

Standards Committee Report  
2005-06

Membership:

Nancy Kunde, Chair

Marcy Flynn (2005-2008)

Steven Mandeville-Gamble (2005-2008)

Susan Potts McDonald (2004-2007)

Aprille Cooke McKay (2006-2009)

John Murphy (2006-2009)

Donna Wells (2004-2007)

Kris Kiesling, *ex-officio*

Mary Lacy, *ex-officio*

Kathleen Dow, *ex-officio*

*Technical Subcommittee on Descriptive Standards*

Chris Prom, *Chair*

Chatham Ewing

Michael Rush

Kelcy Shepherd

Adrian Turner

Michael Fox, *ex-officio*

Susan Hamburger, *ex-officio*

Kris Kiesling, *ex-officio*

Mario Robert, *ex-officio*

Ann Salter, *ex-officio*

*EAD Roundtable Liaison:*

Kate Bowers

2005-06 was a very active year for the Standards Committee. A wide variety of activities and projects are reflected in the subcommittee reports included in this report. Dedicated SAA members represent their profession on a wide variety of standards development and review groups. They are to be commended for their service and hard work.

**General Comments:**

This has been a transitional year. The chair came on board both as a new committee member and as chair. Nancy McGovern, past chair, provided excellent assistance to Nancy Kunde and helped greatly in the transition.

The desire for a more proactive standards development role for the Committee has been mentioned by several individuals. The increasing urgency of managing electronic records makes this an ideal time to pursue a more proactive role for the Committee. Doing so, however, does come with some needs and costs. Developing standards is time consuming and takes dedicated volunteers and staff time to make it happen.

### **Standards Reviewed or ballot cast on behalf of SAA in 2005-06 :**

- Z39.87 Data Dictionary –Technical Metadata for Digital Still Images. June 06 Affirmative ballot cast with NISO
- ISO/DIS 25577 MarcXchange /XML standard
- ISO 5127:2001 Information and document vocabulary
- ISO 832 Abbreviation Rules

### **Proposed Standards:**

\* ISO TC 46 “Requirements for long-term preservation of electronic records.” Supplied comments o the outline.

### **Vision Statement-Memo of Understanding with ARMA International:**

This Statement was drafted by Nancy Kunde and Larry Medina, Chair of the ARMA International Standards Development Committee in December of 2005 following a conference call of both ARMA and SAA leadership to talk about collaboration between the two organizations on standards.

Upon reviewing the proposed Vision Statement, the leaderships of both SAA and ARMA have decided to re-craft the draft document higher level agreement between the two organizations. The proposed Vision Statement is included with this report. The SAA Standards Committee at their August 2006 meeting in Washington DC passed a motion supporting the statement.

### **Proposed activities / projects for 2006-07:**

- \* EAC Collaborative project with ICA
- \* Archival Standards for Archival facilities
- \* Review Process for DACS
- \* Complete a pilot phase of the standards, best practices portal project.

*Sub committee reports included: These reports contain a wealth of information about standards and best practice developments.*

- TSDS-Technical Subcommittee on Descriptive Standards-Chris Prom
- MARBI-Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information-Kris Kiesling
- CC:DA –ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

Also included though not a formal part of the subcommittee reports is an update on the Archives Toolkit prepared by Brad Westbrook.

Respectfully Submitted by Nancy Kunde, Chair, SAA Standards Committee



www.mcd.unt.edu. Work to be completed before the end of the project in August 2006 includes:

- identifying commonly used elements in records representing different
- comparing those commonly used elements to the PCC recommended core records
- examining Tom Delsey's mapping of MARC 21 fields/subfields to the FRBR user tasks in light of the findings from the research
- working on a database that will include historical data about the changes in content designation available since 1972

The study's research results and implications will be presented in a program at the 2007 ALA Annual meeting.

There were few proposals and discussion papers before the Committee that are of direct interest to the archival community. Most had to do with the addition of coded information for specific cataloging communities, the conversion of records between UNICODE and MARC8, and changes to authority and holdings records. Anyone interested in the full minutes of the MARBI meetings can go to <http://www.loc.gov/marc/marbi/minutes/minutes.html>.

#### Standardized terminology for access restrictions in 506 (Proposal 2006-03)

A Registry of Digital Masters was defined by the Digital Library Federation in a set of functional requirement documents in 2001. The Registry became available in OCLC in 2004 and is gradually being populated. Among the original tenets of the Registry is that a registering institution must be committed to preserving the digital object for the long term and that a digital copy must be publicly available, although the public copy need not necessarily be free.

It has become clear that some constituencies are only interested in records for materials that have free public copies, while other constituencies want to track all digital materials, even if there are fees involved or if a single resource can only be accessed as part of a large licensed set. Because of this, Digital Registry participants recently agreed to broaden the scope of the registry by allowing records for digital materials without access copies, provided that registry records carry clear, machine-identifiable indications of when access is open to the public or restricted and whether it is restricted to a limited user group, for a period of time, or indefinitely.

The Committee approved the proposal, making it possible to place machine-readable standardized codes in subfield f of the 506 field to enable users to narrow searches to publicly available digital copies.

#### Data elements needed to ascertain copyright facts (Discussion Paper 2006-DP04)

When users want to make use of a digital resource, they have to know certain facts to assess the copyright status of the work in order to make a reasonable judgment about what use is allowed. As older and unpublished materials that were previously housed in archives and were not generally accessible are made readably available online, questions about use and reuse of these materials has become common. This is especially difficult to resolve as resources are accessed outside the context of the originating archive, and therefore some or all of the information about creation and ownership may be lost. Part of the service that digital libraries can and should provide is to aid users to understand what uses they can make of the materials the library makes available. It is labor intensive to gather information needed to determine copyright status and to

encode it in the record. Adding such information to the record would be optional; providing a way to do this allows for recording it when it is available.

The Committee discussed two options: 1) the possible addition of a new data element to hold detailed copyright information and, 2) the addition of sixteen new subfields to the existing 540 field (Terms governing use and reproduction note). The subfields would include name of creator, copyright holder contact information, copyright and copyright renewal dates, copyright status, and publication status, among others. This copyright information is not intended to be maintained over the life of the digital object. Copyright status in the US would not be the same as that in other countries. Some Committee members thought it would be misleading to put information about the copyright of a digital object that would change over time into a MARC record, and asked the writers of the discussion paper, California Digital Library, to come back with another discussion paper for the Midwinter 2007 meeting.

Kris Kiesling  
SAA Liaison to MARBI

July 24, 2006

**Report to Standards Committee, Technical Subcommittee on Descriptive Standards, from Society of American Archivists from SAA liaison to American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA)**

Name of reporter:

Mary Lacy

Affiliation:

Manuscript Division, Library of Congress

Role:

SAA liaison to CC:DA

Subject of report:

CC:DA activities at ALA Midwinter meeting in San Antonio, Tex., Jan. 20-23, 2006, and at ALA Annual meeting in New Orleans, La., June 23-26, 2006 relevant to development of *Resource Description and Access* (RDA) which will replace the *Anglo-American Cataloging Code*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (AACR2); responses of the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC); and constituency responses throughout the 2005/2006 period

Action required:

FYI; comments have been sought for draft of Part I of *Resource Description and Access* RDA and reported to CC:DA. Comments are currently sought for draft of Chapter 6-7 (formerly Part II) of *Resource Description and Access* (RDA) and reported to CC:DA

Summary:

The American Library Association's Cataloging Committee on Description and Access (CC:DA) met in January 2006 in San Antonio for three meetings featuring review of Part I of RDA, released for constituency review and public comment in December 2005. In addition to detailed discussions of this draft released by the Joint Steering Committee in December 2006, the meetings considered features of the electronic version of this document (which will still be available as a print publication), whether a concise version of RDA would be released, and consideration of training and implementation needs in conjunction with the expected release of RDA in 2008.

CC:DA met in June 2006 in New Orleans for three meetings featuring review of Chapter 6 and 7 of RDA (formerly known as Part II), which was released for constituency review and public comment in June 20, 2006. In addition to general discussions of major questions raised in this just-released draft, the meetings considered features of the electronic version of this document (which will still be available as a print publication), and revisions to the RDA Prospectus and strategic plan for RDA 2005-2008.

Comments:

In August 2005 the Library of Congress proposed the addition of archival principles and practices into RDA; the draft of Part I of AACR3, released for review in December 2004, had been ill-received in general and incorporated the outdated rules for describing manuscripts from AACR2, which LC then proposed to replace with rules derived from DA:CS, the US archival descriptive standard. As liaison I contacted the TSDS subcommittee and members of the Description Section steering committee for their response to the LC proposal. Chris Prom formulated a formal response from SAA based on discussions among TSDS members. Three alternatives were offered: 1. Entirely removing all rules for treatment of manuscript and archival material and pointing to DA:CS, ISAD-G, etc. 2. Including an unambiguous statement and pointers to international/national archival standards, but retaining AACR2 Chapter 4 rules for catalogers wishing to control manuscripts bibliographically, and 3. Pointers to archival standards plus replacing chapter 4 rules with DACS/ISAD-G compatible rules. While TSDS preferred option 1, JSC members (based on feedback from other national organizations and libraries) at their meeting October 2005 decided to pursue a more modest version of option 3, incorporating basic archival practices (but not principles) for the benefit of generalist catalogers who seldom have the need to consult DACS et.al. Detailed information on the outcomes of the JSC meeting can be found at <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0510out.html>, with specific discussion of archival and manuscript resources.

In December 2005 the Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) released a

draft of Part I of RDA, on formulating bibliographic description. This draft was made available for public review; a listserv for informal discussions on RDA was established and a web form for public comments created (SAA members were to comment via the SAA liaison to CC:DA; these comments are incorporated into the ALA response). Chapter 3, dealing with technical description, was not released until January 16, as it awaited completion of the Task Force on Special Material Designators / General Material Designators (SMD/GMD), which released its preliminary report at the end of December. These documents were not discussed at ALA but are being reviewed as well during February 2006.

During February 2006 TSDS members and Description Steering Committee members contributed comments towards an SAA response to these sections; concerns included provisions for recording undated material and the use of square brackets with such conventions; minor rewording of the definition of "finding aid"; and renaming the "provenance" section as "custodial history and immediate source of acquisition." These comments were compiled February 14, and incorporated into ALA's response to the draft submitted to JSC March 20.

The JSC met in April 2006 to discuss comments received from the constituency review of part I (Resource Description) and other aspects of RDA. The outcome of the meeting is available at <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0604out.html>. RDA will now be structured in two parts: part A, which incorporates former part I (resource description) and part II (relationships), and part B (access point control), which covers elements traditionally recorded in authority records. This change will align RDA with other resource description communities where "description" encompasses resource discovery as well as identification. The introduction and general guidelines of part A will integrate those written for parts I and II. Full details of the new structure are outlined in a revised prospectus, which was issued in mid-June 2006 in conjunction with the release of part A-II (former part II) for constituency review June 20. It is available at <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadraftch6-7.html>.

Comments on the RDA draft are being sought by the SAA liaison to CC:DA and should be received no later than August 10. Archivists should note that this draft calls for access points to be created for family names. JSC is interested in whether or not to attempt to differentiate family names, and particularly how family names are handled in other international standards for archival material; these issues will be addressed in Part B, the draft of which should be available for comment in December 2006.

JSC has decided to make additional documents available to the public that previously could be viewed only by JSC constituencies. These documents provide useful background to the RDA drafts. For instance, the American Library Association's (ALA) response to the RDA part I draft can now be seen at <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/ann0512.html#rda1>, where other CC:DA announcements and reports regarding RDA at ALA are available.

Other JSC decisions of note are to provide a mapping of RDA elements to MARC21; to create high-level elements (e.g., "title" and "publication information"); to clarify relationships among repeatable elements; to provide additional levels of numbering to paragraphs in the guidelines; to label rule options better; and to indicate clearly whether each element is required, required if applicable, or optional.

A prototype of the electronic version of RDA is now available for public review online at <http://www.rdaonline.org/>; an evaluation survey is included at the conclusion of the demonstration.

#### Actions taken:

- \* Links to RDA Part I and supplementary RDA information distributed to TSDS, DS, and Archives listserv December 2005
- \* Review of RDA Part I draft by Standards Committee and Description Section steering committee members (comments received were compiled and posted to CC:DA February 7; additional comments on Chapter 3 and SMD/GMD to be submitted to CC:DA February 14. ALA will formulate its response to these documents by March 20.
- \* Review of RDA Part I draft by Standards Committee and Description Section steering committee members (comments received were compiled and posted to CC:DA February 7; additional comments on Chapter 3 and SMD/GMD to be submitted to CC:DA February 14. ALA will formulate its response to these documents by March 20.
- \* Draft of Chapters 6-7, released for constituency review in June 2006; comments due August 2006
- \* The next meeting of the JSC will be October 2006 in Washington, D.C. The draft of Part B should be released December 2006.

#### Time line of major events:

Dec. 2004:	JSC releases draft of Part I of AACR3 for constituency review
January 2005:	CC:DA meetings at ALA
Jan.-Feb. 2005:	Comments on Part I draft gathered from SAA Standards Committee and SAA Description Section; incorporated into ALA response
April 2005:	JSC meets, scraps AACR3 in favor of <i>Resource Discovery and Access</i> ; proposes new outline based on descriptive elements
June 2005:	CC:DA meetings and programs at ALA
July 2005:	LC proposes archival concepts, principles, rules, and examples (primarily based on DACS) to include in RDA
Sept.12, 2005:	Comments on LC proposal for archival description received from SAA constituency
Oct. 2005:	JSC meeting in London; major decisions on RDA Part I content
Dec. 2005:	JSC releases draft of Part I of RDA for constituency review
Jan.-Feb. 2006:	Responses due to CC:DA on draft of RDA Part I
24-28 April 2006:	JSC meeting Ottawa, Canada
June-Sept. 2006	Responses due to draft of RDA Part II (now Part A, Chapters 6-7)

Dec. 2006-Jan. 2007 Responses due to draft of RDA Part III (now Part B)  
2008 Publication of RDA

For further information consult:

1. From AACR3 to RDA: Executive Summary":  
<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/rda0506.pdf>
2. Outcomes of JSC meeting, London, U.K., 10-14 October 2006  
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0510out.html>
3. Outcomes of JSC meeting, Ottawa, Canada, 24-28 April 2006:  
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0604out.html>
4. Public website for CC:DA: <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/index.html>
5. Public website for JSC on RDA: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rda.html>
6. Public website for JSC working documents:  
<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/working1.html>
7. RDA prototype: <http://www.rdaonline.org/>

**Appendix: Documents up for constituency review as of July 2006:****Deadline: July 28****5JSC RDA Part I Sec follow-up RDA Part I, Constituency Review of December 2005 draft, response table**<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/docs/5rda-part1-secfolup.pdf>.**Deadline: July 31****5JSC/ALA/to come List of Specialist Cataloging Manuals**

ALA offered, in its response to the draft of part I, to develop a proposal to provide a list of specialist cataloging manuals to be listed in the 3rd paragraph of RDA 0.1.1.1. The deadline for comments in Confluence is July 31. The deadline for submission of the proposal to JSC is August 7th.

**Deadline: Aug. 10****Comments on 5JSC RDA Part A Chapters 6-7**

To be compiled Aug. 7-13

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdadraftch6-7.html>.**Deadline: Aug. 28** (please submit a few days early)**5JSC LC 5 rev Internationalization**

ALA response is due by September 18.

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/working2.html#lc-5>**Deadline: Aug. 28**(please submit a few days early)**5JSC LC 7 Breton articles**

ALA response is due by September 18

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/working2.html#lc-7>**Deadline: Aug. 28** (please submit a few days early)**5JSC LC 8 Bible headings**

ALA response is due by September 18

<http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/working2.html#lc-8>**Deadline: Sept. 4** (please submit a few days early)**5JSC ACOC 1 rev ACOC revision (URLs)** due by August 7.

ALA response is due by September 18.

**Deadline: Sept. 4** (please submit a few days early)**5JSC RDA Part A Chapter 3, sections JSC document** to arrive by August 7

ALA response is due by September 18

**Deadline: Sept. 4** (please submit a few days early)**5JSC ACOC to come Maori initial articles;** expected in August.

ALA response is due by September 18.

*A Statement of Shared Vision and Collaboration on Records and Information Management Standards Development*  
Final Draft March 2006

## **Shared Vision**

The Association of Records Managers and Administrators, ARMA International, and the Society of American Archivists, SAA, the two recognized associations whose core mission relates to the identification, appraisal, maintenance, retention, disposition, and preservation of records and recorded information, acknowledge the need for a collaborative strategy on standards and best practice development. Standards, best practices, and guidelines are all frequently noted by records professionals as much needed resources, particularly in the realm of electronic records management, ERM. It seems logical and mutually beneficial that where applicable, development of standards be approached collaboratively by ARMA International and SAA. By collaboratively approaching the development of standards and best practices, the most up-to-date thinking and research in both fields can be brought to bear on complex records issues and the best strategies and guidance developed to address them.

It is recognized that aspects of both professions are being redefined, re-invented as digital recordkeeping becomes commonplace. Through the development of standards and best practices, the records professions of archives and records management will be better armed to meet the challenges accompanying this redefining process.

ARMA and SAA hereby acknowledge a shared vision with regard to standards and best practice development. The goals of this shared vision include:

- identifying what emerging standards topics are most relevant
- sharing talent and resources in the standards development and review processes
- establishing a formal communication system between the two association's standards bodies and leadership on standards topics
- facilitating joint action when necessary in response to standards proposed by outside entities
- collaborating with other information management disciplines to strengthen the application of archival and records management practices and principles
- developing uniformity in standards that reflect the very best knowledge and research in both fields, and
- ultimately, developing a collaborative approach to standards development process in those areas in which substantial benefit to both professions can be achieved. It is recognized, however, that there is a need for the two standards committees to exist as autonomous bodies and to also develop work product as discreet entities.

## **A Collaborative Strategy for Standards Development**

To facilitate the above vision statement, ARMA International and SAA will use the following methods:

- The chairs of the ARMA Standards Development Committee and the SAA Standards Committee will be ex-officio members of each other's committees.
- Biannually, the two standards chairs will share a list of proposed standards projects and identify those that would benefit by a collaborative development. This list should be shared with the presidents of each association, executive directors, and other appropriate individuals within each association.
- ARMA and SAA will collaborate on the development of a standards website that will provide a searchable resource for records professionals on current standards, standards in development, and proposed standards, and other available publications and resources. This will involve the identification of a host web site, funds to ensure the continued viability of the resource, methods and access strategies to ensure greatest usability of the resource.
- ARMA and SAA will develop a process for marketing, publicizing, and promoting standards and best practices.
- ARMA and SAA will work with their educational committees and other appropriate bodies to make archival and records management educators aware of standards and identify ways to make standards available to them and their students.
- ARMA and SAA will identify communication channels that will support collaborative standards development activities; sharing of committee membership lists, establishing a standards listserv, a common website (see above), establishing a pool of experts on standards topics including potential authors of standards and best practices, and other tools as necessary to support the collaborative process.
- On an annual basis, the chairs of the ARMA and SAA standards committees along with members of the leadership of both associations will hold a conference call with the leadership of other related standards bodies, such as ALA and AIIM, to share information about proposed projects and seek the exchange of expertise.
- Annually, a report on collaborative standards development activities will be prepared by the two chairs and shared with the governing bodies of each; SAA Council, ARMA International Board of Directors.

Prepared by Nancy Kunde, University Of Wisconsin Madison Records Officer Chair of the SAA Standards Committee and Member of the ARMA Standards Development Committee, and Larry Medina, Senior Records Administrator, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Chair of the ARMA International Standards Development Committee. March 30, 2006