**Agenda Item V.J.**

# Society of American Archivists
# Council Meeting
# January 23 – 26, 2013
# Chicago, Illinois

## Standards Committee Annual Report 2011-2012
**(Prepared by Co-Chairs Marcy Flynn and Cory Nimer)**

## Membership

Cory Nimer (Chair, 2010-2013)
Marcy Flynn (Chair, 2010-2012)
Bruce Ambacher (2010-2013)
Heather Dean (2010-2013)
Matthew Eidson (2011-2014)
Kathleen Feeney (2010-2013)
Rosemary Flynn (2011-2014)
Lisa Miller (2011-2014)
Jeffrey Suchanek (2011-2014)
Dennis Meissner, Council Liaison (2010-2013)

Incoming member for 2012-2015 term:
Dan Santamaria

Incoming chair for 2012-2014 term:
Lisa Miller

Ex Officio:
Anila Angjeli (TS-EAC Co-Chair)
Terry Catapano (SDT Chair)
Gordon Daines (TS-DACS Chair)
Kathleen Dow (NISO)
Chatham Ewing (ACRL RBMS Task Force on Metrics and Assessment)
Laura Jackson (RDDRT Chair)
Michele Pacifico (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Daniel Pitti (ICA-CBPS)
Michael Rush (TS-EAD Co-Chair)
Claire Sibille-de Gimouard (ICA CBPS)
William Stockting (TS-EAD Co-Chair)
Sharry Watson (CAA CCAD)
Tom Wilsted (TS-AFG Co-Chair)
Katherine Wisser (TS-EAC Co-Chair)
Vacant (ARMA)
Vacant (CCDA)
Vacant (ALA-MARBI)
Vacant (AIIM)

## Governance

**Charge and procedures revised**
In the fall of 2011, the SAA President asked the Standards Committee (SC) to review the existing SC charge and draft a revision that would more accurately reflect actual practices and align with other SAA procedural documents. The SC revised the charge, which was submitted to SAA Council and approved in January 2012.[1] The updated charge provides more specific detail about oversight by SAA Council.

[1] The revised charge is available in the SAA Council's minutes, http://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/0112CouncilMinutes.pdf, pp. 13-15.

Other procedural documents revised by the SC and approved by Council are "Standards Development and Review," "Procedures for Development and Review of an SAA Developed Standard" and "Procedures for SAA Endorsement of an External Standard." Additionally, the SC drafted the charge for the recently formed Technical Subcommittee for the Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning.

**Representative appointments**
During the course of the year, there were new SAA SC representative appointments to internal and external groups. Externally, Michael Fox completed his term on the International Council on Archives' Committee on Best Practice and Standards, and this position is now held by Daniel Pitti. Chatham Ewing accepted an appointment to represent SAA to the Association of College and Research Libraries' Rare Books and Manuscripts Section Task Force on Metrics and Assessment. Internally, Standards Committee member Rosemary Pleva Flynn accepted an appointment to represent the SC on the SAA Glossary Working Group.

There were no appointments made for representatives to the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, ARMA International, AIIM or ALA-MARBI, leaving these positions vacant. At the request of SAA's Executive Committee, the SC co-chairs submitted feedback and comments regarding SAA policy on representative appointments to and from external organizations. This topic is currently an action item on Council's agenda, as issues related to criteria for representation are under discussion.

## Endorsements and comments

This year, the SC participated in document reviews, including the review and recommendation of 1) SAA-developed and external standards for action by SAA Council; 2) draft standards being developed by external groups seeking feedback and comments; and 3) the endorsement of annual meeting session proposals,. A listing of documents reviewed is provided below.

**SAA Standards recommended for SAA Council endorsement**
*Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning*,
http://www2.archivists.org/standards/guidelines-for-reappraisal-and-deaccessioning
In March 2012 the Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team submitted a completed draft of the *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* for SC review. The SC reviewed the final draft and recommended adoption to SAA Council in April 2012. Council adopted the guidelines, disbanded the development and review team, and established the Technical Subcommittee for the Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning to maintain and advocate the use of the guidelines.

**External documents recommended for SAA Council endorsement**
ISO 16363:2012: "Space data and information transfer systems -- Audit and certification of trustworthy digital repositories", http://www2.archivists.org/standards/iso-163632012-

space-data-and-information-transfer-systems-audit-and-certification-of-trust (SC recommendation for endorsement adopted by the Council August 2012.)

Association of College and Research Libraries/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section *Guidelines Regarding Security and Theft in Special Collections*, with an "Introduction for Archivists" prepared by the SAA Security Roundtable, http://www2.archivists.org/standards/acrlrbms-guidelines-regarding-security-and-theft-in-special-collections (SC recommendation for endorsement adopted by the Council May 2012.)

**External draft documents comments**
International Council on Archives *Principles for Access to Archives*, http://www.ica.org/9400/news-events/principles-for-acces-to-archives-give-your-opinon-now.htm

ARMA International *Policy Design for Managing Electronic Records*, http://www.arma.org/standards/development/documents/BSR-ARMA-19-20XX_Policy_Design_for_Managing_Electronic_Messages_draft_for_October_2011.pdf

International Organization for Standardization *Information and Documentation—Records Management* (ISO 15489 Parts 1 and 2), http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail?csnumber=31908 and http://www.iso.org/iso/catalogue_detail.htm?csnumber=35845

American National Standards Institute/AIIM "Assessing Trusted Systems for Compliance with Industry Standards and Best Practices" (ANSI/AIIM 25-201X).

**SAA annual meeting sessions endorsed**
"Linking Data across Libraries, Archives, and Museums (Chair: Su Kim Chung) ACCEPTED
"Archival Description: Regional, Continental, and Global (Chair: Michael Rush) ACCEPTED

## Ongoing Projects/Activities

Current committee projects and activities are matched to desired outcomes identified in the report, *SAA Strategic Priority Outcomes and Activities, FY 2010 -FY 2014*, http://www2.archivists.org/sites/all/files/0511-StratPlan_PublicPosting_060111.pdf.

**Technology**
**Standards Portal:** The Portal is an electronic gateway to information on archival standards. Developed with grant funding by the Delmas Foundation, the Portal was launched at the 2011 SAA annual meeting. The SC established an informal Standards Portal subgroup to develop procedures for populating the Portal. This group consisted of SC co-chairs Flynn and Nimer, SC members Dean, Eidson and Miller, SC Council liaison Meissner, and SAA staff member Doyle. Throughout the year, there were teleconferences and email discussions to draft and initiate procedures and encourage member participation in populating the Portal. This resulted in the

creation of draft procedures to submit content to the Portal, the addition of topical terminology about standards listed, and revised forms to propose content. The SC invited SAA component groups to recommend external standards to add to the Portal in order to test the process, which resulted in the addition of nearly 50 externally developed standards.

The committee promoted the Portal through announcements in *In the Loop*, an article in *Archival Outlook* in November 2011, and an Open Forum at the 2012 annual meeting.

This work aligns with desired outcome #2, as the Portal is an online mechanism for information sharing related to archival standards .

**ISO 16363:2012:** Continuing efforts resulting from last year's *Strategic Priority* directive, the SC co-chairs worked with Preservation Section members Brad Westbrook and Tonia Sutherland to encourage the submission of an endorsement proposal now that it is an approved ISO standard. Once the proposal was received, the SC reviewed it and recommended SAA Council endorsement during the August 2012 meeting. Should the standard be endorsed, the committee will promote its use within the archival community.

Work related to ISO 16363 aligns with desired outcome #2, as it supports external standards related to born-digital records.

## Diversity

**Standards Representatives:** During the past year the committee has continued to develop its liaison program with other SAA component groups. Liaisons are selected by the component group to represent their interests to the committee, and to share information from the Standards Committee with their group's leadership. There are currently 27 liaisons representing sections, roundtables, and committees, more than doubling participation from 2010-2011, the first year of this initiative, which had 13 representatives. The liaison program is important because it improves communication, particularly in gathering feedback related to the Standards Portal and external standards under development. The committee plans to continue the program, and will monitor participation by liaisons over the coming year. [2]
The liaison program helps meet desired outcome #4 by promoting diversity and inclusiveness throughout the range of special interest groups within SAA.

## Advocacy/Public Awareness

**Standards Committee involvement with SAA Programs:** In order to improve communication about SAA educational programs, the Education Committee appointed Heather MacNeil to serve a one-year term as liaison between the two committees. Likewise, technical subcommittee chairs contacted the Education Committee regarding upcoming course offerings that may be affected by ongoing revisions to SAA standards.

This effort meets desired outcome#2 since it establishes communication between Education and the SC, which will increase public awareness of archival standards.

**ANSI standards development:** Following the committee's submission of information on the potential impact and costs associated with becoming an ANSI standards developer, SAA Council determined not to pursue membership in ANSI at this time.

[2] List of Liaisons to the SC available at http://www2.archivists.org/groups/standards-committee/section-and-roundtable-liaisons-to-the-standards-committee

.

This inquiry into standards development and accreditation meets outcome #2 as SAA explores increasing the visibility of archives and archivists to the public.

Respectfully Submitted,
Marcy Flynn and Cory Nimer, Co-Chairs, 2011-2012

## List of Appendices

**Appendix A:** Technical Subcommittee for Archival Facilities Guidelines report with three attachments
**Appendix B:** Technical Subcommittee for DACS report
**Appendix C:** Technical Subcommittee for EAD report
**Appendix D:** Technical Subcommittee for EAC-CPF report
**Appendix E:** Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team report
**Appendix F:** International Council on Archives Committee on Best Practice and Standards report
**Appendix G:** International Council on Archives, Section of Professional Association (SPA) report
**Appendix H:** National Information Standards Organization representative report
**Appendix I:** RBMS Metrics and Assessment Task Force representative report

*Staff note: No report received from the SAA Schema Development Team or the representative on* Canadian Council of Archives' Canadian Committee on Archival Description.

# Appendix A

**Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)**
**Annual Report to the SAA Standards Committee**
**July 27, 2012**

## I. August 23, 2011, SAA Standards Committee Meeting, Washington, DC

Michele Pacifico, co-chair of the Task Force on Archival Facilities Guidelines, attended the SAA Standards Committee meeting to update the committee on the status of the Guidelines and to discuss the pros and cons of future ANSI participation. After discussion, it was decided that the Standards Committee would research SAA's interest in ANSI participation and the TS-AFG would investigate promoting the Archival Facility standard with other professional organizations such as the ALA and AIA. The TS-AFG also was charged with developing a plan to work with the Canadians on a joint facility standard.

## II. Annual Report of the TS-AFG: September 2011 to August 2012

November 14, 2011. The TS-AFG held a conference call meeting to discuss their future status and projects. Issues discussed included: ANSI participation, the SAA Standards Portal, the status of a joint initiative with the Canadians, updates to the Guidelines for Archival Facilities, the potential need for additional specialists for future revisions to the Guidelines, and the goals of the subcommittee for 2011-2012. Goals for the following year include reaching out to a wider audience to publicize the Guidelines both nationally and internationally. A copy of the minutes of the meeting is attached to this report (Attachment A.1.).

December 13, 2011. Michele Pacifico and Tom Wilsted, co-chairs of the TS-AFG had a conference call with SAA's Nancy Beaumont, Solveig De Sutter, and Teresa Brinati to discuss partnering opportunities with other professional organizations, availability of the Guidelines online and download fees, and sponsorships and grants for future editions of the Guidelines.

December to March, 2011. Pacifico and Wilsted, with the assistance of Nancy Beaumont, worked on developing relationships with the various Canadian organizations and seeking appropriate representation from Canada for the TS-AFG and the future development of a joint facility standard. After many discussions the Canadian's proposed that a representative from the Canadian Council on Archives (CCA) would lead the Canadian effort to develop a joint standard on archival facilities. The Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) and other interested Canadian organizations would provide consulting support. The CCA agreed to financially support one representative's travel costs for 2 years and provide the funds to translate the joint guidelines into French. Meanwhile Wilsted and Beaumont sought funding from Spacesaver Corporation for SAA's contribution to the joint Guidelines Project.

March 30, 2012. The TS-AFG had a meeting by conference call. Iona McCraith was introduced as the CCA's official representative to the subcommittee. Issues discussed

included: developing a "List of Contacts for Information and Outreach," the SAA Standards portal, reaching out to the ICA and other international organizations, Diane Vogt O'Connor's presentation on the archival facility guidelines at the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) conference in Helsinki in August 2012, new facility information that should be included in updates to the current guidelines, funding for revisions to the guidelines, and proposed meetings for the subcommittee to begin work on revising the guidelines. A copy of the minutes of the meeting is attached to this report (AttachmentA. 2.).

April, 2012. The subcommittee drafted a "List of Contacts for Information and Outreach" that will be used in the subcommittees work in revising and publicizing the guidelines. A copy is attached to this report (Attachment A.3.).

April-May, 2012. With the help of Teresa Brinati, the subcommittee developed a one page flyer summarizing the facilities guidelines and soliciting feedback for an updated and revised edition scheduled to be released in 2014. The flyer was to be distributed in Helsinki at the IFLA conference and preliminary copies were sent to NARA and an ICA representative. Unfortunately circumstances for the subcommittee drastically changed with the termination of Canada's National Archival Development Program (NADP). It directly impacted the funding for the CCA's participation in a joint facility standard. The subcommittee is working to revise the flyer.

May-June 2012. Diane Vogt-O'Connor prepared a paper on the work of the subcommittee and the SAA standard on archival facilities to be presented at the IFLA conference in Helsinki. The subcommittee, along with Marcy Flynn of the Standards Committee, assisted Diane in the drafting and revision of her paper.

Current status. The subcommittee's cooperation with the CCA is on hold until their status is finalized. Meanwhile Pacifico and Wilsted are moving forward to contact other Canadian organizations to determine their interest in a joint archival facility standard. With the loss of the Canadian funding, the subcommittee will be seeking other funding sources to continue the work of their projects.

Respectfully submitted,
Michele F. Pacifico and Thomas Wilsted
Co-Chairs, SAA Technical Subcommittee on Archival Facilities Guidelines

**Attachment A.1.**

Society of American Archivists
Technical Subcommittee for Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)

Minutes of Meeting

Conference Call: Monday, November 14, 2011 9:30 a.m.
Attendees: Marcy Flynn, Michele Pacifico, Scott Teixeira, Gregor Trinkaus-Randall, Diane Vogt-O'Connor, Tom Wilsted,

1. **Summary of Standards Committee meeting and ANSI discussion** (Michele)
    - Summary of the discussion on ANSI held at SAA Standards Committee meeting on August 23, 2011
        - Would an open standards process result in a weaker standard?
        - SAA needs to weigh the monetary and workload costs; does it require a full time staff member?
        - SAA needs to evaluate the benefits of participation
        - To what extent does participation in ANSI benefit archivists; the SAA?
        - Should SAA consider partnering with another organization?
    - ACTION: The Standards Committee will take the lead on pursuing the SAA/ANSI issue. Marcy will consult with the Standards Committee Council liaison, Dennis Meissner, on the status of Council's discussion and thoughts about future ANSI participation

2. **SAA Standards Portal** (Marcy)
    - Portal is being populated
    - Guidelines are under "Administration and Management" – can only be listed under one category on Portal; other option is "Preservation." There is a link to other categories but it is clunky and not obvious at this point.
    - Portal can link to facilities book or publish as a supplemental resource.
    - Discussion: creating a power point presentation about the facilities guidelines for the Portal.
    - Question: will the Standards Portal elicit or underline other standards that we did not consider in the Guidelines?
    - ACTION: TS-AFG needs to discuss with SAA the issues surrounding this, including charges for the publication and links to other standards. Michele and Tom will discuss this with SAA staff.

2. **Status of initiative for joint standard with Canadians** (Tom)
    - The Canadian Council of Archives (CCA) is responsible for determining standards. The Association of Canadian Archivists (ACA) would also like to participate in any joint standards efforts. This issue is before the CCA and ACA and we hope to hear shortly if they are interesting in moving forward on a joint standard.

- If we do proceed with a joint standard effort, there are some open issues:
    - Funding – Spacesaver has indicated that they could provide a $9000.00 grant to cover some of the expenses for this effort; the Canadians have indicated that they would be able to raise some money to help fund travel and expenses. The details for funding still must be negotiated.
    - Technical Subcommittee structure – would we add a few Canadians to the current SAA Standards Committee's TS-AFG? How large should the new group be?
    - Publish new standards in English and French?
- ACTION: Tom will follow up with the Canadians and initiate a conference call when appropriate.

3. **Updates to Guidelines** (group discussion)
    - what is needed? what should we be watching? who should we ask to review for content?
    - Diane: noted that environmental set points are no longer the norm; and that they will be different in Canada.
    - Gregor: suggested that we look specifically at how the Guidelines can be applicable to underserved groups.
    - Scott: noted that the Guidelines do not have seasonal set points, which might aid design engineers and result in more economical equipment.
    - Gregor: need to address issue of security for electronic records; Diane suggested that we consider adding to the TS-AFG a member how is an expert in electronic records and digitization. Someone like Steve Puglia? Tom suggested that the Canadians might bring this specialization.
    - Tom sent an email to past task force members requesting updates in their fields of expertise and advising the subcommittee on future revisions. He proposed a future conference call with past members to discuss new findings and future revisions.
        - Ernie Conrad, in an email, has proposed to ASHRAE that the Facilities Guidelines be referenced in the ASHRAE Handbook chapter on the design of libraries, museums and archives.
    - ACTION: Michele will keep file on proposed revisions. Members are requested to send information to Michele as they get it on issues that need review and further discussion.

4. **Goals of subcommittee for 2011-2012** (group discussion)
    - Who is the wider audience?
        - Pat Alexander, in an email, suggested that we need to reach out to building managers/engineers involved in renovation projects.
    - List of organizations that should know and understand the Guidelines (Tom)
        - AAM (American Association of Museums)
        - AASLH (American Association for State and Local History)
        - AIA (American Institute of Architects)

- AIC (American Institute for Conservation)
- AIIM (American Institution of Information Management)
- ALA (American Library Association)
- ARMA (Association of Records Managers and Administrators)
- ASHRAE (American Society of Heating, Refrigerant, & Air-Conditioning Engineers)
- CSI(Construction Specifications Institute)
- IAMFA (International Association of Museum Facility Administrators)
- ICA (International Council on Archives)
- IFLA (International Federation of Library Association)
- NFPA (National Fire Protection Association)
- National Archival Associations Around the World

- How to reach out to a wider audience?
  - Scott Teixeira, in an email, suggested that we develop a presentation along the lines of "Understanding the SAA Guidelines…" for use with other professions
  - Create a webinar or powerpoint that describes the use and value of the guidelines; for webinars and presentations at professional meetings.
  - COSA uses i-link software; annual cost is $468.00 plus the phone services.
  - Tom has used SAA webinar for his green building Power Point presentation
  - Issues of cost and fees for any online presentation
  - Online publication of Guidelines – download fees? free? Future issues with Canadians and joint standard? Kindle and Nook access?
- ACTION: Michele and Tom will discuss with SAA staff and investigate webinar and PowerPoint possibilities.

Prepared by Michele Pacifico, November 30, 2012

**Attachment A.2.**

Society of American Archivists
Technical Subcommittee for Archival Facilities Guidelines (TS-AFG)
**MINUTES**

Conference Call: Friday, March 30, 2012 10:00 a.m. EST
Attendees: Marcy Flynn, Iona McCraith, Cory Nimer, Michele Pacifico, Scott Teixeira, Gregor Trinkaus-Randall, Diane Vogt-O'Connor, Tom Wilsted

**Status of initiative for joint standard with Canadians**

- Introduced Iona McCraith, who will be Canadian Council of Archives (CCA) official representative to the TS-AFG. The CCA will provide funding for Iona's travel and a French translation of the revised Guidelines.
- Iona will have a working group of advisors from the CCA, ACA and other interested Canadian organizations to assist and advise her.

- Question regarding participation of the Association des Archivistes du Quebec (AAQ) and any other Canadian organizations that represent French-speaking professionals. Iona will reach out to the AAQ, who also is part of the CCA's special assembly.

**Status on goal of subcommittee for 2012 for more exposure** – see attached "List of Contacts for Information and Outreach"

- Additions were made to the draft List of Contacts (see attached revision)
- ICA – Michele will discuss appropriate outreach to ICA with Trudy Peterson; perhaps using the next ICA meeting in August to introduce the guidelines.
- SAA Standards Portal – Marcy proposed putting additional information on the Portal, including any new information that is distributed.
- International Federation of Library Association –IFLA (Diane)
    - Diane's will discuss the Guidelines and upcoming revisions at the IFLA conference in Helsinki
    - This is part of effort to share standards across cultures. Diane reports that there are many countries searching for archival building standards.
    - Tom and Michele will work on one-page handout to take to conference and for other groups. It will serve as the start of our outreach efforts.
    - SAA and Teresa B. will produce a marketing tool (e.g. bookmark or handout)

**Who should we ask to review for current/updated content?**

- Iona: put it on list serve – general call for comments; what are we missing
- Marcy: noted that the guidelines are currently only available in hard copy so it may limit comments.
- Tom: will have another conversation with Teresa B. about a downloadable copy that is cheaper than the print version; downloadable by chapter?
- Other works in progress include:
    - Tom W. is writing an article for *Library Administrators* on how to plan for special collections renovations
    - Tom W. is writing a technical bulletin on records storage facilities for NAGARA-International Institute of Municipal Clerks that is part of a larger series of publications on a variety of records topics
    - ALA has an article coming out on how to build a paper and book conservation laboratory
    - also check: CALM; Heritage Preservation; IAMFA

C. **Updates to the Existing Guidelines**

Who is the audience for the next iteration of the facility guidelines?

- United States
- Canada
- Rest of the World

What additional sections/chapters need to be added to the current guidelines? Ideas mentioned to date include:

- Special needs/changes for buildings in tropical climates
    - Canadians are particularly interested in issues of cold weather.

    - Other countries deal with tropical weather.
- Lowering the environmental impact of archival buildings.
- New developments in temperature and humidity standards – do they match Canadian standards?
- Improving handicapped accessibility in archives buildings (criticism of SAA Accessibility Working Group that they would like to see specific mention of accessibility issues)
- Impact of electronic records and digitization on archival buildings
    - do we need a specialist on the subcommittee for this topic? Someone like Steve Puglia?
    - does digitization activity change the facility?
    - will buildings get smaller as a result of either digitization or electronic versus paper record acquisitions?
    - wiring and WIFI issues

Discussion during conference call added the following:

- Diane: Issues of emergencies and best practices – Diane suggested reviewing the Heritage Preservation Website.
- Iona: Modest libraries/archives with modest budgets – should we try to develop hierarchy of standards – minimum to best practices?
- Marcy: questioned whether we wanted to attempt "core minimal levels"
- Discussion about original intent of standard – use of must, should, may, not recommended.
- Marcy noted that Addendums are common in standards – for those issues that do not fit the standards. Example – case studies.

**What are the strengths and weaknesses of the current guidelines? What changes are realistic?**

- Tom: Will want to meet in person to determine what revisions we will tackle in next version of standards.

**Other Items**

- Funding: No word from Spacesaver if they will fund this project.
- Other sources: Grants
    - Ford Foundation
    - Rockefeller Foundation
    - Getty
    - Kresge Foundation
    - Kellogg
    - Delmas Foundation
    - Kress Foundation
    - Wilson Charitable Trust
- Proposed Meetings: one meeting in DC and one meeting in Toronto
    - do we want to coincide our meeting with the CCA in Ottawa?
    - 3 days/2 nights

**Summary/Task Assignments**

- Tom and Michele: will draft one-page overview document and request for comments
- Tom: will discuss funding issues with Nancy B.
- Michele: will contact Trudy Peterson/ICA
- Iona: will contact the AAQ
- Subcommittee: each subcommittee member will send out "request for comments" flyer to selected organizations, interest groups, list servs, etc. By May 1, each subcommittee member will submit their list of proposed contacts to the group for review to both eliminate duplication and to make sure that all appropriate groups will be contacted. Michele will send out a reminder with appropriate attachment.

Completed by: Michele Pacifico, April 23, 2012

**Attachment A.3.**
DRAFT, mfp 4/23/12

**SAA Technical Subcommittee for Archival Facilities Guidelines**
**List of Contacts for Information and Outreach**

**Government Organizations and Professional Associations**

**U.S. and Canadian:**

AAM (American Association of Museums)
AASLH (American Association for State and Local History)
AAQ (Association des Archivistes du Quebec)
ACA (Association of Canadian Archivists)
AIA (American Institute of Architects)
AIC (American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works)
AIIM (American Institution of Information Management)
ALA (American Library Association)
- LLAMA (Library Leadership and Management Association)
- CALM (Committee on Archives, Libraries and Museums)

ARMA (Association of Records Managers and Administrators)
ASHRAE (American Society of Heating, Refrigerant, & Air-Conditioning Engineers)
CAC (Canadian Association for Conservation)
CAPC (Canadian Association of Professional Conservators)
CCA (Canadian Council of Archives)
CCI (Canadian Conservation Institute)
CoSA (Council of State Archivists)
CSI (Construction Specifications Institute)
Heritage Preservation: The National Institute for Conservation
LAC (Library and Archives Canada)
LC (Library of Congress)
NARA (National Archives and Records Administration)
NAGARA (National Association of Government Archives and Record Administrators)
NACRC (National Association of County Recorders, Election Officials, and Clerks)

**International:**
IAMFA (International Association of Museum Facility Administrators)
ICA (International Council on Archives)
IFLA (International Federation of Library Association)
NFPA (National Fire Protection Association)
UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization)

**Grant Making Agencies**
FAIC (The Foundation of the American Institute for Conservation of Historic and Artistic Works)
NEH (National Endowment for the Humanities)
NHPRC (National Historical and Records Publications Commission)
IMLS (Institute of Museum and Library Services)
Library of Congress & The Foundation Center: Foundation Grants for the Preservation of Libraries, Archives and Museums

**Conservation Centers**
CCAHA (Conservation Center for Art and Historic Artifacts)
NEDCC (Northeast Document Conservation Center)

**Other**
Facility managers
Managers of Archives, Museums and Libraries
History Associates Incorporated (archives consultants)

**Publications**
Many are both print and online publications; some have blogs, daily news, etc.
*Building Design + Construction* (www.BDCnetwork.com)
*ENR Engineering News-Rec*ord (ENR.com)
*Buildings* (www.Buildings.com)
Associated Construction Publications (includes all state based publications on construction issues)
*Architect.* AIA magazine
*Architectural Record* (archrecord.construction.org)
*Architects Newspaper* (www.archpaper.com)
*Green Source: Sustainable Design*
*Architectural Review* (global architectural issues)
***There are many more specialty publications by discipline, i.e. fire safety, security, HVAC, etc.

## Appendix B

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

Submitted July 2012

The Technical Subcommittee on *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (TS-DACS) has had a busy year. TS-DACS is responsible for overseeing the timely and ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of *Describing Archives: A Content Standard*. This report covers the period August 2011-July 2012.

TS-DACS spent the last year preparing a draft revision of *Describing Archives: A Content Standard*. That draft revision was made available to the archival community for comment earlier this month.

### TS-DACS Membership

### Service, 2010-2015

J. Gordon Daines III (Brigham Young University), chair
Hillel Arnold (New York University)
Kathryn Bowers (Harvard University Archives)
Chatham Ewing (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)
Steven Hensen (retired, Duke University)
Jacqueline Dean (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)
Mary Lacy (Library of Congress)
Sibyl Schaefer (Rockefeller Archive Center)
Claudia Thompson (University of Wyoming)

### Ex Officio Members

Marcy Flynn (Standards Committee co-chair)
Cory Nimer (Standards Committee co-chair)
Roslyn Holdzkom (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)
Joyce Chapman (Description Section Chair)

### Revision of *Describing Archives: A Content Standard*

At the annual meeting in Chicago in August 2011, TS-DACS met to continue the process of evaluating the feedback received from the archival community on how to revise *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS). The in-person meeting was used to divide TS-DACS into four sub-groups tasked with the actual revision of the standard. Each sub-group was tasked with reviewing the comments related to their area and making recommendations for potential revision. The sub-groups were: Part I, Part II, Appendices/Crosswalks, and Examples. It was also during this meeting that it was decided to remove Part III from the standard. TS-DACS held three teleconferences over the course of the year to discuss the proposed revisions and a draft revision was finalized in June 2012. That revision was made available to the archival community through the SAA website in July 2012. Comments on the draft revision will be taken through September 15, 2012.

## Meeting Minutes, August 2011

I. Welcome and Introductions
   a. Everyone briefly introduced themselves and their interest in DACS. Jackie Dean was welcomed as a new member of the committee
II. Review community feedback
   a. We reviewed the feedback generated by the community and discussed whether or not we were going to respond to the feedback in DACS or if there was another way to respond (see Appendix A for specific comments).
      i. Recommendations
         1. The committee recommends that DACS be made available electronically. We will recommend that the SAA office and the Publications Board determine the best way to do this. We will also recommend that they consider site licensing.
         2. The committee recommends that the Introductory section of Part I of DACS be enhanced to cover some of the issues raised by the community.
         3. The committee recommends that Chapter 7 be enhanced by the addition of sub-rules. This could include title conventions
         4. The committee recommends that rule 2.3.18 be clarified as requested.
         5. The committee recommends that DACS provide guidance on determining which creator comes first when it is not readily apparent.
         6. The committee recommends that language in DACS referring to companion standards be made as generic as possible (we don't want to be in the position of recommending standards that have become superseded by others).
         7. The committee recommends that careful consideration be given to the use of the term "supplied" in DACS. Should we change this to "devised"? Need to have a compelling argument.
         8. The committee recommends that a companion website be created for DACS. This website could have encoding examples, additional application examples, best practices, crosswalks, etc.
   b. We were only able to review Appendices 1-6 and committee members committed to submitting comments on Appendices 7-13.
III. Change Proposals
   a. DACS Part I—The committee reviewed the proposal made by Steve Hensen and Claudia Thompson. The committee was in general agreement with the proposal. The committee did recommend that specific suggestions from the appendices be examined and considered for addition.
   b. DACS Part II—The committee reviewed the proposal made by Lynn Holdzkom, Chatham Ewing, and Hillel Arnold. The committee agrees with their recommendation to remove Part III from DACS. The committee further recommends that consider be given to rewriting Part II to reflect its relationship with ISAAR (CPF) and to provide guidance on content for records created according to this standard (EAC-CPF in our context).
   c. Appendices—The committee reviewed the proposal made by Sibyl Schaefer and Mary Lacy. It was recommended that majority of the information in the

appendices be made available through the proposed companion website and that they be removed from DACS. It was also recommended that we link to the SAA Glossary rather than create our own.

IV. **Action Items**
   a. Committee members will review Appendices 7-13 (see Appendix A) and get their feedback to Gordon by September 23, 2011.
   b. Gordon will send out a Doodle poll for our next meeting which will occur in mid to late October.
   c. Committee members will indicate to Gordon which sections of DACS they would like to draft possible text for based on the above recommendations by our next meeting.

### October 2011

I. Community Feedback (Appendices 7-13)
   a. Reviewed the community feedback contained in Appendices 7-13
   b. Agreed to incorporate the following feedback in our revisions:
      i. 2.5 extent—Add computer files/formats to extent types. Provide examples
      ii. 2.5 extent—Remove the example of "Box 10 Folder 6." The consensus was that this is not an extent statement.
      iii. 3.1 scope and content—clarify what is meant by the word "abstract"
      iv. Part II Describing Creators—Make 10.15/10.26 require and 10.14/10.25 optional

II. Re-conceptualizing Part II
   a. Had a lengthy discussion about how to re-conceptualize Part II. The consensus was that we should move Part II in line with ISAAR (CPF) but that we need to be careful to not be overly proscriptive. Focus needs to be on content rather than encoding.
   b. Talked about the need to provide ways to link to external information.

III. Writing Assignments
   a. Gordon committed to creating a list of the various changes that need to be incorporated in our revision as well as the individuals responsible for them. Draft text needs to be completed by February 17, 2011.
      i. Part I—Steve Hensen, Claudia Thompson, Joyce Chapman, Jerry Simmons
         1. Consider putting a statement in the introductory section discussing the use of square brackets, abbreviations, acronyms, etc.
         2. Discussion of authenticity in the introductory section
         3. Clarify what is meant by levels of description
         4. Expand Chapter 7—include information on things like title conventions and variant titles
         5. Clarify 2.3.18
         6. 2.3 Title—add information on additional format types and their use in titles.
         7. 2.3 Title—add information for selecting appropriate creators ( see p. 21 of DACS Minutes (August 2011)
         8. 2.3.17 make sure that this clear
         9. Make a recommendation on the use of "supplied" versus "devised"

10. Consider providing additional guidance for dealing with aggregations with title information
11. Decide whether or not to remove the AACR2 references and replace them with RDA (2.3.2)
12. 2.5 extent—Add computer files/formats to extent types. Provide examples
13. 2.5 extent—Remove the example of "Box 10 Folder 6." The consensus was that this is not an extent statement.
14. 3.1 scope and content—clarify what is meant by the word "abstract"

ii. Part II—Hillel Arnold, Chatham Ewing, Jackie Dean, Cory Nimer
    1. Part II Describing Creators—Make 10.15/10.26 require and 10.14/10.25 optional

iii. Appendices/Crosswalks—Sibyl Schaefer and Mary Lacy
    1. Focus will need to be on crosswalks

iv. Examples—Kate Bowers
    1. Kate agreed to write draft text for requesting examples for DACS website; Gordon will send out the message and examples will be sent to Kate

IV. Community Portal—will the TS-DACS page work?
http://www2.archivists.org/groups/technical-subcommittee-on-describing-archives-a-content-standard-dacs

a. Talked about using the TS-DACS page and creating a node for a "compendium of practice"
b. Also talked about linking to the Standards Portal via the Unofficial Resources link.

### January 2012

Dennis let us know that Council has approved funding for a small working group meeting of TS-DACS in Chicago. It will involve a subset of TS-DACS and will finalize a draft version of DACS. Timing will be worked out soon.

1. Part I revisions (Claudia, Steve, Joyce)

--major discussion centered around the issue of what to call hybrid/electronic collections. Are they personal archives, personal records, etc.? It was decided that we will pose this question to the community when we put the revised version of DACS out for comment prior to SAA 2012.
--also talked about the need for clarification on what needed to be added in terms of authenticity. Kate will get Claudia her thoughts on this.
--added variant titles note to Chapter 7. Are there other notes that need to be added to Chapter 7 ?

2. Part II revisions (Hillel, Chatham, Jackie)

--current plan is to move chapters 9 and 10 to 2.6 and 2.7; the goal is to preserve as much of the content as possible.
--will be looking at ISAAR (CPF) and lining up minimal requirements. This will mean emphasizing the flourish dates and dates of existence

--had a discussion about companion standards and it was decided that we will suggest appropriate companion standards but not mandate specific standards
--talked about the need to clarify that creators can exist at any level of a collection
--talked about potential addition of entity type to creator
--major revision here will involve Chapter 11. Need to flesh out the chapter to enable authority record creation. Also need to line up minimal requirements with EAC. Needs to be as compatible as possible with ISAAR (CPF) and RDA. Examples need to be improved

--discussed creating levels of authority records (basic, value-added)
--issue of parallel and variant names

--talked about recommending that a working group separate from TS-DACS be established to tackle authority record content. Gordon will work with the Standards co-chairs to formulate a proposal. We will keep authority information in DACS for now

3. Crosswalks (Sibyl, Mary)

--this section will be one of the last completed. Currently planning DACS to RDA, DACS to MODS, DACS to Dublin Core crosswalks. Will update existing crosswalks as applicable. Sibyl is working to update Appendix B.

4. Examples gathering (Kate)

--need to improve the number and quality of illustrative examples in DACS
--Kate will be sending out a call to the community to supply examples in the next week or so. As specific types of examples are needed, let Gordon know and we will issue additional calls for comments
--it was proposed, and the group agreed, that we should take one collection and create a record for each of the levels in DACS (value-added, optimum, minimal)
--will need EAC encoding examples for the portal site.
--will also need additional examples of rules application for the portal site.

--Kate mentioned numeric identifiers (ORCid) as being an issue that we should look at.

**We need to have draft text of the revisions completed and submitted to Gordon by May 14, 2012.**

### June 2012

1. Review Part I Revisions
    a. The group agreed that the content of 3.2.4 should be moved to 7.1.8 and that examples of when to include information about what donors have done to the collection prior to donation should be added to 3.2.3.
    b. Discussion about use of acronyms and brackets. The group agreed to keep the current statement
    c. Slight change made on p. 7: Archival material can be arranged and described at many different levels (see Statement of Principles: Principles 3 and 4).
    d. Add exclusion to Chapter 3 indicating that information on what the processor has done is in 7.1.8.

e. 7.1.8 needs to be augmented to included information on authenticity. Kate will work with Claudia on this.
f. Change the beginning of 9.12 and 9.23 to: At a minimum, provide a brief summary
g. Group agreed with the rest of the recommended changes

2. Review Part II Revisions
   a. Chapter 9 was meant to be moved to 2.7
   b. There was a little discussion about 10.10 with the consensus being to leave the rule. The question was also raised about what constitutes an entity. Cory will work on a sample definition.
   c. Group agreed with the rest of the recommended changes.
3. Examples
   a. There is a need to gather more examples for some sections of DACS. Kate Bowers will create a "wish list" of examples to circulate to committee members. All committee members will look for examples that fit the "wish list" and send them to Kate.
4. Next Steps
   a. The revision draft will be posted to the SAA TS-DACS webpage in early July 2012 and feedback will be solicited from the community.
   b. We will hold a working meeting in conjunction with SAA's annual meeting in San Diego. The meeting will be on August 8, 2012 from 9 to noon.
   c. Additional community feedback will be solicited
   d. October/November a subgroup of TS-DACS will meet in Chicago to finalize the revised version of DACS
   e. The revised version will be submitted to the Standards Committee for review
   f. The revised version will then be submitted to SAA Council for approval
   g. It is hoped that the revised version will be approved and available prior to June 2013

# Appendix C

## Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) Report, 2012 Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting

The Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description is happy to report a busy and successful year of work focused on the process of revising EAD.

Following our meeting at last year's SAA Annual Meeting, TS-EAD had five primary goals:

1. Prepare for March 2012 TS-EAD working meeting
2. Create a digested list of community comments
3. Summarize points of emphasis guiding the revision
4. Summarize technical design options for the revision
5. After the March working meeting, provide the Schema Development Team with a summary of changes to be effected.

TS-EAD posted the presentations from the EAD Revision Forum at the 2011 SAA Annual Meeting to the SAA Standards Portal following the meeting. Prior to its March working meeting TS-EAD posted three preparatory documents to the Standards Portal: EAD Revision: Digest of Comments, EAD – Technical Considerations, and EAD Revision – Points of Emphasis.

TS-EAD held conference calls in December, January and February, met for a three-day working meeting on March 7-9 at the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University, and held three conference calls after the March meeting. The working meeting was funded with support from the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, the Nationaal Archief of the Netherlands, and the Beinecke Library. Additional grant support for the EAD revision from the National Endowment for the Humanities will be used to support a meeting of the Schema Development Team at the University of Virginia in October, and possibly a tag library editorial team meeting in the spring.

At the March working meeting TS-EAD focused on responding to the community input received during the comment period, discussing additional recommendations from committee members, identifying topics requiring further investigation, and establishing a timeline for the completion of the revision. The minutes of the working meeting and subsequent reports provided the SDT with documentation of changes to be implemented. The process of building consensus within TS-EAD regarding the revision is ongoing.

TS-EAD and the Schema Development Team will share the in-process revised schema prior to the SAA 2012 Annual Meeting and present a summary of agreed-upon changes at the EAD Roundtable meeting. The provisional timeline for the completion of the revision is as follows:

- Alpha release of schema and call for community feedback – early fall 2012
- Schema Development Team meeting – October 2012
- Beta release of schema, documentation and migration tools, final call for community feedback – January 15, 2012
- End of final comment period – February 15
- Tag library editorial team meeting – late February/early March 2013
- Finalize tag library and recommendations for schema – April 1, 2013
- Final schema and tag library release – July 1, 2013

TS-EAD will hold a joint annual meeting with the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Context and the Schema Development Team on Wednesday, August 8th, 2012, from 8:30 AM to 12:30 PM, at the San Diego Hilton Bayfront, Cobalt 504. The agenda for the TS-EAD portion of the meeting is as follows:

TS-EAD meeting agenda:

- Updates and reports
  - Library of Congress EAD site report
  - EAD Roundtable (re: EAD Help Pages)
  - EAD Roundtable presentation
  - Schema Development Team
  - Any news from the Standards Committee
  - Russian tag library translation
- Revision review
  - Progress to date
  - Status of alpha schema
  - Outstanding issues
  - Restatement of Points of Emphasis
- Discuss remaining revision issues
- Timeline review and update
- Task assignments and next steps
  - Testing
  - Tag Library

Respectfully submitted by Michael Rush and Bill Stockting, TS-EAD co-chairs, July 2012.

TS-EAD Members:

Michael Rush, Co-Chair (Yale University)
Bill Stockting, Co-Chair (British Library)
Michael Fox (Minnesota Historical Society)
Kris Kiesling (University of Minnesota)
Angelika Menne-Haritz (Bundesarchiv)
Kelcy Shepherd (University of Massachusetts Amherst)
Claire Sibille-de Grimouard (Direction générale des patrimoines)
Henny van Schie (Nationaal Archief / Bibliotheek)
Sharry Watson (Provincial Archives of Alberta)
Bradley Westbrook (University of California, San Diego)
Karin Bredenberg, ex officio, Schema Development Team (National Archives of Sweden)
Terry Catapano, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Columbia University)
Florence Clavaud, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Ecole nationale des chartes)
Michele Combs, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Syracuse University)
Marcy Flynn, ex officio, Standards Committee (Silver Image Management)
Glenn Gardner, ex officio, Library of Congress (The Library of Congress)
Mark Matienzo, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Yale University)
Hillel Arnold, ex officio, EAD Roundtable (University of Florida)
Cory Nimer, ex officio, Standards Committee (Brigham Young University)
Daniel Pitti, ex officio, Schema Development Team (University of Virginia)
Merrilee Proffitt, ex officio, OCLC Research (OCLC Research)
Salvatore Vassallo, ex officio, Schema Development Team (University of Pavia)
Katherine Wisser, ex officio, EAC Working Group (Simmons College)

# Appendix D

## Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Context (TS-EAC) Report, 2012 Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting

The Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Context is happy to report a busy and successful year of work focused primarily on the process of editing and translating the tag library of EAC-CPF, disseminating the standard, and managing inquiries about the standard for the international community. The TS-EAC is also involved in the process of the revision of EAD and is particularly attentive to issues related to the reconciliation of both standards, EAD and EAC-CPF.

Following our meeting at last year's SAA Annual Meeting, TS-EAC had four primary goals:

1. Edit the tag library for consistency and accuracy
2. Promote and manage the translation of the tag library into French, German, Italian, etc.
3. Update the website
4. Work on examples to reflect the current standard

The tag library has undergone a significant review to incorporate revisions brought to light initially during the French translation process, followed by that of the German translation. Semantic, terminological and technical issues were pointed out. Some of them were resolved; others need more thorough consideration as they are related to both standards (EAC-CPF and EAD) and their interoperation. And so the issues pointed out during this process will also benefit to the revision of EAD and, when time comes, to the writing of the EAD tag library. A draft of the new EAC-CPF tag library has been prepared and is ready for encoding. It will be incorporated with the translation efforts. An outstanding point is that of a model and infrastructure for a dynamic management of the Tag Library and its various existing and forthcoming translations. The work for such model has started at the SDT level. When such model and infrastructure is ready the TS-EAC will then move the content of the Tag Library to it and will organize work for integration in the system of the various translations.

Translations in French and Italian have been completed (the French one is already published on line and made accessible from the EAC-CPF website); translations in Greek and German are underway, and translation in Spanish will start soon. Comprehensive information about translations and institutions in charge of the translations in the respective countries is published on the EAC-CPF website.

The website was revised for direct information architecture. Hans-Joerg Lieder from the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin stepped down as webmaster as his duties changed; Gerhard Müller from the same institution has stepped up to take on the task of webmaster. Discussions with Brian Doyle are scheduled to discuss the disposition of the website vis-à-vis changes with SAA's technology and movements by the EAD site. Statistics from the website indicate that traffic on the website continues to holds steady between 500 and 1,000 unique visitors per month. In 2011, there were 13,187 visits to the site; in January-July 2012, 9,155 visits to the site.

The examples group has been led by Jerry Simmons. He reports that the group has worked both on the examples in the tag library and EAC-CPF website as well as gathering new examples for the website. The examples subcommittee will be meeting in San Diego following the TS-EAC and TS-EAD meetings.

TS-EAC will hold a joint annual meeting with the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description and the Schema Development Team on Wednesday, August 8th, 2012, from 8:30 AM to 12:30 PM, at the San Diego Hilton Bayfront, Cobalt 504. The agenda for the TS-EAC portion of the meeting is as follows:

TS-EAC meeting agenda:

- Updates and reports
  - Tag Library editing
  - Translations
  - Website
  - Examples
  - Any news from the Standards Committee
- Project Updates
  - SNAC
  - APEnet
  - EAG draft
  - France: towards the development of national reference authority files for archives
  - EAF draft (France)
  - Others
- EAD Revision and Reconciliation discussion
- Goals for next year

Respectfully submitted by Katherine M. Wisser and Anila Angjeli, TS-EAC co-chairs, July 2012.

TS-EAC Members:
Anila Angjeli, Co-Chair (Bibliotheque Nationale de France)
Katherine Wisser, Co-Chair (Simmons College)
Kerstin Arnold (Bundesarchiv)
Erica Boudrea (John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum)
Karin Bredenberg (National Archives of Sweden)
Basil Dewhurst (National Library of Australia)
Wendy Duff (University of Toronto)
Tammy Peters (Smithsonian Institution Archives)
Victoria Peters (University of Glasgow)
Chris Prom (University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign)
Aaron Rubinstein (University of Massachusetts, Amherst)
Jerry Simmons (National Archives and Records Administration)
Stefano Vitali (State Archives of Florence, Italy)
Lina Bountouri, Ex Officio, Greece (Ionian University)
Terry Catapano, ex officio, Schema Development Team (Columbia University)
Marcy Flynn, ex officio, Standards Committee (Silver Image Management)
Dennis Meissner, Council Liaison (Minnesota Historical Society)
Gerhard Müller, ex officio, Webmaster (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin)
Cory Nimer, ex officio, Standards Committee (Brigham Young University)
Daniel Pitti, ex officio, Schema Development Team (University of Virginia)
Michael Rush, ex officio, TS-EAD co-chair (Yale University Library)
Jennifer Schaffner, ex officio, OCLC Research (OCLC Research)
William Stockting, ex officio, TS-EAD co-chair (British Library)
Salvatore Vassallo, ex officio, Schema Development Team (University of Pavia)

# Appendix E

**Date: July 20, 2012**
**To: SAA Standards Committee**
**From: Reappraisal and Deaccessioning Development and Review Team (RD-DRT)**
**RE: Annual Report**

The RD-DRT met at the SAA 2011 Annual Meeting in Chicago. In addition to the review team members, individuals from the Standards Committee and council liaison Dennis Meissner were in attendance. The group discussed the comments received thus far, the SAA Code of Ethics revision, and formed a plan to submit the guidelines to SAA Council by the June 2012 council meeting.

Also at the SAA 2011 meeting, the RD-DRT hosted an open forum to discuss the draft guidelines. Approximately 50 people attended and notes from the forum are available upon request.

The group also had a representative available during the SAA "Office Hours" for any SAA members who wanted to discuss the guidelines on an individual basis. Although no members showed up to specifically discuss the guidelines, the representatives promoted the guidelines and the open comment phase to passers-by who were curious and wanted more information.

The open comment closing date was extended from September 16, 2011 to October 14, 2011. The group received comments from approximately 15 individuals throughout the entire open comment phase. In addition to discussing comments during the SAA annual meeting, the group held a teleconference in early November to discuss the remaining comments and other miscellaneous business. Agendas for all meetings are available upon request.

A final version of the guidelines was produced in January 2012. The RD-DRT submitted a complete submission package (available upon request) to the Standards Committee in early February 2012. In March the Standards Committee voted to approve the guidelines and forward them to SAA Council for acceptance as a formal standard. SAA Council endorsed the guidelines in May 2012 and disbanded the RD-DRT with thanks.

The official *Guidelines for Reappraisal and Deaccessioning* is available on the SAA Standards Portal: http://www2.archivists.org/standards.

--Submitted by Laura Uglean Jackson

## Appendix F

# International Council on Archives Committee on Best Practices and Standards

**Committee on Best Practices and Standards**
**Comité des normes et des bonnes pratiques**

**edited by Claire Sibille – de Grimoüard,**
**ICA Committee on Best practices and Standards**
**July 12nd, 2012**

The ICA Committee on Best Practices (ICA/CBPS) has had a busy year. This committee is responsible for overseeing the ongoing intellectual and technical maintenance and development of ICA descriptive standards and for encouraging their dissemination. This report covers the period August 2011-July 2012.

**1. Progress report on ICA standards and draft on common chapter on relationships**
ICA/CBPS prepared a draft of a common chapter to be included in all 4 international descriptive standards on relationships between different types of archival entities, as well as a progress report which is intended to focus on improving the consistency between the content of the standards in their current versions and the main directions of future revisions. Both documents are available on ICA website (http://www.ica.org Section Resources Centre/Standards or http://www.ica.org/13155/standards/cbps-progress-report-for-revising-and-harmonising-ica-descriptive-standards.html and http://www.ica.org/13149/standards/cbps-relationship-in-archival-descriptive-systems.html). This work will be presented at the 17th International Congress on Archives, Brisbane (Australia), 21st-24th August 2012, for discussion and exchanges with the international archival community.

**Different levels in the needed changes can be identified.** In addition of editorial changes (creating a common preface for all four standards, creating a General Introduction for all the standards and a section 1. Scope and Purpose for each of them as well, etc.), more substantial changes could be made.

Currently each of the standards has a glossary, and often single terms are not defined consistently across each. **One common glossary would be beneficial** and would eliminate the need to populate revisions to terms across multiple standards over time. There are only two truly unique terms ("Institution with archival holdings" in ISDIAH, "Function" in ISDF), but these seem suitable to include in a common glossary. Terms would seem applicable to all standards although they only feature currently in ISAD(G) (Access, Accrual, Appraisal, Arrangement, Author, Collection, Custody, Document, File, Finding aid, Fonds, Form, Formal title, Item, Level of description, Medium, Series, Sub-fonds, Supplied title, Title, Unit of description). The ISAD(G) definition for 'Authority control' is a see reference for ISAAR(CPF), but the term in ISAAR(CPF) is 'Authority record'. Either this term could be deleted from the glossary, or a new definition created for it. Lastly, terms appear in more than one standard where the definition is inconsistent; their definition should be reviewed (access point, corporate body, creator, provenance, record).

The names of some descriptive elements (particularly between ISAAR, ISDF and ISDIAH) should be homogenised. Furthermore, **the ISDIAH and ISAAR entities share numerous descriptive elements**. The distinction between an institution in its role as creator and its role as custodian need not be made by multiplying the number of entity types to correspond to the number of roles an institution may conceivably carry out. It would be preferable to document the entity once and then relate it to other entities differently in respect of each separate role it undertakes. **This suggests the possibility of revising ISAAR(CPF) to integrate elements unique to the custodial role**, and to provide guidance on the choice of these elements. As an example, the scope of ISAAR(CPF) Description Area could be extended to accommodate elements from ISDIAH Contact, Access and Services Areas.

In addition**,** the Control area should be common to the four standards. **The Control area of ISAD(G) should be extended and homogenised** with the Control areas of ISAAR(CPF), ISDF and ISDIAH, as it was already done in ICA-AtoM.

Lastly, **it would be useful to explain how the standards fit together**. For example, you can only use ISAD(G), but if you use ISAD(G) in conjunction with ISAAR, the Administrative / Biographical history element of ISAD(G) becomes useless because the description of the records creator is managed by ISAAR; ISAAR can also be used to structure the information contained in the Administrative / Biographical history element of ISAD(G) or to create separate authority records; if you use ISAD(G) in conjunction with ISAAR and ISDF, the Functions, occupations and activities element of ISAAR is not to be used because the description of functions is managed by ISDF; the same situation occurs with many of the elements in ISAAR(CPF) and ISDIAH given that they both describe actors. In addition, you can use another standard to enhance or improve a description; for instance, ISAD(G) does not offer full information related to the biography or administrative history as ISAAR(CPF) can do.

So, CBPS prepared a draft of common chapter on relationships between different types of archival entities and also on relationships of archival authority records, descriptions of functions and archival descriptions to other relevant external information resources not covered by an archival descriptive system.

However, in its current status, the draft does not provides an explanation of the meaning of the relationship types, so there are many questions, especially with regard to the "creator of/created by" relationship type: Is the meaning of "creator" in ISAD(G) or in ISAAR equivalent to the meaning of "creator" in RDA or to that in Dublin Core? Is the agent responsible for acquiring archival materials and forming an artificial collection (collector) a "creator" in ISAAR(CPF)?

At any rate these questions reveal the ambiguity of a term such as "creator" (but this is only an example). As long as the context is a well defined one, and that we operate within one isolated institution, we might perfectly cope with one term fixing its meaning within the given context, but today the finding aids are on the Internet, they become part of interrelated information systems, and are likely to be linked to all kinds of information resources. In this context explicating the types of relationships becomes a key issue.

**2. Towards an archival conceptual model?**

The only way to eliminate the redundancy in the suite of standards would be to develop a conceptual model and then to go back to the rules and identify those unique and shared elements based on all potential relationships. It could help archivists to solve the issues raised by the combination of descriptive standards in an archival descriptive system, as some elements for the links are missing, the entities to be included in a system are not so clear, etc.

Thus, the ICA/CBPS project for the next term 2012-2016 aims to develop a conceptual data model reconciling and harmonizing the four international standards developed since the early 1990s, to make explicit and formal the links between the elements of the 4 international standards. **It is not to develop a new encoding format**, but to consider the conceptual relationships between archives, their creators/holders and functions of creators, and to **clarify the concepts underlying the standards and description formats**. Then, the conceptual model developed for archives should be compared with those developed for museums and libraries in an attempt to harmonize museum, archive, library processes via an understanding of common concepts behind the documentation, in particular to understand their complementary values.
Ongoing initiatives will be considered, such as, for instance, the logical object model implemented in ICA-AtoM software, or the conceptual model developed in the framework of the LOCAH project or lastly the two-year project of the National Archives Service of Finland (NAS), whose primary goal is to develop a common archival descriptive information system for archival institutions in Finland.

**3. ICA-AtoM Seminar**

Several members of ICA/CBPS participated in the ICA-AtoM seminar organized on 2-4 May 2012 in Paris by the International Council on Archives with the support of the Archives de France. This session had 3 main objectives:

- to create a team of trainers for ICA-AtoM software;
- to develop a toolkit in French and in English (tutorials, training scenarios, exercises, etc.);
- to encourage the dissemination of ICA-AtoM and to prepare a training programme which ICA could propose to its branches and sections to be delivered in the framework of their conferences.

The members of the team would then be able to adapt and use those training aids in their cultural context and languages, which included Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Slovenian, Romanian, Bahasa Melayu and of course English and French.

After highlighting the standards and languages implemented by ICA-AtoM and their relationship and delivering a guided setup of ICA-AtoM software, the trainers split up the attendees into three working groups:

1) Essential technical knowledge, setting up, administration and settings; implementation of standards for archival descriptions into ICA-AtoM;
2) Adding and editing contents (archival descriptions, authority records, records describing archival institutions or functions);
3) Accession records module (rights, physical storage, etc.), taxonomies, query and search within archival descriptions and display of the results.

The documentation and training aids prepared by these three working groups are stored in a workspace developed on the ICA website (included in the Digital Recordkeeping Programme pages).

On the last day, the attendees discussed the governance of the project and the expected evolutions of the software.

## 4. ICA/CBPS membership for the term 2008-2012

| | |
|---|---|
| Marion Beyea (chair) | Provincial Archives of New Brunswick (Canada) |
| Nils Brübach | Sächsisches Staatsministerium des Innern, (Germany) |
| Adrian Cunningham (corresponding member) | National Archives of Australia (Australia) |
| Blanca Desantes Fernandez | Subdirección General de los Archivos Estatales, Ministerio de Educación, Cultura y Deporte (Spain) |
| Bärbel Förster | Eidgenössisches Department für auswärtige Angelegenheitten EDA (Federal Department of Foreign Affairs) (Switzerland) |
| Michael Fox | Minnesota Historical Society (United States) |
| Beatriz Franco Espiño | Jefe de Servicio de Valoración y Tratamiento Documental, Subd. Gral. De Archivos Estatales (Spain) |
| Padré Lydie Gnessougou Baroan-Dioumency | Sous-directrice de la Documentation et des Archives, Direction générale du Trésor et de la Comptabilité publique (Côte d'Ivoire) |
| Vitor Manoel Marques da Fonseca | Arquivo Nacional - Direção-Geral (Brazil) |
| Robert Nahuet | Library and Archives Canada, Corporate Archival Standards and Systems Specialist (Canada) |
| Victoria Peters | Andersonian Library, University of Strathclyde (UK) |
| Bogdan-Florin Popovici | Arhivele Naţionale ale României (Romania) |
| Claire Sibille – de Grimoüard (secretary) | Service interministériel des Archives de France (France) |
| Stefano Vitali | Soprintendenza Archivistica per l'Emilia Romagna (Italy) |

# Appendix G

**TRUDY HUSKAMP PETERSON**
**810 Massachusetts Avenue N.E.**
**Washington, DC 20002**
**Tel: 202-547-7969**
**FAX: 202-547-7589**
**archivesthp@aol.com**
**www.trudypeterson.com**

July 31, 2012

Dear SAA colleagues:

I will not be joining you in San Diego, as I will be going to Brisbane for the ICA meeting the following week for my final appearance as your representative. I want you all to know how very much I have cherished the opportunity to represent SAA at the Section of Professional Association (SPA) of the International Council on Archives during the past four years. I have had a wonderful time on the SPA steering committee, have met many, many interesting people from other associations, and have tried to represent clearly the professional position of archivists in the United States.

The next SPA steering committee will set the agenda and work program for the next four years, and the SAA representative will have a strong voice in helping shape those plans. I am sure that methods of certification will continue to be an issue and, like ACA, SAA will want to monitor that carefully. We also should expect continued activity around the issues of archives and human rights, including work towards developing a statement of responsibility for archivists dealing with archives that have importance for asserting human rights. A joint working group from SPA and the ICA's Human Rights Working Group is drafting the statement, and I hope we will see a first draft this autumn.

Two major issues will be voted upon at the August ICA meeting in Brisbane. One is a revision of the ICA constitution; the revision is complicated but not apparently controversial. The other is a vote on the draft "Principles of Access to Archives," which was developed by a working group that I led. I hope the "Principles" will be adopted; the draft has gone through various rounds of comments and revision and I believe that the text now does reflect the prevailing professional position on access.

SAA has much to contribute to other associations, just as we have much to learn about the issues that confront them and the means they have chosen to resolve them. But our contribution is larger than simply sharing information with our sister organizations. I am convinced that participation in ICA by the professional associations is crucial for the health of the worldwide archival profession. As you know, the overwhelming majority of funds for ICA activities come from national archives and, consequently, the national archivists have the most influence within the ICA structure. Increasingly we are seeing national archivists who don't come from the profession, which is a significant change from the situation of thirty years ago when most national archivists were archivists by training and background. What this means is that the issues of concern to the profession per se and to archivists as career professionals are most strongly represented in ICA by the professional associations. Their voice must be clear and consistent,

ensuring that professional questions are raised at ICA and that the professional position is accurately stated in debates. It has never been more important for the professional associations to work in ICA than it is today.

Thank you again for letting me represent SAA on SPA.

Trudy Huskamp Peterson
Certified Archivist

# Appendix H

**National Information Standards Organization**
**Activities and Ballots, 2011/2012**
**Report to the Standards Committee of the Society of American Archivists**

Kathleen Dow, Liaison
University of Michigan, Special Collections Library
kdow@umich.edu
August 3, 2012; October 26, 2012

**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, learning and publishing. NISO website: http://www.niso.org/home

**Current (as of 8/3/12) list subscriptions for the Society of American Archivists**

ANSI/NISO Z39.19-2005 Review Ballot (CCM)
ANSI/NISO Z39.2-1994 (R2001) Review Ballot (CCM)
ANSI/NISO Z39.47-1993 (R2003) Review Ballot (CCM)
ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R2002) Review Ballot (CCM)
ANSI/NISO Z39.50-2003 Review Ballot (D2D)
ANSI/NISO Z39.84-2005 Review Ballot (CCM)
ANSI/NISO Z39.87-2006 Review Group (CCM)
ANSI/NISO Z39.89-2003 Review Ballot (D2D)
ANSI/NISO/ISO 12083-1995 (R2002) Review Ballot Voting Pool (CCM)
Ballot 64 (D2D)
*Newsline*
NISO Voting Members
TC46 Ballot Advisory Group

## 2011/2012 Proposals, Reviews and Standards w/Votes

2011-08-30 ISO/FDIS 27730, Information and documentation — International standard collection identifier (ISCI) TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2011-09-01 Systematic review ISO 2709:2008, Information and documentation — Format for information exchange TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2011-09-30 ISO/FDIS 30301, Information and documentation — Management systems for records — Requirements TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2011-09-30 ISO/FDIS 30300, Information and documentation — Management systems for records — Fundamentals and vocabulary TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2011-10-02 Proposed New Work Item: Standards for Digital Bookmarking and Annotation Sharing NISO Voting Members. Vote: YES

2011-10-17 ISO/DIS 1087, Terminology work — Vocabulary TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: ABSTAIN

2011-11-15 ISO/DIS 19005-3, Document management — Electronic document file format for long-term preservation — Part 3: Use of ISO 32000-1 with support for embedded files (PDF/A-3) TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2011-12-09 Systematic Review ISO 259-2:1994, Information and documentation -- Transliteration of Hebrew characters into Latin characters -- Part 2: Simplified transliteration TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: ABSTAIN

2011-12-09 Systematic Review ISO 259:1984, Documentation -- Transliteration of Hebrew characters into Latin characters TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: ABSTAIN

2011-12-09 Systematic Review ISO 233:1984, Documentation -- Transliteration of Arabic characters into Latin characters TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: CONFIRM

2011-12-09 Systematic Review ISO 9:1995, Information and documentation -- Transliteration of Cyrillic characters into Latin characters -- Slavic and non-Slavic languages TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: CONFIRM

2011-12-14 Proposed New Work Item: Standardized Specification for Resource Synchronization NISO Voting Members. Vote: YES

2012-01-04 Approval of New TC46/SC4 Secretariat and Chair TC46 Ballot Advisory Group (Finland). Vote: Approve

2012-02-29 Systematic Review ISO 15489-1, Information and documentation — Records management — Part 1: General TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: REVISE W/COMMENT

2012-02-29 Systematic Review ISO/TR 15489-2, Information and documentation — Records management — Part 2: Guideline TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: REVISE W/COMMENT

2012-03-01 Systematic Review ISO 832:1994, Information and documentation -- Bibliographic description and references -- Rules for the abbreviation of bibliographic terms TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: CONFIRM

2012-03-01 Systematic Review ISO 15707:2001, Information and documentation -- International Standard Musical Work Code (ISWC) TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: ABSTAIN

2012-03-23 ISO/FDIS (2nd) 27730, Information and documentation — International standard collection identifier (ISCI) TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2012-04-02 ISO/DTR 17068, Information and documentation — Records management — Trusted third party repository for digital records TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES
2012-04-20 ISO/DTR 18128, Information and documentation — Risk identification and assessment for records systems TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2012-04-30 ISO/DIS 25964-2, Information and documentation — Thesauri and interoperability with other vocabularies — Part 2: Interoperability with other vocabularies TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2012-05-25 Systematic Review ISO/TR 21449:2004, Content Delivery and Rights Management — Functional requirements for identifiers and descriptors for use in the music, film, video, sound recording and publishing industries TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: ABSTAIN

2012-06-19 NISO Board of Directors Directors Election (2012-2015) NISO Voting Members.
Votes:

Janice L. Fleming (American Psychological Association)
Mairead Martin (Pennsylvania State University)
Patricia A. Steele (University of Maryland Libraries)
Tyler Walters (Virginia Tech University Libraries)
Keith Webster (John Wiley and Sons)

2012-06-19 2012 NISO Board of Directors Vice Chair Election NISO Voting Members
Vote:

Heather Reid

2012-06-19 Approval of Proposed New Work Item: Develop Recommended Practices for Demand-Driven Acquisition (DDA) of Monographs NISO Voting Members. Vote: ABSTAIN

2012-07-30 ISO/CD 21127, Information and documentation — A reference ontology for the interchange of cultural heritage information TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2012-08-13 ISO 30302 Justification Study TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: YES

2012-08-16 TC46 New Work Item Proposal for Technical Specification: Recommendation on methods of validating the success of deacidification processes for printed and handwritten documents TC46 Ballot Advisory Group. Vote: ABSTAIN

# Appendix I

## RBMS Metrics and Assessment Task Force

At the ALA Annual meeting the task force determined to break into smaller, more focused groups that would each compete the following deliverables:

- Literature review, including existing methodologies
- Environmental scan, including note of gaps and overlaps
- List of definitions/vocabularies that emerge from literature review and environmental scan

The task force is not planning any sort of survey at this time but rather plans to rely upon its members to provide insight to a variety of institutions. They are working on setting up a Google Site for us, which should help facilitate better communication across the task force.

The groups consist of the following:

- Accessioning, Acquisitions, Cataloging, Processing, and Metadata: Martha Conway, Eva Guggemos, Jen Talley.
- Conservation, Preservation, Exhibits, and Exhibit Loans: Ian Bogus, Sarah Fisher, Moira Fitzgerald.
- Instruction & Reference: Anne Bahde, Lisa Carter, Heather Smedberg.
- Use & Users, Web stats, Circulation, Gate Counts, and Community Impact: Christian Dupont, Mark Greenberg, Emilie Hardman, and Elizabeth Call.