

**Society of American Archivists  
Standards Committee  
Annual Report 2008-2009**

**Membership**

Polly Reynolds, Chair (2008-2010)  
James Cassedy (2008-2011)  
Kate Colligan (2007-2010)  
Chatham Ewing (2008-2011)  
Aprille McKay (2006-2009)  
John Murphy (2006-2009)  
Sibyl Schaefer (2008-2011)  
Lisa Carter, *Ex Officio*  
Kathleen Dow, *Ex Officio*  
Kris Kiesling, *Ex Officio*  
Michael Rush, *Ex Officio*  
Edward Ryan, *Ex Officio*  
Lisa Weber, *Ex Officio*  
Nancy Kunde, Immediate Past Chair  
Margery Sly, Council Liaison  
Autumn Reinhardt Simpson, Intern (2008-2009)

**New members**

Laura Drake Davis (2009-2012)  
Cory Nimer (2009-2012)  
Sharry Watson, replacing Gerald Stone as a TSDS (now Standards Committee) Ex Officio

I would like to give special thanks to Nancy Kunde, the immediate past chair of the Standards Committee. Nancy was willing to help transition me to the chair position and I am extremely grateful for all of her help and advice. Nancy was the driving force behind the initial idea to review and revise the Standards Committee's mission. Her hard work and dedication to this project while chair allowed us to quickly and easily move forward and finish what she began. I only hope that we have fulfilled her extraordinary vision. Thanks also to Autumn Reinhardt Simpson, our 2008-2009 intern. Autumn was extremely hardworking and we were happy to have her help, especially during this busy year. Finally, I would also like to extend a very big thank you to Margery Sly and Mike Rush for their assistance with the Standards Committee's project to review and revise our mission and procedures. Margery and Mike graciously read all of the drafts and provided invaluable support and advice. We could not have completed this major revision without their help.

## COMPLETED PROJECTS/ACTIVITIES

### **Endorsements**

The Standards Committee endorsed two sessions for the 2009 annual meeting: “More Than Just Passing Acquaintances: DACS and Companion Standards” (William E. Landis, Chair) and ““The Whole World is Watching””: Contextual Information in Descriptive Systems with EAC-CPF” (Katherine M. Wisser, Chair). The Program Committee accepted both proposals and both were presented at the 2009 conference.

### **Facilities Guidelines**

In fall 2008, the Standards Committee contributed comments on the final draft of *Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers* during the comment solicitation period. In January 2009, the Standards Committee unanimously recommended to Council that the *Facilities Guidelines* be adopted as an SAA Standard. SAA Council officially approved the *Facilities Guidelines* as a standard on February 27, 2009.

### **Orphaned Works: Statement of Best Practices**

In January 2009, SAA Council recommended that the Working Group on Intellectual Property contact the Standards Committee to discuss whether their completed document, *Orphaned Works: Statement of Best Practices* go through the standards process or be submitted directly to SAA Council. The IPWG felt strongly that the document was not a standard. Furthermore, since the Standards Committee was in the middle of revising its mission and procedures and the IPWG wanted the document publicized as soon as possible, the document was forwarded to SAA Council. Council adopted the document as SAA’s first official best practice. The timely appearance of this project and others like it certainly helped the Standards Committee define its scope during our “re-mission” project. In light of the emergence of projects like this one, the Standards Committee has proposed overseeing best practices in addition to standards as part of their new charge.

## ONGOING PROJECTS/ACTIVITIES

### **Review and Revision of the Standards Committee’s Mission and Procedures**

The most time and dedication this year was devoted to the revision of the Standards Committee’s mission and procedures. This year we made revisions based on last year’s research, survey results, and discussions.

Over the course of the year, the Standards Committee submitted several reports to Council. The first report in January 2009 proposed that the Standards Committee be a more active committee and requested permission to move forward in revising our mission and procedures. Council agreed that the Standards Committee should be more active and urged the Standards Committee to make the necessary changes to the mission and procedures to reflect this vision. The August 2009 report included revisions of all of the major Standards Committee documents and procedures as well as new procedures. Some of the major changes proposed:

#### Areas of Responsibility:

- In addition to standards, the Standards Committee would oversee best practices (but not thesauri.)

#### Structure:

- Size of the Standards Committee increased from 6 members to 9 members.
- Chair serves for two years and becomes ex officio for one year.
- Subcommittees responsible for overseeing all SAA-adopted standards.
- Development and Review teams assigned to groups working on standards projects, best practices, or other general or specific areas of concern.
- Dissolve TSDS.

#### Maintenance:

- Subcommittees monitor standard's use and application, gather ongoing comments and feedback, promote the standard, and educate on the use of the standard.
- Standards review cycle completed in 5 years with review beginning 3 years after adoption or reaffirmation.

#### Support:

- SAA staff support for Standards Committee activities.

SAA Council has asked the Standards Committee to make a few minor adjustments to the report and documents. The Standards Committee hopes to have the revisions finalized by early 2010.

### **Deaccessioning Guidelines**

In December 2008, the Acquisition and Appraisal section contacted the Standards Committee about a proposed deaccessioning standard. The Standards Committee reviewed the standards proposal and agreed that the project had merit. A group will move forward on the development of the project and the Standards Committee will keep the group abreast of any major changes to the Standards Committee procedures that might affect development. The Standards Committee and the Acquisition and Appraisal section are still in the process of determining whether the proposal would be more appropriate as a standard or a best practice.

### **Functions Thesaurus**

The Functions Thesaurus was another project that helped the Standards Committee determine its area of coverage during the remission process. A few years ago, SAA Council forwarded the Functions Thesaurus project to the Standards Committee for review. The Functions Thesaurus Working Group (a subgroup of the Records Management Roundtable) and the Standards Committee were not sure that the functions thesaurus was technically a standard. However, no process within SAA existed for the vetting or review of such non-standards projects, thus the Standards Committee seemed to be the most appropriate liaison. The Functions Thesaurus Working Group contacted the Standards Committee again this year in order to make a final decision about the overall responsibility for the project. After much discussion, the Standards Committee decided that it would not actively oversee thesauri for several reasons. First, it is not clear whether a thesaurus should be considered a standard. Second, the maintenance and revision of a thesaurus would be more than the Standards Committee alone could

adequately handle. The Standards Committee will stay in communication with the Functions Thesaurus Working Group, but ultimate authority over the functions thesaurus project will rest with Council.

### **MOU with ARMA**

The Standards Committee hopes to continue to move forward on potential projects to work on jointly with ARMA. Margery Sly will move the MOU higher on the SAA Council agenda this year.

### **Technology Best Practices Task Force**

In February, the Technology Best Practices Task Force presented their final report to SAA Council with the recommendation that the Standards Committee “create working groups to identify common practices and best practices in focused areas of electronic records and digital asset management.” At this time, Standards Committee is not ready to continue the work of the task force until the Committee’s mission and procedures have been finalized. The Committee agreed that the development of such a working group might be more appropriate once the standards web portal has been completed.

### **DACS**

DACS has been up for review since last year but no major revision/review discussions have taken place. The working group has been concerned with process and the ongoing funds to maintain the standard. The DACS working group would like to wait for the completion of RDA before proceeding with major revisions.

### **EAD**

TSDS agreed that EAD is ready for review and revision (see TSDS report for additional details). Mike Rush, chair of TSDS, will be writing up a new charge. New members to the EAD working group (subcommittee) will also need to be appointed.

### **RDA**

The Standards Committee will continue TSDS’s work with ALA’s Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access to submit SAA’s input on RDA. Lisa Carter has stepped down as SAA’s liaison to the CC:DA; a new liaison will need to be appointed.

### **EAC**

The Standards Committee eagerly looks forward to receiving the final draft of Encoded Archival Context – Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF) from the EAC Working Group and its submission for approval as an official SAA standard.

## **NEW PROJECTS/ACTIVITIES**

### **Standards Portal**

A standards portal, an envisioned collaborative online site where current and emerging standards and best practices can be posted, has been in discussion for a number of years. SAA’s new website infrastructure will allow for the support of such a standards portal and SAA has agreed to support the portal’s development. A Standards Portal Task Force will be appointed, which will hopefully include a few Standards Committee members.

The Standards Committee intends to play a role in the development, population, and implementation of this portal.

## **DIVERSITY INITIATIVES**

### **Physical Disabilities Best Practices**

The SAA Joint Records Management Roundtable/Archives Management Roundtable Working Group on Diversity in Archives and Records Management has recently produced two documents: *Recommendations for Working with Archives Researchers with Physical Disabilities* and *Recommendations for Working with Archives Employees with Disabilities*. The Standards Committee has reviewed these documents and feels they should be developed as best practices. Once SAA Council has approved the changes to the Standards Committee's mission and procedures, the group can move forward.

Respectfully Submitted,

Polly Reynolds, Chair, 2008-2010

### **ATTACHMENTS:**

Reports from the following subgroups/liaisons are attached:

- ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (Lisa Carter, liaison)
- Canadian Committee on Archival Description (Sharry Watson, liaison)
- Encoded Archival Context (EAC) working group (Katherine Wisser, chair)
- Encoded Archival Description (EAD) working group (Kris Kiesling, chair)
- International Council on Archives Committee on Best Practices and Standards (Claire Sibille, liaison)
- National Information Standards Organization (Kathleen Dow, liaison)
- Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines (Michele Pacifico and Thomas Wilsted, co-chairs)
- Technical Subcommittee on Descriptive Standards (Michael Rush, chair)

**Report from Lisa Carter, SAA liaison to the ALA's Committee on Cataloging:  
Description and Access  
July 31, 2009**

Throughout 2008-09, the ALA Committee for Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA) advised on and contributed to the development of several descriptive standards. Complete lists of actions taken by the Committee are available from their website, <http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/>, including:

- The Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions for July 1, 2008–January 20, 2009 (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair45.pdf>) and for January 21, 2009–June 30, 2009 (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair49.pdf>)
- Minutes of the Meeting held at 2009 ALA Midwinter (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/min0901rev.pdf>)
- The Chair's Report of Strategic Comments on *Resource Description and Access* (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair46.pdf>)

Minutes from the 2009 ALA Conference Meeting (which the SAA Liaison was unable to attend) are not yet available.

**Highlights of activities undertaken by CC:DA in 2008-09 include:**

The CC:DA Task Force on the Review of Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials) (DCRM(S)), provided a report/response to the chair of the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee in July 2008.

(<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair44.pdf>) Generally, the Task Force found that this manual for cataloging rare serials is a huge improvement over what previously existed. Recommended improvements were primarily specific wording suggestions.

A CC:DA Task Force on the Review of the Proposed ISBD Area 0 was charged to review the ISBD Area 0 proposal submitted by IFLA for worldwide review. The proposal was intended to improve bibliographic control and access to resources in multiple formats and/or published in more than one physical medium. The Task Force found the proposal successful in meeting its goals but recommended some improvements which are outlined in their review (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair47.pdf>)

CC:DA also reviewed the complete draft of RDA, gathering feedback on the CC:DA wiki. A resulting report on the CC:DA's concerns and suggestions for RDA (<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/chair46.pdf>) was submitted to CCS at the end of January 2009. The report outlines RDA's most critical flaws and presents 3 recommendations for improvement (a rewrite of the draft, publisher attention to market requests and JSC objectives and retention of the advances made during the development of RDA). Detailed discussion of RDA progress took place at both ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual (minutes for Midwinter are available at

<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/min0901rev.pdf> while minutes for Annual are forthcoming). The RDA text was handed to the co-publishers on schedule on June 22, 2009. RDA is scheduled to be released at the end of November 2009. Testing of RDA (<http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/>) by twenty selected partners is to begin by the end of the year.

The CC:DA internal email discussion lists [ala-ccda] and [ccda] were merged with the public [rules] list (rules@ala.org), so that committee work can be followed openly by interested parties. Committee members have read-write privileges while non-committee member subscribers have read-only privileges on the resulting [rules] list.

CC:DA commented on a significant number (too many to list here) of ISO/NISO reviews.

**DATE:** July 23, 2009

**NAME:** Report on the Canadian Committee on Archival Description

**SOURCE:** Sharry Watson, Chair, Canadian Committee on Archival Description

**SUMMARY:** This document describes the activities of the Canadian Committee on Archival Description (CCAD), a committee of the Canadian Council of Archives, for the period of October 2008 to July 2009.

---

#### **RAD/RDDA**

After the completion of the 2008 revision of *RAD/RDDA* and the subsequent release to the archival community, CCAD's long term goal is keeping the standard compatible with current descriptive standards and access systems in an effort to meet the Committee's mandate. CCAD intends to move forward by networking with various descriptive standards-related bodies to help keep our standard current.

#### **MEETING OF EXPERTS ON DESCRIPTION**

In light of recent developments involving standards related to *RAD/RDDA* the Committee has taken pause to review the proposed Meeting of Experts on Description. Preliminary planning for Meeting of Experts took place in the 2008-2009 fiscal year. Although it has been concluded this exercise would still be relevant in the long term, the timing of such an event is in question. CCAD would like to monitor the impact and direction of recent developments in the descriptive landscape before moving forward with the Meeting of Experts on Description and any further redevelopment of our current standard.

#### **CONCISE RAD**

CCAD continues to support the development of Concise RAD by Library and Archives Canada. Concise RAD was reviewed in light of the 2008 revisions to the standard. Comments and corrections will be brought back to Library and Archives Canada.

#### **RDA**

CCAD reviewed the draft standard of RDA and provided comments to the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing.

#### **ICA-ATOM PILOT**

CCAD has supported the ICA-atom pilot project by consulting on mapping the elements from RAD and subsequent revisions to the system.



EAC Working Group report: Standards Committee, August 11, 2009

Compiled by Katherine M. Wisser, Chair, EAC Working Group

Accomplishments:

\* The EAC Working Group is releasing the schema and tag library of a gamma version prior to the annual meeting of the Society of American Archivists in Austin, August 2009. The schema release will be disseminated through an announcement on various email lists.

\* Along with this version, there will be a 90-day period where the working group seeks input from the archival community before moving the schema from Gamma to Version 1.0.

\* Two additional members were added to the working group: Lina Bountouri of Ionian University (Greece) and Karin Bredenberg, Riksarkivet (National Archives of Sweden)

\* EAC Website hosted at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin in conjunction with the Bundesarchiv

Given the challenges presented by the international character of the working group, we have conducted their work via conference calls and email list discussions. We are pleased with the schema and tag library and look forward to engaging with the larger community. We are looking for people to test the schema and provide constructive feedback so that we may release the schema as version 1.0.

The current schema is significantly different from the beta version. The working group has made a conscious decision to align the schema with ISAAR (CPF). In addition, given the advancements in XML technologies, the schema reflects a more sophisticated implementation of the standard and should prove to be robust.

In the short term future, the Working Group will be reviewing the feedback provided on the gamma version to release Version 1.0, considering next steps with EAC-CPF and beginning discussions on the creation of an EAC XML schema for ISDF that would complement EAC-CPF and EAD.

EADWG Report for TSDS  
**July 2009**

The EAD Working Group co-sponsored with OCLC Research and the SAA "EAD @ 10: A Symposium Celebrating the 10<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of Encoded Archival Description," held on 31 August 2008 in San Francisco. The morning session focused on use of EAD outside the US, and included presentations by four of the international WG members—Bill Stocking (UK), Claire Sibille (France), Angelika Menne-Haritz (Germany), and Henny van Schie (The Netherlands). In the afternoon, several individuals gave papers and then had a panel discussion about taking EAD into the future. Panelists included Kathy Wisser (UNC, Chapel Hill), Mark Matienzo (NYPL), Michelle Light (UC, Irvine), Jeanne Kramer-Smyth (U Maryland), and Mary Elings (UC, Berkeley). The discussion was facilitated by Jackie Dooley (RLG Programs, OCLC Research). Proceedings of the symposium are available in PDF and MP3 at <http://www.archivists.org/publications/proceedings/EAD@10.asp>. The symposium took the place of the EAD Working Group meeting traditionally held on the Sunday after the SAA annual meeting.

The 2002 *EAD Tag Library* is out of print, and while it has been available online since it was published, the HTML format is not conducive to printing. The SAA publications office recently released a PDF of the *Tag Library*. It is available on the EAD home page: <http://www.loc.gov/ead/>. Many thanks to Teresa Brinati for making this happen!

The WG will meet on Sunday, August 16, from 9:00-12:00. As requested by TSDS, the group will discuss potential revisions to EAD.

Kris Kiesling  
EADWG Chair

**INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL ON ARCHIVES  
CONSEIL INTERNATIONAL DES ARCHIVES**

*Committee on Best Practices and Standards / Sub-committee on archival  
description*

*Comité des normes et des bonnes pratiques / Sous-comité des normes de  
description*

**Report from Claire Sibille – de Grimoüard, SAA liaison to the ICA Committee on  
Best practices and Standards  
July 15<sup>th</sup>, 2009**

The Archives school of Marburg (Germany) hosted the annual meeting of the CBPS sub-committee on archival description, 2009, 25<sup>th</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> May. As it had been stated during the last international congress on archives at Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia), 2008, 21<sup>st</sup>-27<sup>th</sup> July, the main purpose of the meeting was to identify the needs for harmonizing the 4 ICA descriptive standards and to look at the possibility of developing a compendium explaining the relationships between ICA standards and existing or forthcoming standards such as Encoded Archival Description (EAD), Encoded Archival Context - Corporate bodies, Persons, Families (EAC-CPF), Encoded Archival Guide (EAG). Another important matter was the ICA-AtoM software, a free open source tool which is being developed by a Canadian company, Artefactual Systems, for ICA.

**Membership**

Padre Baroan (Ivory Coast), Marion Beyea (Canada; CBPS chair), Nils Brübach (Germany), Blanca Desantes (Spain), Vitor da Fonseca (Brazil), Beatriz Franco (Spain), Michael Fox (United States), Hilary Morgan (Canada), Victoria Peters (UK), Bogdan Popovici (Romania), Claire Sibille-de Grimoüard (France; CBPS secretary), Stefano Vitali (Italy), Amy Warner (UK)

**Review of ICA descriptive standards and conceptual modeling**

The sub-committee identified different levels in the needed changes: harmonization of the 4 ICA standards, of the content of the rules and of the application of the standards.

However, it was decided that the more substantial changes should be considered later. ICA standards are not used at the same level. ISAD(G) is recognized as the basis for archival description and it is very common in many countries, but we can't say the same thing for the three others. The main priority of CBPS is to explain to the international community how descriptive standards relate to each other.

Some countries have already started to develop a conceptual model for archival description focusing on relationships. For instance, the Commission on Spanish Archival Descriptive Standards (CNEDA) has developed a document entitled "Conceptual Model of Archival Description and Basic Data Requirements for Descriptions of Records, Agents and Functions – Part 1: Entity Types" (this draft is available at [http://www.mcu.es/archivos/docs/NEDATiposEntidad\\_20081215.pdf](http://www.mcu.es/archivos/docs/NEDATiposEntidad_20081215.pdf)). The aim of this first document is to identify the principal entity types (and entity subtypes) of the conceptual model of archival description. It also provides information about the identification of the principal relationships between these entity types (and entity subtypes). CBPS also plans to review the work of professionals in related disciplines (e.g., FRBR / FRAD, CIDOC-CRM, ISO work on 2146).

So, the sub-committee decided **to establish a compendium** with additions (for example a common area for the control of archival descriptions) and focusing on the **relationships between the different types of entities**, but with **no fundamental changes of structure of the 4 ICA standards**. This document will be made up of different self contained parts which will describe records, records creators, functions of creators and institutions with archival holdings. It will contain a general introduction including a history of the ICA-standards-related activities, a data model and a section explaining the relationships between the different archival entities (archival material, creators, functions of creators and archival institutions), a set of elements of description for each type of entity and appendices for crosswalks and references to articles in different languages about conceptual modeling. This document, which would be released in 2012, is to be considered as an intermediate step before a call for comments and a full revision of the standards for the term 2012-2014.

### **ICA-AtoM software**

The Canadian Company Artefactual Systems is developing a free open source multilingual software enabling institutions to create and to put on the web archival descriptions compliant with ICA descriptive standards. The origin of the project was the preparation of an archival guide on human rights (AtoM is the acronym of "Access to memory"). Sponsors are the Archief School (Netherlands), the Center for Documentation and Research (Arabic Emirates), the Direction des Archives de France, Library and Archives of Development (Bank WorldGroup) and Unesco.

An on-line demo (<http://ica-atom.org/demo/>) enables anyone to test the 1.0.7 beta release of the software. Archival institutions can also participate in ICA-AtoM beta testing: the institution can host its own version of the software or Artefactual can host it on its server at no cost during the beta testing phase.

It is an interesting idea to provide local institutions with an open source tool, enabling us to disseminate ICA standards. The sub committee on descriptive standards is actively reviewing AtoM and will prepare a report.

National Information Standards Organization Activities and Ballots, 2008/2009  
Report to the Society of American Archivists

Kathleen Dow, Liaison  
University of Michigan  
Special Collections Library  
Ann Arbor, MI 48105-1205

August 7, 2009

NISO Mission Statement

NISO fosters the development and maintenance of standards that facilitate the creation, persistent management, and effective interchange of information so that it can be trusted for use in research and learning. NISO website: <http://www.niso.org/home>

Society of American Archivists' Standards Committee website: <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~kdow/index.html>

- \* Links to pdfs of the full text of proposals, reviews, and standards
- \* Links to current issues of Information Standards Quarterly and NISO Newsletter

Standards Committee forum: SAA Standards Committee List [standards-cmte@forums.archivists.org](mailto:standards-cmte@forums.archivists.org)

- \* Used to announce the posting of a new document for review to SAA/SC website
- \* Also used to announce posted links to new issues of NISO publications and any other document or publication of interest

The Society of American Archives is eligible to participate in two voting pools: the larger, comprehensive, NISO Voting Member group (143 members, from 83 organizations) and the TC46 Ballot Advisory Group (121 members, from 70 organizations). The latter group votes and comments on initiatives presented by the Technical Committee 46 (TC46) which is the ISO committee responsible for standards in the area of Information and Documentation. NISO has been designated by ANSI as the U.S. Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Administrator for TC46. NISO Voting Members located in the U.S. make up the TAG membership and may participate in voting and commenting on proposed standards. NISO submits the U.S. votes and comments on

standards developed by TC46 and identifies the U.S. experts for subcommittees and working groups. TC46 focuses pm the standardization of practices relating to libraries, documentation and information centers, publishing, archives, records management, museum documentation, indexing and abstracting services, and information science.

In 2008/2009 NISO sent out notices alerting voting members of 27 standards, proposals, or solicitations for voting pools. There are an additional 9 open ballots, 6 of which will be closing in early 2009. (Please see Proposals, Reviews and Standards, below.)

The proposed ISO/FDIS 15836, Information and documentation — The Dublin Core metadata element set presented to members of the Standards Committee in December, 2008, garnered the most responses of any ballot presented during the past year. Outlining a uniform reworking of elements and tags used in the Dublin Core metadata set, several members of the Committee offered a recommendation on the vote. Overall, the 10 "yes" votes that were entered were based on my reading and comprehension of the importance and feasibility of the ballot to the profession. "Abstain" votes were entered when a proposal was out of the area of expertise of the committee due to its highly technical nature. "Abstain" votes were also entered when NISO representative Cynthia Hodgson solicits votes from all voting members for low activity ballots in order to ensure that the ballot didn't die due to insufficient votes (25% participation is required to move forward).

There is usually a low response to emails sent to solicit opinions and recommendations from Standards Committee members. Both former chair Nancy Kunde and current chair Polly Reynolds have been reliably responsive and supportive in sending out emails reminding members to vote while also offering their recommendations. But one of the problems with other committee members may be when they are faced with the length of most standards, often running to over 40 pages; daunting at best when considered in the midst of a busy work day. It might be helpful to continue reaching out to the SAA community beyond the Standards Committee membership by contacting other groups with a vested interest in NISO standards, such as: Metadata and Digital Object Roundtable Steering Committee, Description Section Steering Committee, Preservation Section Steering Committee, and Technical Subcommittee on Descriptive Standards (TSDS). In addition, alternative methods for delivering the standards and proposal documents (PDFs) should be considered.

Despite the low response rate to requests for comments and vote recommendations, I believe that SAA should remain a voting member of NISO. It is important to make sure that our voice is heard along with our peers in NISO; these include ALA, ARMA, NARA, as well as related organizations such as ASIS&T, ARL, AIIM, and OCLC. As we are well aware, standards are increasingly important in our global information age, and having the archivist's vote/voice/viewpoint on the contents of these standards is key to the continuing success and relevance of our profession.

2008/2009 Proposals, Reviews and Standards (Voted Ballots are in Bold)

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

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

Voting Opened: 2009-0715

Published: ISO 22310 - ISO 22310:2006(E), First edition, 2006-04-01

2009-04-23

Information and documentation — Guidelines for standards drafters for stating records management requirements in standards

Published: ISO 15836, Information and documentation — The Dublin Core metadata element set – review of terminology, 2nd edition, revision

2009-02-15

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

2009-01-28

ISO/TC 46/SC 4 8459, Information and documentation — Classification of bibliographic data elements for use in data interchange

Vote: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Open date: 2008-11-19

ISO/FDIS 15836, Information and documentation — The Dublin Core metadata element set



VOTES: YES

NISO Voting Members

Open date: 2008-10-30

ISO 6630:1986, Documentation -- Bibliographic control characters

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-10-28

ISO/CD 27730, Information and documentation — International Standard Collection Identifier (ISCI)

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

Open date: 2008-10-24

ISO 10324:1997, Information and documentation -- Holdings statements -- Summary level

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-10-24

ISO 4:2997, Information and documentation — Rules for the abbreviation of title words and titles of publications

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-10-24

ISO/DIS 690, Guidelines for bibliographic references and citations to information resources

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
New Projects

Open date: 2008-10-08

ISO/DIS 12620, Terminology and other language and content resources— Specification of data categories and management of a Data Category Registry for language resources

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

Open date: 2008-10-02

ISO 16442, Computer applications in terminology — Terminological markup framework

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Open date: 2008-09-10

TC46/SC11 N874, New work item proposal: Risk Assessment for Records Systems

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
New Projects

Open date: 2008-09-06

ISO/DIS 2146, Information and documentation — Registry services for libraries and related organizations

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Open date: Draft Standards

2008-09-06

ISO 19005-1, Document management — Electronic document file format for long-term preservation — Part 1: Use of PDF 1.4 (PDF/A-1)

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-08-21

ISO/PDTR 15801, Document management — Information stored electronically — Recommendations for trustworthiness and reliability

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

Open date: 2008-08-21

TC171/SC1 N170 NWI: Information system for electronic records preservation

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
New Projects

Open date: 2008-08-20

TC46/SC11 N865, New Work Item proposal: Digital records conversion and migration process

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
New Projects

Open date: 2008-08-12

ISO 23950:1998, Information and documentation — Information retrieval (Z39.50) — Application service definition and protocol specification

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-08-12

ISO 8777:1993, Information and documentation - Commands for interactive text searching

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-08-12

ISO 233-2:1993, Information and documentation - Transliteration of Arabic characters into Latin characters - Part 2: Arabic language - Simplified transliteration

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-08-07

ISO 11940:1998, Information and documentation — Transliteration of Thai

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-08-07

ISO 11800:1998, Information and documentation — Requirements for binding materials and methods used in the manufacture of books

VOTE: ABSTAIN

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-08-07

ISO 11799:2003, Information and documentation — Document storage requirements for archive and library materials

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Open date: 2008-07-31/Close 11/2008

ISO/TC 46 / SC 11 N865, Archives/Records Management: Digital Records Conversion and Migration Process.

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

Open date: 2008-06-06

ISO/DIS 28500, Information and documentation — WARC file format

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

CORE (Cost of Resource Exchange) Proposal Ballot.pdf

NISO Voting Members  
Calendar Documents

Open date: 2008-05-01

ISO 2108:2005, Information and documentation -- International standard book number (ISBN)

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-04-28

ISO 14416:2003, Information and documentation -- Requirements for binding of books, periodicals, serials and other paper documents for archive and library use -- Methods and materials

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Systematic Review Standards

Open date: 2008-04-28

ISO/CD 27729, Information and documentation -- International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI)

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

Open date: 2008-03-29

ISO/CD 26324, Information and documentation -- Digital Object Identifier (DOI)

VOTE: YES

TC46 Ballot Advisory Group  
Draft Standards

Open date: 2008-03-29

ISO/CD 690, Information and documentation — Guidelines for bibliographic references and citations

Date: July 17, 2009

To: SAA Standard Committee

From: Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines

RE: Annual Report of the Task Force

The Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines completed a final working draft of Archival and Special Collections Facilities: Guidelines for Archivists, Librarians, Architects, and Engineers in July, 2008. The Task Force sent the draft to the SAA Standards Committee, the SAA Publications Board, the National Association of Government Archivists and Records Administrators (NAGARA) and the Council of State Archivists (CoSA) for review and comment. In addition, it was made available online and requests for review and comments were sent to a variety of professionals and professional groups including architects, archivists, conservators, and construction specialists.

All comments were reviewed by Editors Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted and pertinent responses were incorporated into the draft publication. The Standards Board carried out a final review and then sent the draft to the SAA Council for final approval. On February 27, 2009 SAA Council approved the publication as an official standard of the Society of American Archivists.

Final revisions and the copy editing process began in Spring 2009 and the final page proofs, index and cover were approved in early July 2009. Archival and Special Collections Facilities will be officially launched at the SAA Annual meeting in Austin, Texas in August 2009. The publication will be available in hard copy and as an online publication.

The Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines has not had further discussion on how to proceed with the next step to develop national standards for archival facilities. Our next step will be to consult with the SAA Standards Committee on how to proceed with this long term goal.

Submitted by: Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted, Co-chairs of the Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines, July 17, 2009



## **Technical Subcommittee on Descriptive Standards (TSDS) Annual Report, 2009**

From September 2008 to August 2009, TSDS worked to review and promulgate standards related to archival description. Our primary activities consisted of commenting on the public draft of RDA, revising the charge of the EAC Working Group, requesting a revision to EAD, and contributing to the revision of the Standards Committee mission and charge. As part of that reorganization, the Standards Committee, with our approval, agreed to dissolve TSDS.

### **RDA**

In December, TSDS submitted comments on the public draft of *Resource Description & Access* (RDA) to ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access. The bulk of our comments focused on how RDA will be applied in the context of collection-level cataloging of archival materials. In addition to comments regarding specific rules, TSDS had larger questions about how archivists will apply some of RDA's FRBR characteristics to archival materials.

### **EAC Working Group**

Early in the year TSDS approved and submitted to SAA Council a revised charge for the Encoded Archival Description Working Group. The group's charge was extended to encompass additional EAC standards beyond EAC-CPF (Corporate Bodies, Persons, and Families), which is being presented at the annual meeting. The Working Group will continue its work by developing EAC-Functions, based on the ICA's *International Standard for Describing Functions* (ISDF), and additional EAC standards as appropriate.

### **EAD Revision**

In February TSDS unanimously agreed that it is time to begin work on a revision to Encoded Archival Description. TSDS sent a formal request to the EAD Working Group, which they took up at the annual meeting. Among the reasons TSDS gave for a revision to EAD were the need for interoperability with EAC-CPF; an opportunity – given the experience of the developers of the Archivists' Toolkit and Archon – to improve EAD's ability to function within a relational database; and to consider requests for opening up EAD to namespace interoperability, such as allowing portions of EAD to be embedded in other schemas or allowing other schemas to be embedded in EAD.

### **Standards Committee Mission and Charge**

During the past year, TSDS continued to help the Standards Committee draft a revised mission and charge, as well as updated procedures for the review and approval of SAA standards and the endorsement of external standards. As part of that reorganization, the Standards Committee agreed with TSDS to dissolve the subcommittee.

In order to assure a smooth transition, TSDS submitted recommendations to the Standards Committee that two current members of TSDS join the expanded Standards Committee; that the Standards chair appoint a committee member to serve as a descriptive standards coordinator and monitor relevant activity in the profession; that current ex officio TSDS members now serve with Standards; that the EAD and EAC Working Groups now report to Standards; and that Standards continue to pursue TSDS's primary agenda items, the approval of EAC-CPF as an SAA standard and the revision of EAD.

### **TSDS 2008-2009**

Michael Rush, chair  
Laura Davis

Megan Friedel  
Doris Malkmus  
Mark Matienzo  
Cory Nimer  
Kathryn Young