

KT's Notes from EGAD Meeting in Rome, Oct. 23-25, 2017

Present:

- Florence Clavaud
- Miia Herrala
- Vitor Fonesca
- Beatriz Franco
- Padre Gnessougou
- Gavan McCarthy
- Victoria Peters
- Daniel Pitti (chair)
- Bogdan Popovici
- Javier Requejo
- Martin Stürzlinger
- Kat Timms (“KT”)
- Salvatore Vassalo
- Stefano Vitali

20171023

EGAD Work Plan, timelines / deadlines

- Proposal accepted by PCOM - \$30,000EU until 2020
- MOU; Project charter with timeline
- A lot of feedback was received on the draft CM – time-consuming to do it justice
- Project Charter:
- <https://www.dropbox.com/preview/EGAD-All/Administrative/EGAD%20ICA%20RiC%20II%20MOU%2BSchedule%20v7%2B.docx?role=personal>
- Schedule A – deliverables
- 2017-18
 - RiC-CM – second draft based on public comments – released for public comment in early 2018
 - RiC-O – incomplete draft released for public comment early in 2018 – revised based on comments during 2018, complete draft by end of 2018
 - RiC-AG – will present a preliminary description of this to PCOM for comment in 2018; will conduct presentations and workshops on RiC
- 2018-19
 - RiC-CM: third draft completed and released for comments in early 2019
 - RiC-O: complete draft released for comments late 2018
 - RiC-AG: draft outline with initial drafts of some parts completed; presentations & workshops done – shift to practical training (although we are not really changing description... just intellectually re-arranging... not clear what this practical training might

- be about at this point...however, do want systems that could support; could be two types of training – for archivists, for software developers)
 - Talked about SNAC – maintained as relational database, but served up as triples using separate software app
 - RiC-O: project in France implementing aspects – proof of concept; not translating existing descriptions on the fly to RiC-O, more static; will want to prove, in the future, that can convert existing legacy data forward into RiC
 - AG a form of training material; perhaps beyond remit of EGAD to prepare other training materials; focus should be on the model and ontology
 - Material online – perhaps links to prototypes
 - Policy-oriented introduction on RiC for ICA Forum for National Archivists?
 - Reminder to remain technology-neutral, as descriptive systems will vary by archives (e.g. in some cases, they are just one module within a larger collection management system)
- 2019-20
 - RiC-CM: stable, complete version will be released
 - RiC-O: stable, complete version will be released
 - RiC-AG: stable, complete version will be released
 - Presentations and workshops - could have some training for processing archivists, or re: methods and techniques in developing technological infrastructure...
- All of this is tentative – subject to revision based on new understandings
- Potential to meet 4X til 2020 – Berlin, London, Bucharest, possibly Virginia; RiC-O meetings – FC will look into funding options

RiC-O progress / status

- Met in Paris last winter
- Modelling the role of the archivist in description – hot topic; critique of the archivist’s role
- FC – showed human-readable version of the ontology – starts with principles – e.g. must be useful; functional; flexible; open
- Showed classes in Protégé – hierarchical ordering – e.g. Agent with sub-classes; Activity a sub-class of Event; Name – AgentName, Identifier, Title; Type – RecordSetType, ActivityType; EventType; Relation – types like ArchivalProvenanceRelation; AuthorityRelation; EvidenceRelation; SocialRelation; WholePartRelation; etc.
- Relations as classes; n-ary; beginning date, end date, certainty, description, has context, has place, relational associates, state; a Relation links exactly two things
- Agent (person) member of Agent (group)
- Agent has relation to Relation (class) has relation to Agent
- RiC-O is complicated but can be used as-is
- Have shared it with companies and individuals outside of EGAD for feedback
- CIDOC CRM – modelling of events – this person assigns X attribute about Y other thing

Status of digest strategy (publicly responding to community feedback)

- I gave an overview of the document – have been using it as a discussion tool during recent teleconferences
- Whatever the future of this document, it at least reflects the results of our recent discussions
- Is time-consuming, but 2 birds with one stone (EGAD needed to discuss the comments somehow anyway)
- Unsure what will be released to the community (could release some kind of statement; not for continual dialogue with EGAD, though broader community could discuss the statement)
- Not feasible to do ongoing dialogue – not possible to address all details in the comments either
- Most recent version of Digest document is from Oct. 18th – nearly through the properties area; still have not discussed the high-level feedback on relations
- Digest document – represents cherry-picked comments – there are other resources in DBox available for EGAD’s reference (i.e. organized or consolidated versions of the community’s feedback)
- DP: Could publish list of digest questions without responses – here is what we are deliberating on – and mention that 2nd version of CM is coming, will have opportunity to comment then
- Me: This would need editing. Still like the idea of providing some information – even 5 points to address common, basic misunderstandings (e.g. is RiC CM a conceptual model, data model, etc.?)
- MS: digest of issues without answers – good resource, but without any direct response for rationale or reasoning behind decisions, may cause issues if doesn’t appear in 2nd version
- DP: not enough resources to address all points, may not understand all points
- FC: could add an appendix to v.2 re: main things changed, opportunity to provide rationale then. Design principles
- DP: OK to identify what is in or out of scope for strategy for addressing the comments
- VF: suggesting not to share digest of questions. 2nd version of CM will be sufficient. Digest aggregates and combines things – not everyone’s comments are reflected there anyway.
- DP: want to avoid getting caught up in ongoing debate and interchange... can’t afford to be indecisive. Not possible to get global consensus on everything
- GMcC: feedback is a picture of the community – its diversity. Digest of major issues – will not engage on any discussion, hold your thoughts and comments to respond to the next draft. Important to reflect back to the community who they are...
- BF: could use digest to make a FAQ. With answers remaining a little vague
- DP: academic portion of the community – it is their business to analyze and critique, versus people that are building systems. Some commenters said you didn’t address X, but X was in there, just subtle. This points to one of the major issues that needs to be addressed here – Presentation of RiC.
- JR: Spanish model – in response to 2 large commenters – said thank you, please feel free to present us with an alternative for X, which must be consistent with the rest of the model
- DP: distillation of comments, attempted to pull out main ones that were identified by more than one person; not all comments may be reflected, needed strategy to produce a summary like this; in the process of deliberating on this; when release the next draft, hope it reflects well our consideration and deliberation on the comments that were received

- MS: want to ensure that people feel consulted...
- DP: process of producing X behind closed doors; this is traditional; not dynamic, interactive with public (not practical, cannot do) – releasing public drafts is our responsibility – nothing beyond that
- DP: one major takeaway from comments – our presentation strategy was not effective; long list of entities (relations) confusing; unclear why certain ones were included, and others were not; seemed somewhat arbitrary; also terminology confusion – will need to explain which terms were chosen and what we mean by them; why X is an entity and not a property and vice versa

Ordering of entities (presentation)

- Hierarchy of entities was suggested (primary, secondary and tertiary)
- These 4 are primary: Record; Record Set; Agent; Function; ~~Mandate~~ (?) What, Who & Why. When (Date) and Where (Place) – bracket these off for a minute. These 2 occupy a special role in relation to the rest; they are supportive – in a metaphysical space they are primary (required for existence) – but from point of view of presenting the entities – they are the environment
- 5 W's could be essence of organizing principle
- What is the rationale for defining any of these as primary?
- B/c basic elements reflected in description traditionally – consistent over time
- Re: distinction between Record & Record Set – many commenters supported, but some were concerned with not being able to consistently interpret and implement these, so advocated for one record entity (whether aggregate or item). EGAD supports the distinction, will have to win over the rest of the community. Could be part of application guidelines.
- Put Mandate at secondary level; primary at level of Agent
- Re: Place – not necessarily core of previous descriptive standards; address the 'where' of the holding institution, but not the 'where' of the records creation
- Focus is on What (records) Who (agent) Why (function). Where could come up more in relations between these entities (e.g. when someone did X in relation to records; where could be jurisdiction)
- 3D presentation for accommodating Place and Date (outside of hierarchical presentation)
- Date and Place as properties of other entities vs. entities themselves? Just a matter of the terminology that we used? Entities – classes; properties – actually ~~attributes~~ – characteristics, statements of facts about the entity that make it distinctly that entity
- HoldsOf relations (i.e. an attribute of X) – says X about Y; (Y is not autonomous) e.g. Gavan has blue eyes
- HoldsBetween relation (i.e. a relation between X and Y) – X as a Place is an entity that we want to make statements about ... (both X and Y are autonomous) e.g. Gavan is from Australia
- We are concerned with the identification of things. Making factual statements. The accumulation of these essentially express what that thing is
- Cardinality – 1:1, M:1, M:N – way of mapping relations e.g. Agent has 1 birthdate; Agent can have many names; 1:1 always a literal; 1:M could be literals, or controlled vocabulary; Record can have 1 documentary form; but Documentary form could be related to many records; M:N both entities are described in their own right

- Need to clarify what we've done re: entities, properties and relations – which type of relations could it have based on 1:1, M:1, M:N – part of explaining our “design principles”

—lunch—

- re-cast current RiC-CM introduction – re-draft (as discussed at previous teleconference), started by AC
- points back to existing ICA standards; new one could also explain basic RiC components (entity, property, relation – DP has a draft started of this that he will build on and finalize after Rome meeting)
- RiC – RiC-CM, RiC-O, RiC-AG
- History of Archival Practice (DeSalle and Proctor, 2017)
- original RiC introduction to be revised, address RiC product family (suite of 3)

Function, Activity, Transaction

- Confusion expressed by the community on these...
- Function (as practiced in particular place and time) vs. Function (Abstract) – this was the original intent
- Function could subsume activity and transaction in its description
- How to uniquely identify a particular function – description/label in association to a particular date and place (AKA jurisdiction) – some Agent mandates another Agent to have authority for fulfilling function X within a given jurisdiction
- E.g. of Australia – immigration control, function performed by various agents over the years
- Concepts – ensuring Justice (King); administration of Justice; criminal justice; civil justice ('sub-functions')
- MS: description of concept (Function Abstract) would be quite empty – because the description could only exist re: a particular context; otherwise really just a controlled term for the function
- ISO 26122 business process analysis standard – review to see how it compares to RiC approach
- Community feedback: hard to distinguish between Function and Activity – is there a way to define an entity that addresses this ambiguity; how do we model this effectively
- Can we treat Activity at a conceptual ('abstract') level, too
- French approach – created a vocabulary for Functions – 'domain of activity' – covers functions in a broad sense, but also activities carried out in support of those functions
- <https://data.naa.gov.au/def/agift.html> Functions thesaurus
- Concepts showing up in more than one hierarchy – a graph. Thesauri can be poly-hierarchical also.
- Does SKOS support this? Any node can have more than one broader term? FC: yes
- Allows for Function in one context to be Activity in another context
- E.g. fiscal accounting – procurement office, is their function to do procurement and contracts; but every unit within university has responsibility for fiscal xyz – not primary function, but activity in which they have to engage as part of their mission
- Function (Abstract) – need new label or definition?
- Unnamed conceptual thing that covers what was Function (Abstract) as well as Activity (aka abstract)....

- Is explaining the relativity of functions, activities, etc. part of the solution here? – How function x is activity y in 2 different contexts?
- Suggestion – having 1 ‘function’ entity and use relations to explain context – nature of relations between the Agent and the instance of the entity
- Confusion in the community’s feedback – a lot of it was in reaction to the unclear examples
- Ends (function) and means (activities); activities can be parcelled out into smaller pieces – has a duration
- DP: feels strongly that abstract function needs a home in the model in order to push further the standardization of description (i.e. provide a foothold for building an international controlled vocabulary for functions)
- Or, can it be accommodated in one Function entity that could be implemented as either a controlled vocabulary (abstract terms) or function existing in a given context
- CIDOC-CRM: Activity, but no concept of Function; Activity is subclass of Event; something that happened in which Agents were involved
- LCSH “education” – mean ‘educating’ (functions are reflected)
- FC: suggesting to remove Function (Abstract) and suggesting to have Concept entity and explain how it could be used for function, activity, etc. – it can be used for categorizing things, as well as topics of records
- ‘archival subject headings’: Concept – function, activity, acts or transactions
- K Thibodeau: argued that performance of an activity is a performance, cannot be documented.
- Talk of collapsing function with activity, because they are not entirely mutually distinct; A can be B, or B can be A, in different contexts
- MS: likes distinction between abstract function and function within a particular context to avoid confusion when doing consulting work (i.e. most people would not be concerned with purely abstract function and could be told to ignore it). Better to have them distinctly defined (Thought: is this the role of implementation guidelines, or does it need a place in the model?)
- Back to primary/secondary: argument that activity should be primary because it must happen in order for a record to exist; vs. Function may not always exist (e.g. a poet has no function)
- FC: suggesting umbrella entity like ‘function’ or ‘business domain’ – and further subdivide it if needed, into function, activity, etc. (mirroring approach in RiC-O for Agent – broad class, with sub-classes for Person, Group, etc.)
- Revisiting idea to collapse Record with Record Set – already share a number of properties
- Challenge with finding a usable term for the combined ‘function’ entity (‘business’ ‘affairs’ etc.)
- Function, Activity, Mandate: objectives and the means to achieve them
- Caution – want to include personal papers – this language might seem too business/organization-heavy
- ‘process’ entity; ‘competency’....
- Looked at definition of process in Merriam-Webster <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/process>
- ‘Process’ could be the term used for the higher-level entity – with sub-entities, function, activity, etc.
- FC: what about occupation and position? Are they in scope here
- DP: perdurants – unfold over time (CRM: temporal entities)
- Mandate out of scope here; occupation in scope here (?) or support entities of Agents

Discussion of high-level entities resumes...

- Relaying the discussion on the way over to the meeting room re: umbrella structures for primary entities:
 - o 'archival resource': record; record set
 - o 'agent': person, group, corporate body, family
 - o 'function' (not 'process' as discussed yesterday): ISDF originally included both objective and process toward achieving this objective (both ends and means) --- to include goal/objective/purpose (responsibility – which is the link to mandate), activity, transaction
- Position / Occupation – closer link to Agent.... Would be secondary
- Issue of proper term for 'archival resource' – can be dealt with later, remotely
- Question of whether 'archival resource' includes dataset or not (some say yes, included in record set; FC was asking whether this was the intent)
- Plan: to look at this issue further for digital records (part of larger group of issues re: digital records and RiC)
- Easier bridge between this high-level and existing ICA standards
- Secondary entities: Controlled Vocabulary entities as *
 - o Record component
 - o **Documentary form ***
 - o **Function (~~abstract~~)-terms ***
 - o **Occupation ***
 - o Position
 - o Mandate
 - o Place (X occupy own section – have names & boundaries that change over time)
 - o Date (X occupy own section)
- Date & Place occur in many areas... need to be developed separately
- Discussion of Documentary Form: similarity with library (genre); also diplomatics – different forms have different characteristics at different places and times; normally applied to individual records
- Suggesting to add '**Record Set type ***' as another of the controlled vocab entities – e.g. fonds, series, etc. – exception: 'miscellaneous'
- At the moment in RiC-O, Documentary Form is a SKOS-controlled vocabulary
- Suggestion to remove the Controlled Vocabulary (CV) entities for now, but leave a door open to re-add them later
- Better to reduce rather than expand at this point, since original # of entities seemed too much (14)
- The CV entities can be seen as having histories (e.g. are relative to time and place) – Documentary Form and Occupation; but reduced version for CV, for understandability
- Introduce these 4 as controlled lists.... Rather than full entities
- What is practical and what is purposeful in a given project – sometimes they are most appropriate as CVs and other times need to be elevated to full entities because they require their own descriptions

- Question about extending the model at local level – adding new entities and properties – need to define a way that this kind of extension could occur
- Question about clarifying what is mandatory or optional – could be explained in intro piece re: roles of RiC-CM, RiC-O and RiC-AG; the latter might be the place for indicating obligations
- Otherwise, likely that primary entities would be the mandatory ones
- Prescriptive rules – define minimum; proscriptive rules – never do X
- Proposing to have these 4 * introduced as CVs... but that they could be localized and contextualized, etc. The only one of these that we’re supporting the contextual description of – for now, is Function... leaving open the possibility of doing these 4 in the future – explain this in RiC-CM with examples
- Suggestion to add Record Component into umbrella of ‘archival resource’
- Relation of record component to compound record
- Suggestion to avoid using terms/ideas of compound record and record component – just have ‘Record’, which can be recursive... or multiple Records can come together to form a single Record.... Leave it open
- SV: contextual view of Record – is what is contained in a Record Set. Ontological definition of Record is fine, but knowing what is actually a Record can only be known through recognizing this context.... (it is a Record in context)
- Discussion of fuzzy boundaries of these things.... And how much we want to try to identify and describe them
- ABC is record in my context, but could be Record Component in your context
- Suggestion to eliminate Record Component – instead allow Record to be part of another Record
- Specify the nature of the relation in the property (AKA relation) that connects them
- Example of embedding content in an email vs. typing it in separate document and attaching it.... How does this affect the definition/boundary of the record
- Summary: have Record; articulate that Records can be parts of Records... get rid of ‘component’ and call it ‘Record Part’ (e.g. email with attachment, charter with seal); when talking about part of a record, talking about something that is intrinsic to the Record (fundamentally part of it) – while a seal can fall off of something, it was intrinsically part of the document to which it had been affixed
- Avoiding term ‘element’ or ‘component’ (each which speak to different aspects of diplomatics)
- Discussion of which entities have a physical component: agent-person, record (and what about place?) otherwise the rest are social constructions – DP argues that our focus is on the social constructions around records; for physical preservation, physical aspects and their relation to the socially constructed aspects become important
- For a person – biological person vs. social person - limited details relevant to Record for biology (birth and death date, could say biological sex). Social construct person – gender; could have more than one identity over lifespan, or overlapping and coexisting at one time
- Thinking of Record (containing Records) vs. Record Part (which is to remain an entity) – could it be left up to RiC-AG to clarify in which situations option A might be better to reflect/describe vs. Option B? Answer: yes, possibly.
- Talking about two aspects (social vs. physical) being intertwined – and this creates the Record
- Suggestion to make ‘Record Part’ recursive as well (examples where record components contain other record components.... Example related to a register)

- Record Part – either physical or social; describing the parts of the integral whole (of the Record)
- Currently same properties are assignable to Record or Record Part – but Record Parts may not always be single (e.g. an attached zip file)
- ‘Archival Resource’: would have properties assignable to either of Record Set, Record, Record Part; these three sub-entities would each have their own unique properties as well
- May not always know what X is, to know which types of properties to assign – having the option to just use Archival Resource properties would be helpful in this case
- Social Construct vs. Physical: there will be separate properties for describing each; and may be additional properties that bridge the two

Properties – review of select properties to investigate which might lie at the intersection between social and physical aspects

- Authenticity and Integrity Note: one of the bridge properties looking at both social construct and physical
- Content Extent: tried to disentangle the social and physical, but didn’t do this successfully
- Quality of Information: original intent was about physical (quality of the reproduction)
- Scope & Content: mostly intellectual
- Encoding Format: arguing that human representation is encoded in physical X
- Media Type: arguing that it’s mainly physical.... But intended to support human communication (social)
- Previously – had tried to borrow from both RDA and Spanish model to avoid reinventing the wheel when trying to tease apart physical from intellectual (social) characteristics
- Community feedback: unclear what was intended; plus pointed out bits of overlap across 6-8 different properties
- Suggesting to make a list of the properties that are unclear/problematic: do more analysis, and look at more resources (e.g. PREMIS) – and go back to RDA, Spanish model, InterPARES (digital records) – U of NC’s Bitcurator
- Also think about which properties could be elevated to ‘Archival Resource’ level
- Re: yesterday – discussion re: avoiding use of term ‘property’ in CM, since it was being used in an atypical manner, and differently from how it was used in RIC-O (it means relations there) – so, options to use ‘characteristics’, or ‘**attributes**’
- Something that we attribute to X
- ‘property’ is used to mean attribute in several disciplines (e.g. philosophy)
- ‘assertion’ – i.e. asserting/saying X about Y – goes into realm of archivists making assertions about records based on evidence --- one kind of assertion is to attribute a particular characteristic to an entity, or assert a relation between entities
- Include explanation about attributes as part of preface re: ‘entities’, ‘attributes’ and ‘relations’ (basic terminology in use in the CM)
- Explain (archival) description? – DP: description is the broader concept, archival description is a type of description
- Spanish model defines archival description (not description): as a process and as a product
- Description as a function, goal – e.g. serves sub-functions of access and use

- APEX: repository-level guide – basically a finding aid describing the finding aids
- Spanish model: define attribute for their usage of it, not intended to represent global usage of term
- Which attributes at Archival Resource level also apply to Record Set, Record and Record Part? Which are specific (exclusive) to each of the latter three entities? Are there attributes at level of Record that can be inherited by Record Part?
- Goal: intellectual coherence; simplicity
- GMcC: forced directed graph showing patterns in properties – grouping of properties per entities; properties shared across entities; properties that reoccur for various entities like those around history and those around language
- Date information – different at various levels (e.g. creation date vs. date span, summarizing members of a set)
- Suggestion to determine umbrella-level properties for Function grouping also
- Agent – now umbrella as well, with person; group - corporate body, family; as sub-entities
- Need to do same exercise of determining which attributes are assigned at umbrella level vs. to specific entities underneath

—lunch—

- re-iteration of proposal for umbrella entities; yes, making more (sub) entities underneath, but they are comprehensibly organized (coincidentally Hurley's Doers, Deeds, Documents)
- concern that have made the CM more complicated because of adding new sub-entities, but the problem with the original model was the undifferentiated flat list, not the number of entities per se
- don't want to use 'type' anymore – was not a clear way of dealing with this kind of situation – i.e. how could you assign properties only to certain 'type' values of entities - making them all entities makes property assignment easier

Review of Part 1 of Digest/Discussion question document

- Criticism of RiC not expressing underlying principles – FYI SAA Principles – didn't include provenance
- Comma article on RiC-O – addressed some of the issues in 1.5 (re-use of existing ontologies) – need to clarify what stage of publication this is in
- Yes, could provide some info on rationale for decisions made
- Could include list of commenters as an appendix to RiC-CM v0.2 (shows community collaboration and input)
- Name as entity: Spanish model – has 9 types of name; Name is an attribute of 4 entities; must be clarified with type of name
- Finnish model – 3 Agent Names – Name as a separate entity – preferred, variant and former (from RDA) – when using Name, must specify the type
- Discussion of types of Name – approaches, authority control for Agents – recommending following the library community with respect to name control – has a long history and established practices

- For RiC, need to follow-up further on Name (already a class in RiC-O) – i.e., making it an entity or not – being an entity would create more complexity
- Curatorial events – Relationships is interconnected with Events (both have a duration of time; BP had argued that event was shorter in time, but not necessarily)
- Access – at the properties level, RiC had mashed together intellectual and physical concerns; technical access conditions hadn't been distinct in original list of properties – but had a property that addressed mediation
- Rights as an entity – could be separated out at least in database constructions – traditional approach would be to have it repeatable – qualify with dates – “don't use yyyy-mm-dd” and “use yyyy-mm-dd”
- Cardinality for some of these – e.g. name, rights – if repeatable, 1:1, etc. – for RiC, in Application Guidelines (AG)
- Modelling description of things – avoiding issues of obligation and cardinality (to be specified in AG)
- Be able to qualify certain properties with date and place – so why not a shared property of all relations? DP argued that it would not be applicable to all – e.g. would not want to have a date property for Date entity
- Control attributes – descriptive assertions – e.g. archivist assigned rights on yyyy-mm-dd --- state who, when, where, source citation, found evidence
- Want to be clear when/how date can be a property without making it universal
- When M:1 relations, qualify by date – to be explored in RiC-AG – what does 'date qualified' mean – relation with Date entity? No - basically which entities could have date as a property – and/or into the world of descriptive assertions
- State (time bound) (changeable)
- Trait (permanent) (unchangeable)

20171025

- Classification: was discussed at length in Italy – bridge between RM and archives – currently decontextualized in the draft CM without reference to the classification schema
- At times you have access to the original schema; in other times it could be lost – and just have codes remaining; could also have multiple schemes applied over time – including within the archives
- DP proposes having Classification as an entity of the CV type – 1:M (one record can have many classification terms or codes – may be controlled or uncontrolled) - identify the source so that someone can follow-up further – BP concerned that cannot identify source at all times; identifying the source would refer to the classification scheme as a separate thing
- MS: codes are applied, reflecting classification or arrangement, but do not separately describe classification as an entity?
- FC: situations where there is no scheme – have to describe your arrangement practice (so, is a separate thing, an entity); 2nd option – have external scheme that you link out to; 3rd option – have internal classification scheme... Basically arguing that you describe your vocabularies or schemes used

- DP – Classification – saying that it is an entity – with its own attributes (i.e. the terms, codes) – but these are also being presented as attributes of Records (although the underlying relation is between the Record entity and the Classification entity) – his list of attributes: term, code, descriptive note, source (which scheme, or who), PID
- In other words – being presented in the CM as an attribute of Record or Record Set, but being modelled ‘out there’ as a separate classification entity... sort of unacknowledged... at least in the CM?
- SV: Q re: entities, attributes, complex attributes (like this one), relations?
- Could in fact treat all attributes in this way (?)
- conflating describing description with demarcating entities?... are the codes and terms in a scheme its attributes? Or its ‘contents’ in a sense... what it is....
- Example of literal value being assigned as an attribute of record, needing to provide info on source, who applied the code, and when (is this describing description – not saying that the classification scheme is itself an entity... like providing a quote from p. 3 of a textual record?)
- Yes – classification as an ‘entity’ (secondary, tertiary, supporting, etc.)
- JR: classification code as a type of name for another entity (name or identifier)
- FC: results of discussion yesterday re: Name as an entity or not?
- DP: suggesting to treat Name in a similar sense to the approach to Classification... FC: defer this work until later. Add it as an entity now, or postpone it?
- One option – to explain in CM that parallel, variant, etc. names need to be addressed, but will not be addressed (as an entity or class) in CM – is a repeatable attribute; - will be entity in RiC-O. Could do the same thing for Classification (don’t treat it as an entity in the CM, say it will be addressed in RiC-O). Being conveyed in a simplified way, as an attribute.
- FC: suggesting to expand on Classification (because more unique and central to archival practices) but not Name for this draft – DP: should do both or neither
- GMcC: let’s do Name as an entity now
- BP: suggestion to use analogy of database modelling to try to explain increasingly complex RiC – entities, attributes, and some attributes are more complex (have additional tables to explain them)
- JR: suggesting to re-name 2nd level of entities – instead of secondary, could be ‘operational’ or ‘functional’ or something like that
- SaV: FRAD has Name as entity because is focus of that model – is not our focus? Make something an entity to put focus on it. Might make more sense to give this attention to Classification rather than Name. Would be easier to teach the model with fewer entities.
- Leave decision open for now? Experiment with both options?
- Re: agent Names – follow RDA’s approach as encoded in MARC (Note: names as global property currently applies to more than just Agent entity Applied to everything)
- What to do with leftover Position and Mandate? Position – group under Agent? Part of Agent identity? Also has a connection to the business/function entities. Is a link to an agent Group
- Suggestion to leave Mandate among list of secondary entities – authority given by Agent A to Agent B

Digest/Discussion 1.4 extensibility – example for this is EAC – Australia: used in highly extensible way for research community – various communities would want to extend; important for attributes

Digest/Discussion 1.8 addressing personal context more: intent was to address both; could be helped by adding more non-business record examples – could include poet. Examples at Mexico workshop could include this. MS: examples that show minimal application of RiC components

Digest/Discussion 1.10 Date – suggestion to treat date as one of the complex attributes (like classification, etc.) – need to explain the date.... Me: but this is expressing date as an attribute (the literal string using a particular calendar vs. a timespan.... DEFERRED for future analysis.....

Digest/Discussion 1.12 Place – suggested deferring for later – look at the comments in more detail.

Digest/Discussion 1.13 Concept/Thing – if highest level in entity stack, assign common properties there. FC: agrees to qualify scope of concept/thing within RiC – won't address all things/concepts out there.... Suggests to distinguish Concept from Thing, former is social construct, latter is physical. Describing the real world using concepts... Just have top-level Concept entity, leaving out Thing? FC: concepts are abstract things. JR: concept, object, event are packaged into 1 entity in NEDA.

Properties

Digest/Discussion 2.2 Data types – move to AG?.... and the transformation of certain entities into the CV-style would clarify which would need the controlled vocab datatype. JR: in some attributes – included specification of how to implement – e.g. dates; also mentioned repeatability. Currently working on guidelines (NEDA products: 1- conceptual model; 2- vocabulary; * 3- minimal data for describing records, agents, actions)

Template for each attribute: identifier, computer-friendly label, name, description, group (groupings of attributes), possible specification or qualification of attribute (e.g. date type), extensibility (with other attributes or relations), repeatability, possible list of categories for use with attribute (e.g. could be applied as date range), general comments, examples

Included as appendix to its CM how NEDA crosswalks to or aligns with other standards

Digest/Discussion 2.5 Identifier – one way of naming, vs. Names.... Possible to add section 'Appellation' (also: class code is a 'name' of a concept)

Digest/Discussion 2.6 digital issues – checksum info. When to include detail and when to point out to something else. Warning re: replication or re-use of something like PREMIS – or could be seen as an endorsement. Distinguish between digital preservation and description of digital... JR: could be a matter of extensibility – how to match up to other standards... DP: purpose behind description is not to support digital preservation ... is about providing contextual description of the object.... BP: so, need to have definition of archival description (its scope)... DP: argues that the aspect of preservation we're concerned with is with the intellectual description, to complement physical description which is separately managed and described... Me: a scope issue + presentation BP: if presentation of properties goes more toward Spanish template, could show options for implementing P5 Authenticity and Integrity Note as checksums.... DP: can point out to specific parts of other standards...

Digest/Discussion 2.10 History (property of record) – keep an alternative to narrative... history could be done as a series of events/relations with Agent... etc. chronological list in EAD. Two options: simple prose narrative, or elaborate timeline (in AG?) – structured. RiC-O – event as an entity, but not yet in CM. Need to work out the details yet of how it will work. Defer decision on how it will be addressed in CM – divide what we have currently between endurants and perdurants... FC: previous document on Events ... LODE, CRM, etc.

—lunch—

See “20171117 final draft - RiC-CM Digest_Discussion questions” for notes on the questions covered that hadn’t previously been discussed in teleconferences (issues #3.11 to 3.16; 4.1)

Brief discussion on naming relations

- When describing the relation – will the name of the relation be a property/attribute of it?
- Technologically not needed to name the relation, but in the CM explanation – will use a name? Or typed?
- No point in providing a name?
- Relation is not an entity in the model, so don’t need to assign a name

NEXT STEPS:

Next draft RiC-CM v0.2

- DP, BS and I will attempt to re-format the existing conceptual model (establish a placeholder for the revised content that is anticipated to come) – remove current intro to appendix, reformatting and re-organizing contents -- need to outline new introduction – gather up ideas from this meeting – will include rough cut at reorganizing properties to reflect inheritance... - creating skeletal outline, so that others can fill it in and will help RiC-O team to ensure their product will be compliant – template for description of relations
- Re-organize DropBox to make reference documents more findable
- Jan. 30th new deadline for next draft – should be fairly stable by start of January....
- Concern about draft RiC-O – would want it to be in alignment with v0.2 of RiC-CM
- JR – will share NEDA template for attribute description

Otherwise:

Task 1: subset of record-related properties that were intended to address physical and intellectual characteristics – look at RDA, PREMIS, Spanish Model, Finnish model, InterPARES, Bitcurator. Are there some that are purely physical; while others touch on the relationship between intellectual and physical. Analyzing things in this fashion could be useful, even if it’s not included in CM. Looking to capitalize on pre-existing approaches – evaluate the other methods to see how they’ve addressed

the fundamental issues. Don't necessarily want to expand on what we had done before, more clarify or refine it. (Martin, Miia, Beatriz, Hélène, Bogdan)

Task 2: assess property assignment to record-related entities, which properties apply to all, which properties apply to specific entities, which can be inherited at different points in the hierarchy. GMcC mentioned that this analysis has at least in part already been done. Also account for general properties across all entities.

Task 3: relations – analyze current situation in order to revise as needed. E.g. potential to organize or type relations (could have hierarchical components – e.g. isAssociatedWith as highest level, with others being specializations of that – don't want to retain a flat list), add definitions, scope and examples. Build on work by FC done in RiC-O. Reduce number of relations, focusing on the basics – could always be extended in an implementation. Focus on primary entities – particularly corporate body/person/family (CPF) to CPF relations and CPF to Record relations. (Florence, Gavan, Javier, Victoria, Salvatore, Aaron)

Task for DP: introductory material re: design principles and use of modelling terminology (e.g. entity, attribute, relation, etc.) and our usage of it; potentially define description and archival descriptions (assertions and so forth)