2015
- Development of Standard began in September of 2015 and is underway

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

- Revision continues, Final Draft expected 2016
- See appendix 2 for complete report

Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning

- Revision Underway
- See appendix 3 for complete report

Guidelines for Graduate Programs in Archival Studies

- Revision Request Anticipated Soon
- Will be fast-tracked (at the request of Council) upon receipt

Archival Continuing Education Guidelines

- Revision Request Anticipated Soon
- Will be fast-tracked (at the request of Council) upon receipt

Ongoing projects and activities

Initiatives associated with the 2013–2018 Strategic Plan

Goal 1: Advocating for Archivists and Archives

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

Goal 2: Enhancing Professional Growth

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

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

Goal 3: Advancing the Field

Work happening on the joint task forces with RBMS will both develop new standards (3.1) and enable active participation in partnerships and collaborations (3.3). The committee continues to support the revision of existing standards and development of new standards through active work on *Guidelines on Archival Facilities* and the development of *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* (3.1). Reviewing the revisions to *DACS* standards supports participation in standards development (3.1).

Goal 4: Meeting Members' Needs

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

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

At the standards committee annual meeting in August 2015 the committee and technical subcommittee members engaged in discussion regarding international participation in standards development. As a direct result, the Draft Charge for TS-EAS was revised and resubmitted to Council, demonstrating a commitment to greater diversity in the committee membership (4.3)

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

Questions and concerns for Council attention

The external representative to ARMA International remains vacant pending additional research regarding a 2008 Memorandum of Agreement between SAA and ARMA International (item D.3, Council meeting minutes, August 12–13, 2013¹). Last year our Council liaison reported to standards committee that SAA staff would investigate this matter. The committee simply wishes to remind the Council of this in case it is considered a priority.

Respectfully Submitted,
Meg Tuomala and Carrie Hintz, Co-Chairs, 2015–2016

Appendix 1

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

SAA Progress Report

July 28, 2016

**Prepared by: Amy Schindler, SAA co-chair,
and Christian Dupont, ACRL/RBMS co-chair**

BACKGROUND

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

Officers

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

Members

- Moira Fitzgerald (ACRL/RBMS), Yale University
- Thomas Flynn (SAA), Winston-Salem State University
- Emilie Hardmann (ACRL/RBMS), Harvard University
- Jessica Lacher-Feldman (SAA), University of Rochester
- Sarah Polirer (SAA), Cigna Corporation
- Gabriel Swift (ACRL/RBMS), Princeton University
- Bruce Tabb (ACRL/RBMS), University of Oregon
- Elizabeth Yakel (SAA), University of Michigan

SUMMARY OF MEETING ACTIVITIES

The SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Force on the Development of Standardized Statistical Measures for the Public Services of Archives Repositories and Special Collections Libraries created by the SAA Council and RBMS Executive Committee in 2014, met six times in-person and via conference call as a group between September 2015 and June

2016. The in-person meeting in January 2016 during the ALA Midwinter meeting included eight guests who participated in a lively discussion of their needs and interests for development of public services measures. The meeting in June 2016, during the ALA Annual Meeting included ten guests who shared useful feedback and suggestions on Version 1 of the document released the previous week. Subsets of the task force members met in separate working sessions over a dozen times between September 2015 and June 2016. During the upcoming SAA Annual Meeting the task force will host a lunch open forum and a regular task force meeting soliciting feedback from attendees on Version 1 of the document.

ONGOING ACTIVITIES

Since September 2015, Task Force members have continued discussions about the proposed standard and the format of the draft document. On June 22, 2016, the Task Force [published Version 1](#) of the document for comment. The comment period will include both the ALA and SAA Annual Meetings and will close on August 22, 2016. For practical reasons, the document was published on the SAA website on June 22 and on the [RBMS website](#) on July 28. Several comments have been received to date, both online and via email, that will inform future draft versions.

The proposed standard divides public services into seven domains: User Demographics, Reference Transactions, Reading Room Visits, Collection Use, Events, Exhibitions, and Online Interactions. Each domain includes one basic measure, two or more advanced measures, and several recommended metrics.

The Task Force meetings at the ALA Midwinter Meeting, ALA Annual Meeting, and SAA Annual Meeting are open to any interested attendees and comments have been received at each meeting since the Task Force's first meeting at the 2014 SAA Annual Meeting.

Information about the Task Force was prepared for the Museum Archives Section newsletter (Winter 2016). Task Force member Emilie Hardman presented the work of the Task Force in the session "Standards and Best Practices for Metrics: Reports from the SAA-ACRL/RBMS Joint Task Forces" at the Spring 2016 New England Archivists meeting along with representatives of the other two SAA-ACRL/RBMS task forces. Members Amy Schindler and Tom Flynn will present information at the Reference, Access and Outreach Section's Marketplace of Ideas at the 2016 SAA Annual Meeting. A session including members of the Public Services and Holdings Counts and Measures task forces has been accepted for the Fall 2016 MARAC meeting.

A full report on the results of the survey conducted by the Task Force in 2015 has not yet been completed. The Task Force began publishing posts sharing the results of the survey by domain during the Version 1 comment period to publicize the comment period as well as disseminate some of the data from the survey. These posts are available on the [SAA microsite](#).

On April 20, 2016, the Task Force shared its draft definitions for terms, which will be an appendix in Version 1 of the document, with the SAA Dictionary Working Group. The updated definitions as released in Version 1 were shared with the working group in June 2016.

Brenda McClurkin of UT-Arlington has been appointed to the Task Force effective after the SAA Annual Meeting. She will take the place of Jessica Lacher-Feldman as an SAA-appointed member.

A request for a one-year extension, through August 2017, was submitted June 13, 2016, and approved June 27, 2016.

NEW ACTIVITIES

- Published Version 1 of the standard for comment on June 22, 2016.
- Soliciting comments in-person during the Task Force's meeting at the ALA Annual Meeting and at a lunch forum at the SAA Annual Meeting (co-hosted with the Holdings Counts and Measures Task Force).
- Review comments received on Version 1 and a draft of Version 2 during Fall 2016.
- Publish Version 2 in winter 2017.
- Host webinar to share and solicit questions on Version 2 in winter 2017. Also solicit in-person comments at the ALA Midwinter Meeting.
- Explore offering additional feedback sessions at meetings of regional associations in 2017.

Appendix 2

To: SAA Standards Committee

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

Re: Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee

Date: July 27, 2016

Below is the annual report for the TS-AFG.

In July 2015, The TS-AFG requested a 9-month extension for the current committee's appointments in order to complete the revised standard. The extension has expired and the revised US-Canadian standard is still in draft. However, Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted, with help from the subcommittee members, plan to complete the draft this fall. Once the draft is completed, it will need to be vetted by multiple groups, reviewed by the Standards Committee, and then complete final revisions. We hope to again have a copy editor and someone to format our charts but do not know its status.

There is no working TS-AFG listed on the SAA website. Although the subcommittee membership has expired, Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted are still coordinating the revised facility guidelines and communicating subcommittee business with the Standards Committee and the former subcommittee members. Michele plans to attend the Standards Committee meeting on August 2, 2016, to discuss the status of the technical subcommittee.

Michele has discussed the status of the TS-AFG with Nancy McGovern, Nancy Beaumont, and the chairs of the Standards committee in person and by email. Tom Wilsted and I have been co-chairs of the predecessor task force and the current TS-AFG for 10 years. While we are committed to completing the revisions to the 2009 standard as a joint US-Canadian standard, we have concerns about the future of the subcommittee and the monitoring of the standard. A number of the former TS-AFG members have retired and we do not have any candidates for members. We have informally tried to recruit members and have requested an intern. To date, we have not had any positive responses, but we will continue to work on identifying interested members.

We look to the Standard Committee for guidance on the status of the TS-AFG. Tom and Michele are open to your ideas and will support the SAA and the Standard Committee in whatever way you deem appropriate. Our recommendation is to grant another extension to the subcommittee so that we can finish the revisions to the archival facility standard.

Additionally, Michele has been appointed the incoming representative to NISO and will be continuing with the Standards Committee in that position.

Announcements were sent out to various lists about the subcommittee's open forum that is to be held at SAA in Atlanta on Thursday, August 4, 2016 from 12:15 to 1:30. We hope it is as successful as last year's forum, which drew 75 SAA members

and lots of discussion. Michele will again use the forum to solicit interest in the guidelines and the subcommittee. The open forum announcement that was sent out to SAA lists reads:

You're Invited:

There will be an open forum to update colleagues on the developing joint US/Canadian facility standard at the SAA Annual Meeting in Atlanta. Michele Pacifico, co-chair of the Technical Subcommittee - Archival Facility Guidelines (TS-FAG), will discuss some of the challenges in developing the revised standard for facilities and the "new thinking" about preservation and systems, review the open issues, pose questions, and seek comments on the kind of information members would like to see in the revised standard. The meeting will be held on **Thursday, August 4, 2016 from 12:15 to 1:30 in Room 2013.**

All are welcome to participate. For more information, contact Michele Pacifico at martinpacifico@comcast.net or at 301-908-8720.

Last year at the TS-AFG open forum, some audience members suggested to Michele that the high attendance at the forum reflected the lack of sessions at SAA on facilities, environmental conditions, sustainability, etc. Michele discussed this concern about the lack of sessions on these topics with Dennis Meissner (incoming SAA president) and Nancy McGovern (VP and next president). Michele also noted it on the SAA Conference survey and has followed up by shepherding a sustainability proposal for next year's conference.

This year there will be a session chaired by Michele titled: "Sustainable Archives: Strategies for Our Future" on Saturday morning, August 6. Colleagues who attend the TS-AFG open forum will be encouraged to attend the sustainability session, as it will address the "new thinking" about archives facilities and how the standards are changing. This session summarizes the issues and challenges the technical subcommittee is working to properly address in the revised archival facility standard.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Michele F. Pacifico and Thomas Wilsted

"Acting" Co-Chairs, SAA Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines

Appendix 3

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

August 2015-July 2016

Members:

Laura Uglean Jackson (Chair)
Chela Weber (Committee Member)
Mark Shelstad (Committee Member)
Margery Sly (Committee Member)
Jaimie Quaglino (Ex Officio, Acquisitions & Appraisal Section)
Meg Tuomala (Ex Officio, Standards Committee Co-Chair)
Carrie Hintz (Ex Officio, Standards Committee Co-Chair)
Timothy Pyatt (Council Liaison)

In August 2015, the TS-GRD initiated the formal review for the *Guidelines on Reappraisal and Deaccessioning*. We heavily publicized this during SAA 2015 (Cleveland) by making announcements at all section meetings and nine roundtable meetings; distributing ribbons for conference badges; and holding office hours in the exhibit hall. In addition, we held a lunch and learn where we presented an overview of the Guidelines, answered audience questions, and received comments. We also met in person during the conference to discuss the review plan.

After SAA, a call for comments was sent to various listservs and we received comments via email and in a Google Doc. The TS-GRD discussed the comments over the phone and determined that some changes will need to be made to the Guidelines, thereby necessitating a revision to the standard. The TS-GRD will submit the full review package in fall 2016.

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

July 2016

The Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) has had a very 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 2015-July 2016.

A major focus of the committee over the past year has been revising the current education offerings for DACS, led by an Education Team chaired by Elise Dunham with Maureen Callahan, Cynthia Harbeson, Adrien Hilton and Susan Luftschein as members. This project began by identifying content in the current day-long *Introduction to DACS* seminar that could be improved and better delivered as discrete online webinars. Volunteers were solicited to help develop content for these short videos, and members of the Education Team collaborated with these volunteers to revise content as necessary. The ongoing work of this team also includes a revision of the current day-long *Introduction to DACS* with overhauled exercises focusing on applying DACS rules in a collaborative and interactive environment.

Another major accomplishment this year was transitioning DACS to a version control system in order to improve transparency of the revision process, manage actual revisions more robustly, and provide content that can be easily serialized to multiple formats for presentation online or in print. This work, which was done by Adriane Hanson and Hillel Arnold, involved migrating DACS content to Markdown and placing it under version control in [Github](#), as well as creating documentation regarding the overall revision process, converting Markdown to other formats, and how to use Github to suggest changes or comment on an existing change proposal.

The committee also completed a minor revision to the Preface of DACS to [remove mention of a companion website](#), which was initially conceived as an effort to provide additional guidance to the archival community about the application of DACS rules, a need the committee felt was better met with a revision of education offerings as described above. Additional change proposals to add or amend existing crosswalks are in progress.

TS-DACS also provided comment on several changes to companion standards, proposals and tools, including revisions to RDA, a proposal from NARA regarding authorized forms of names, and a requirements document for development of the ArchivesSpace public interface.

The committee has also convened an advisory discussion group to assist TS-DACS in determining the need for a systematic review of the DACS Principles.

Society of American Archivists Representative to American Library Association (ALA) Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) and the MARC Advisory Committee (MAC) Annual Report 2015-2016

The semi-annual meetings of CC:DA and MAC were held as part of the ALA Annual meetings in Orlando, Florida from June 24-27, 2016. The meetings discussed the ongoing changes to *Resource Description and Access* (RDA) and the MARC format, many of which focused on shifting these standards for greater compatibility with linked data principles. At CC:DA this included discussion on the development of the FRBR-LRM model, while MAC reviewed a number of proposals and discussion papers for methods of inserting URIs into bibliographic and authority data and improving machine-actionability. With the completion of this meeting cycle MAC is now on hiatus, while CC:DA is preparing to review constituency proposals in preparation for the upcoming meetings of the RDA Steering Committee (RSC) in November.

As always, only a portion of the agenda items at CC:DA and MAC were directly aimed at archival practice. Still, there were a number of proposals that may impact the description of archival materials and that should be considered by SAA technical subcommittees associated with descriptive standards. A summary of these proposals is provided below, as well as a list of other CC:DA and MAC actions.

MAC

Expanding Country of Producing Entity List

The committee considered a proposal by the Online Visual Catalogers (OLAC) to expand the definition of the 257 field in the Bibliographic format to include autonomous regions in addition to independent countries (see <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-04.html>). While the committee was sympathetic to the need for this change, the British Library representative suggested that including regions under the label autonomous could lead to political complications for national libraries using this field. Based on the

discussion, the proposal was not approved and OLAC will revise the proposal before it is resubmitted for a future meeting.

The decision to reject the proposal at this time maintains current practice for film archives, though it remains an issue to monitor.

Defining X47 Fields for Events

This proposal by OCLC sought to establish a means of recording event-based terms separately from subject terms in a series of new X47 fields (see <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-05.html>). This proposal was primarily aimed at refining the FAST vocabulary, and the representative of the Library of Congress reiterated that due to other priorities this change will not be implemented in the Library of Congress Subject Headings list in the foreseeable future. The committee accepted this proposal as written.

While this change will not affect most archives, those using the FAST vocabulary should anticipate changes in term values to X47 values in the future.

Indicating Punctuation in the MARC Authority Format

The committee reviewed a proposal by the German National Library recommending the addition of a single byte indicator in the Leader 18 position to indicate whether punctuation is present in headings (see <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-10.html>). This request was based on existing usage in German-language authority files, and included a provision for blank values to allow backward-compatibility. The proposal was approved by the committee.

The inclusion of an indicator value for punctuation may simplify the transformation of archival authority record content to the MARC Authority format, if it should become necessary.

Recording Definitions in the MARC Authority Format

The committee reviewed another proposal by the German National Library calling for the creation of field 677 for recording definitions (see <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-12.html>). While there was some continued discussion about using indicators values to allow the reuse of the existing 678 or 680 fields instead, the agreed with the proposal that the establishment of a separate field would be the best solution and approved the change with the addition of a subfield \$u to the field definition.

The decision to record definitions independently from the Historical Note (MARC Authorities field 678) maintains current practice for archivists recording this information in library authority records.

Recording Relationships as URIs

This discussion paper by the British Library, developed in conjunction with the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, recommended the redefinition of subfield \$4 in the 371, 4XX, 5XX, and 7XX fields in the Authority format to allow the recording of the URI for a relator term. Similar changes to the 1XX, 6XX, and 7XX fields were also requested (see <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp17.html>). While the proposed changes would affect a large number of fields, Sally McCallum of the Library of Congress recommended that solutions for recording URIs should be consistent across the MARC

format and should not be field-specific. It is expected that this paper will return again to the committee as another discussion paper.

This proposal is indicative of the growing interest within the library community in preparing for the migration from MARC to a linked data format. Archives should remain cognizant of such changes in order to ensure compatibility between archival and library transmission formats.

URIs in MARC

The committee also considered a proposal by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, made in conjunction with the British Library, to remove the parenthetical "(uri)" prefix in the MARC 21 Authority, Bibliographic, and Holdings formats (see <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp18.html>). The use of such prefixes is common in the MARC formats, as subfield \$0 allows a number of control numbers to be recorded. However, the proposal contended that URIs include their own prefix (i.e., "http://"), and that this secondary prefix was unnecessary. It is anticipated that the removal of this prefix requirement would simplify the transformation of MARC data into linked data, though data inconsistency may also lead to additional record processing. Based on the discussion it was determined to convert the paper into a proposal, which was then approved by the committee.

As with the previous discussion paper, this change was made to improve compatibility with linked data conventions. Archival standards should continue to monitor the adoption of this model by the library community to ensure compatibility between these communities' standards.

Other Issues

Other items discussed in the committee with a lesser impact on archival descriptive practice included:

- Clarifying the definition of subfield \$k and expanding the scope of field 046 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This proposal submitted by the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) recommended modification of the definition of the 046 field to allow more consistent recording of date information in the 046 field. This proposal, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-03.html>, was approved by the committee with minor revisions.
- Defining field 347 (Digital File Characteristics) in the MARC 21 Holdings format. This proposal was put forward by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, and called for the introduction of a new field to record file characteristics for individual items. This proposal is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-06.html>, and was accepted by the committee.
- Defining subfield \$3 in field 382 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This proposal by the Music Library Association requested the addition of a subfield \$3 to allow catalogers to indicate the portion of a musical work to which the medium

- of performance terms apply. This proposal is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016-07.html>, and was approved by the committee.
- Redefining code values in field 008/20 (Format of Music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This proposal, also by the Music Library Association, called for revisions to the definitions of four code values and the addition of a value for piano scores. This proposal is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-08.html>, and was approved by the committee.
 - Recording distributor number for music and moving image materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This proposal was submitted jointly by the Music Library Association and the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC), and called for revisions to definitions in the 028 and 037 fields to reduce ambiguity in recording distributor numbers. This proposal, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-09.html>, was approved by the committee.
 - Designating matching information in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. This proposal was submitted by the German National Library, and called for the creation of field 885 to record the status of matches between records in a merged authority system. This proposal, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-11.html>, was approved with some amendments by the committee.
 - Designation of the type of entity in the MARC 21 Authority format. Another proposal by the German National Library called for the creation of a new field 075 for recording controlled terms, as well as term codes, control numbers, and code term source. The proposal, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-13.html>, was approved with limited amendments by the committee.
 - Adding subfield \$0 to fields 257 and 377 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format and field 377 in the MARC 21 Authority format. This discussion paper was submitted by the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, and called for the addition of subfield \$0 to these fields to allow links to be recorded as URIs. Based on the discussion in the committee, the paper was converted into a proposal and approved. The original discussion paper is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp19.html>.

- Recording temporary sublocation and temporary shelving location in the MARC 21 Holdings format. The discussion paper from OCLC called for the addition of a subfield \$k in the 87X fields and the redefinition of subfield \$l for temporary shelf locations. It was recommended that OCLC check the alignment of this proposed use with current data before moving forward. The discussion paper received a favorable response, and will move forward as a proposal at a future meeting. The full paper is available at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp20.html>.
- Defining subfields \$e and \$4 in field 752 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This discussion paper from the ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section called for the addition of subfields for recording relator terms as controlled vocabulary terms and as term codes. The paper, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp21.html>, was converted to a proposal and approved.
- Defining a new subfield in field 340 to record color content in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This discussion paper submitted by the Art Libraries Society of North America called for the addition of a new subfield (potentially subfield \$g) for recording information about color. The paper was well received and should move forward as a proposal at a future meeting. The full paper is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp22.html>.
- Adding subfields \$b and \$2 to field 567 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This discussion paper submitted by the National Library of Finland requested the addition of new subfields for recording controlled terms and term source codes for the Methodology Note field. While there were some concerns about recording controlled terms in a 5XX field, the committee was generally favorable to the proposal. The full paper is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp23.html>.
- Define a code to indicate the omission of non-ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This discussion paper by OCLC and the Program for Cooperative Cataloging requested the addition of a term value for cases where a record may not include ISBD-compliant internal punctuation, and punctuation is not included at the end of a subfield. This paper, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp24.html>, was converted into a proposal and approved.
- Extending the encoding level in the MARC 21 Authority format. This follow-up discussion paper, based on the earlier 2016-DP16, called for the expansion of Leader 17 and 042 fields to accommodate an encoding-level vocabulary used by

the German integrated authority file. After some discussion it was determined that this could be accommodated with existing subfields in the 024 field, and the paper was withdrawn. The full paper is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp25.html>.

- Designating a norm or standard used for Romanization in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This paper by the German National Library suggested three different methods of recording the method of transliteration used, either on a record-wide or field-specific basis. However, concerns were raised about the compatibility of these approaches with linked data structures, and it was recommended that the DNB work with Library of Congress to develop a replacement discussion paper. The original paper is available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp26.html>.
- General field linking with subfield \$8 in the five MARC 21 formats. His discussion paper from the German National Library called for the addition of a consistent, general designation for subfield \$8 in all applicable fields and formats. While two options were provided, but at the request of the British Library and the Biblioteca Nacional de España the second option was preferred. This paper, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp27.html>, was converted to a proposal and approved using Option 2.
- Using a classification record control number as a link in the MARC 21 Bibliographic format. This discussion paper from the German National Library explored methods of linking Bibliographic format records to classification number records as well as other authority records. Two options were provided in the paper, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp28.html>, though the committee preferred the first option. This paper will return as a proposal at a future committee meeting.
- Defining new subfields \$i, \$3, and \$4 in field 370 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. This paper was submitted by the ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee and proposed adding subfields to clarify the relationship between an associated place to the materials described. This paper, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp29.html>, will be revised a resubmitted as a proposal at an upcoming committee meeting.
- Defining new subfields \$i and \$4 in field 386 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats. This discussion paper was also put forward by the ALCTS Subject Analysis Committee, and called for the addition of these subfields to clarify the relationship between the terms used and resource being described. The

discussion paper, available online at <https://www.loc.gov/marc/mac/2016/2016-dp30.html>, will also be submitted as a proposal at a future committee meeting.

CC:DA

Flexibility in Creating Variant Access Points

This proposal by the ALA Representative to the RSC recommended a number of changes to RDA chapters 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11 to allow greater flexibility in the creation of variant access points. While many catalogers have followed earlier guidelines under AACR2, RDA includes a number of provisions reducing options for formulating variant names. This proposal called for the elimination of these limitations, and there was general agreement in the committee that such changes would be beneficial in addressing researcher needs. The proposal was recommended by the committee for RSC action.

FRBR-LRM Review

The other main activity by CC:DA during the past six months was a review of the FRBR-LRM draft. A task force had been established following ALA Midwinter, and I served as a member of that group. Comments were then gathered from task force members, reviewed, and an official response submitted on behalf of CC:DA. Unfortunately, many of my comments were left out of the official response which focused on library concerns. I was able to submit my comments to the FRBR-LRM review group, though, and hope to receive a response from that group once their review is complete. The call for comments was also distributed to the Archives and Archivists (A&A) listserv, but it is unknown whether and how many comments were submitted by archivists during the comment period.

Updates from Other Organizations

As part of their meetings, CC:DA also receives a number of reports from other organizations and representatives, including the ALA Representative to the JSC, the Library of Congress, and the RSC. Some points of interest to archivists from these reports include the following:

- The RSC chair, Gordon Dunsire, reported on preliminary work being undertaken by that group to plan the revision of RDA to accommodate the FRBR-LRM. Many of these changes are meant to improve compatibility with linked data applications, as well as internationalization. The group is also working on developing methods for implementing local application profiles for the standard. He also reported that efforts to establish an Archives Working Group have been delayed, but that he hoped one could be created prior to the November RSC meetings.
- The Library of Congress reported on its BIBFRAME pilot, which was completed prior to the ALA meetings. The response from catalogers was generally positive, with many requesting to continue working in BIBFRAME after the pilot ended. A

new pilot using the BIBFRAME 2.0 vocabulary is being planned for the coming year.

Other Issues

A number of other proposals and discussion items with lesser impact on archival practice were addressed at the CC:DA meetings. These included the following:

- A proposal by the American Association of Law Libraries to clarify the guidelines for establishing access points for laws governing more than one jurisdiction (RDA 6.29.1.3).
- A proposal by the Online Audiovisual Catalogers (OLAC) to create a controlled vocabulary for regional encoding of optical discs (RDA 3.19.6).

Respectfully submitted,
Cory Nimer, SAA Representative to CC:DA and MAC

Appendix 6

Title: External Representative to NISO Annual Report

Date: 06-17-2016

Representative(s): Genevieve Preston

Summary of Activities

NISO sent 6 ballots to the advisory group for voting. Of the 6 ballots sent, 5 of these related to archives, or archival practices.

Completed projects/activities:

6 ballots reviewed and voted

Ongoing projects/activities:

Systematic Review of ISO16175-1, 16175-2, 16175-3 Principles and functional requirements of records in electronic office environments.

New projects/activities:

No new projects to report

Initiatives associated with the 2014-2018 Strategic Plan:

Goal 3:

3.1. Identify the need for new standards, guidelines, and best practices and lead or participate in their development.

3.3. Participate actively in relevant partnerships and collaborations to enhance professional knowledge.

Questions/concerns for Council attention: None at this time.