Notes Paris RIC-CM 15.5-17.5.2018

Day 1
Notes 15.5.2018 -17.30

There are parts of CM-draft that need to be written again and some people need to work with these parts and further discuss problematic issues with Daniel.

We are late on our work. Set dates/steps of the work? what Is realistic in our timeline and what are the steps (tasks) to get there.

Not yet ready to educate the model.

1. Daniel have created primary-secondary entities document
2. Listing entities all attributes as template
3. Relations.

There are some serious gaps in the model and need more essence description than terminology focus.

CM1→CM2 Most of the work is arranging earlier versions text to new structure.

NEDA in spain next steps- review national metadata schema against NEDA-model… then developing first extensions for neda-model and guidelines to implement NEDA in systems. Different way of working nowadays: USA developing DACS etc. by community needs. RIC-CM not final product but it need to be stable that implementation could take place.

DOCUMENTS WALKTHROUGH

Primary secondary entities.

What we do here is not so new (now very Australian standards/referencies- need balance).- *Every one of the group seek other similar reference sources to list here.*

Record object-term, no "archival object", how about " Record resource"? Retrospective-view in RIC! not about record management terms. These (record set etc.) all are "kind of record resources".

Record part- not a kind of record, so it differs from others

Agent: Florence´s ideas implemented in Daniels text.

Person: Mark Twain example. Person we are not interested in biological entity, all person are socially constructed. One human being and several persons. RIC describes socially constructed identities (tied to biological body). Predominant identity in description is a choice, and there is a possibility of relations between persons.

DOLCE ontology treats persons as human being. Nomen-persona. No "biological"-term in the description because human being means both social and physical. Joint personas (2 writers make a book with 1 identity)- treated as person not as group, because joint identity is not group. Luther Blissett, "blooming" it is not a group either.

Family. rda based definition. For example tribe could be family and legal corporate body at a same time. One can also use "group".

Corporate body. legal or social status, not all corporate bodies have legal status.

Position. Bogdan: need a Role of person in a workflow but not about position at organisational chart. In English role/position are used usually as synonyms. Same position is being occupied by one or more persons, both personas have same functional role.

Delegate agent. Social bots added also, but no examples on this. *need for examples*

Activity

This top-level entity is not like others (entities under this entity are not a kind of activity as in other umbrella entities). Field of activity, an umbrella. Process would be better latin based term for this?, possibilities also: "Rational activity", "Human (formed) activity". Activity and rule-header change. Is there any other place to use rule than in Activity.. no.

Mandate discussion: Mandate-entity may be with activity also (is mandate a relationship?), Mandate Event is an transaction between agents: agent gives authority to another agent(s) to do something, in time x and at place y. Then there comes reference to document/record that is contains this mandate; Function is to do something and then there are rules that govern the process. Certain position has authority to do something. Mandating event vs. event (timespan) that mandate is valid. Rule is complex attribute of activity? Mandating event and rule under activity.

Secondary entities: "complex attributes" or attributes used in a specific way, that are like entities? supportive entities. Daniel wanted complex attributes to be separated from attributes (and their attributes/qualifiers).

Appellations, are necessary in RIC-O, but maybe not in RIC-CM. Do RIC-CM use these as attributes or as an entity? Date, PID etc. are treated as attributes in Daniels other document. Delete "Appellation"? Same as "nomen"(LRM). Nomen "entity" is string-attribute actually. Now there is no description about appellation. When coming to classification name is used to categorizing things. These entities are about (authority) control.

Is there information how nomens/LRM is implemented? Names are at least treated as entities. Other known facts about person than identifier or name? That named thing. In the end we have to achieve clarity no matter of the terms used when making assertions about first order entities. Are these entities, attributes or relations? *Florence have now responsibility to draft text about why using these certain as entities and other as attributes*. Classcode could also be name… appellation is a relation between nomen and other entities- is appellation an entity here? cidoc-crm has appellation-class with names and identifiers.

when multiple (person) appellations in database, some might have had multiple names with date valid. RIC-CM have only obligation to archival community. Problems and options could be detailed in articles or some other place than maintext.

RiC-E16 Name

RiC-E17 Title

RiC-E18 Term

RiC-E19 Class Code

RiC-E20 Global Persistent Identifier

RiC-E21 Local Identifier

Classification entities *need more work (see also day 3)*

We haven't had time to think these really through, and what each means- analysis about discussions Kat+Daniel+Bogdan have done earlier→ Distinction between grouping and classification, but both basic human activity. Shared qualities of some group and formal process. Other have controlled schemata for classification (based on function, organisational hierarchy etc.) systems use codes, values.

Florence din´t want to use term "class", Florence has form, collection ,serie, file and cglossary definitions in RIC-O, but these could be extended to controlled vocabularies. *Need to find generized way to categorize things or to categorize in certain level in RIC-CM?* → *maybe certain usual categorizations would be best?*

Generic type for classification? maybe some of these we can define (for example documentary form, record set type) but there also other typing. Act of classification is happening at many levels. How about using just "Type" occupation type etc.? certain classification action.

all controlled vocabularies, all categories of things but we need to have a shared language

RiC-E22 Occupation

RiC-E23 Activity Class (functional classification is here), associate this with agent and records. Domain of activity and domain where this is valid. "restoration" and "cultural heritage" or "building x".. To recognise this as category but not to control this.

RiC-E24 Documentary Form

RiC-E25 Record Class (there is no narrower etc. terms and this is the vocabulary we need to make in RIC-CM)

➔ Classification that describe 3 core entities (activity, agent, record, for example documentary form), then there are classified and classifiers (record set type).

classification schema to classifying something, that tool to use to classification?

"controlled concepts" that are named by terms, concepts used to classifying. "conceptual entities"

for example "occupation"- controlled concepts, category of these is occupation as a concept, vocabulary in here is an entity that we manage in system and have term (in different languages),could have synonyms, scopenotes/definitions etc. Entity could have relation to each other entity BT/NT/associated-relations.

Javier: "controlled concepts" not saying it is classification. Selection of concept things that are not other entities so we could be more flexible. At the end everything could be classification. We also have concept/thing entity. Uses in indexing (key access point) or categorization.

Bill: is name a controlled concept? agent an instance that have name, a term that points to concept. List of things that are appellations and some are used with agent and some are concepts.

Expanding this list to categorize categorization- we continue this later.

Name-entities used with both core entities and supportive entities.

➔ daniel revisit text and then discussion about date and place tomorrow (everything could be placed on space and time), DOLCE region place within coordinate system. Dates appear in every entity. Relations and events also tomorrow.

Day 2

16.5.2018 9.40-17.30

Strategy for next days: briefly discuss some issues about date, two working groups from Rome: relations and event + physical vs. intellectual.

If there issues need more discussion on difficult issues we put them to list and everyone work with them (digest) afterwards. We can´t make timetable before we have identified the issues/tasks ahead.

Martin makes TODO-list with Miia and others are free to supplement/add tasks to this.

DATE

RiC-E26 Date

RiC-E27 Single Date

RiC-E28 Date Range

RiC-E29 Date Set ➔ *this may not be included in the model.*

Daniel: what are the attributes with these? Is date an umbrella entity for these 3 kinds of date?

We want to encourage using standardized forms, also possibilities of uncertainty and other qualifiers with EDTF-format.

Date set is a wrapper and it is difficult, can we just leave it from RIC-CM and leave it to implementations. Maybe date set on RIC-O. Discussion about implementation possibilities (repeating, EDTF) with the rest of attributes.

In spain there is list of elements for minimum description and "user tasks".

We need to have cardinality/ repeatability in the model (at least in attribute descriptions).

RELATIONS GROUP ROME

Draft in march. For moving forward we need to defining entities + what about Event/Relation entity.

Relations subgroup folder in dropbox latest draft with comments (not Gavins there). + fuller list outline in other document.

List of many relations could be used in Event? Florence: Event need to be an entity.

What difference between event and relation: picture

Record manuscript was created xx in place x removed, digitized. One can use "history" prose or use

Event: creation (description of event) has date=12th century; place=Italy; createdBy= Abby (group).

Back to Relations:

Relations define record-agent; Event "createdBy" –Agent possibilities to have direct relations between record and Agent or via Event. Also a need to have shortcut from record to Date of event and place of event.

Javier: Difference between Type of relation vs. relation itself?

If we give more options what community will use?

ead/eac-cpf chronological list-example, Global persistent identifier for event needed for cronlist.

Two or more paths/ways to use RIC-CM in different systems/services! One might use a shortcut (in database for describing) and another phase migrates these to event-relations, third service uses provided metadata by its own logic.

Focusing events that are close to archival community/description used.. record lifecycle events, agent (life/production) events (birth, death, educational, occupation) , mandating event. → modest list. We won´t be using war event with birth/death event. → *a need for list of meaningfull, recordable events for archives.*

Record management events, "assertion event". We don´t cover all events.

Event entity is now supportive entity.

Florences document 2016 describes event more detailed.

Relations

Relations not relationship. On examples No business-term but professional activity relation.

Generic list of attributes: identifier, description, date, location, certainty, state (past or present) maybe we do a vocabulary for two last ones?). Name is on another place. Presence and past tense relations now we use present tense, but some of relations happen once like creation, but some other could change over time (Record-is heldBy- Agent vs. record-isCreatedBy-Agent).

Now (In RIC-CM) there is no generic broad "is AsssociatedWith"relation (toprelation for another relations gategories)

semantics and hierarchy issues

domain-range for relation?

Domain:Record (1..m) -cretedBy- Range: Agent (0..m), Relation between two entities

semantics of relation, some relations have no domain/range (=unconstrained relations), cardinality, some prose-text and "sameAs" or "closeEnough"-relations. There may be no time for this kind of equivalence searcing, but at some level it is needed for community to undestand. Names of relations are there as "labels" or "name"

createdBy

- attribute 1
- attribute 2

isCreatorOf (inverse relation) asymmetric relation

- attribute 1
- attribute 2

Some relations have attributes and other don´t. → text of what one can do could be on Guidelines, *Florence needs to remove this text to another document.*

Need for examples

"In the list below, every relationship is defined through:

- *a specific abstract name (for example, "archival provenance relation");*

- *a prose definition ;*

- *a suggested pair of names for the two direct arcs that connect the entities concerned (for example : is author of | authored by)* (these pairs of names are not always provided yet in this draft);

- *one or more examples* (TO BE ADDED)

- *a list of subcategories if applicable*

- *domain and range ?*

  "

  entity x-date has relation "datation-relation"..

➔ *Florences task is to do more formal presentation and merging different documents for CM. After that a "language polishing" could be done*. This affects how we represent attributes (Daniel explores this). We together can fill in the table after it is formalized. This also have huge impact on RIC-O.

How about assertation event and relations certainty and state etc.?

PHYSICAL VS. INTELLECTUAL dimension of records (Bogdans slideshow)

Showing examples on challenges and possible resolution.

Can we do description "once" in chain of reproduction or "sameness of records" and checking other standards if we are missing something. How/is it different to describe content than physical features.

case 1: Message with manifestations /versions of original email, paper-version with markers, digitized and microfilmed version.

case2: different moment at time, digitized record have no stamps accession numbers etc. but earlier microfilmed version has not those markings. Then there is migrated version (with corrupted colors), same message in textual form published in book.

Are these manifestation different records? Blue column at the presentations table show that records have a bit different properties.

New contexts for different manifestations.

do we see all (manifestations) to be new records, date of copy as date of record- this is

is there two different records, because there is also two (or more) different dates.

one record with instantations ("historical date")

Date of the copy could be saved for this kind of record or relations between records could be stated or same (intellectual content) information could be stated several times .

Copies (copy might lose history, if only content is preserved) and manifestations (dublication, or authenticated copy for same purpose).

Florence: problem with documentary form as shared intellectual component. Documantery form might be the same or not.

Example: Walt Whitman manuscripts (microfilmed and analog originals). New digital copies have even more information than originals. Sometimes it is more like "functional equivalence" not "sameness" of the records.

But why we need to make new record?

Florence: record can function as former one, but they are not the same.

Who is defing this functional equivalence? for some of the people records are not surrogates but stains on the records mater in research. Some other functional needs (not the stain to make assertations). Historian might be interested about content, court might need other functional equivalence needs.

significant properties on migration what need to be kept.

this is a puzzle, "I have seen Michelangelo´s David" A picture? A real sculpture? in some usecases they are the same and another they are not. "shares same message" "functional equivalence"

same message have been transformed to another medium

Microfilms/digitized objects make new fond in most countries.

Record-resources definition in RIC-CM covers both intellectual content and physical features.

Finnish AHAA-datamodel have implemented manifestations [Miia´s picture]. Maybe there is a way of having these kinds of relations in RIC-CM without using term "manifestation" or having manifestation as an entity?

RIC-Record is broad may not be record at formal sense..

- attributes

- relations

- events

Some of these apply to message and some to physical (generation 0), then have generations of reproduction where these issues need more precise handling according to how ones want to implement the RIC-CM model → RIC-Record (may be called record or manifestation depending on implementation) this have attributes, relations and reproduction events

Message+generation 0 are strongly intertwined in first RIC-Record, then after reproduction new RIC-records, some characteristics change and physical features form a new record-description but could also form (but not need necessary to form) a new record for describing "originals" physical features.

[Daniels image with cloud]: it is very hard to divide message from physical, maybe not to wrap onto different entities but to group attributes differently.

WEMI-model (works, expressions, manifestations, items) affects the terminology in finnish model.

Miia could work with daniels proposal (with what relations this would work) if it works and after that with Florence etc. in RIC-O maybe message/intellectual component-class. No need to change RIC-CM- this difference between message and message inscribed is not important to every system.

Bogdan leads some work with grouping attributes intellectual/physical.

RiC-Record , id=""

RiC-Record- Message, id=""

RIC-Record- Message inscribed, id=""

Bogdan: only missing attributes (?) "manifestations" structure of the record (electronic records intellectual message) and behaviour (database commands, appearance). Filterable excel properties of RDA and seeing what are we missing. Bogdan has send an email with attributes and Daniel have copypasted them to dropbox-file.

tomorrow: Entities attributes list by Daniel walkthrough (is these ideas ok to proceed), CENEDA template

Day 3

17.5.2018 9.15-

NEDA [link to Javiers document in Dropbox??]

Template of describing each attribute and relation in NEDA, maybe we want to use this

ISO- 11179 and Australian government METeOR [link here??] influenced metadata items structure in NEDA model: image of data element concept (name and definition of concept and information about use of concept) and value of concept.

Some attributes are used as trigger to other attributes (extensibility?). This table is only what attributes are there to use with what entity, but not for describing its special use within every entity.

We will have shared attributes like "date" different kinds if dates related to record ie. creation date, event date. RecordSet and Record have now different RIC-codes but same name, it would be efficient to have this kinds of shared attributes once and some qualifier for different entities. Problem: each entity has different values /datatypes.. date of agent function ? "identification attributes" grouping etc.

Putting attributes into groups? by content vs. physical? Record resource-level would have all attributes shared by all recordset, record, recordpart. You can use them all around, but use is a bit different.

Specification of name like "type of name" is "authorized form". This is mixing categories other with control and other nature of the name itself. In Spanish 3th standard there will be lists of nametypes for Agents outside conceptual model (implementation preparations).

How we want to work with attributes table of Daniel. → need to import now missing attributes from CM1- to this document (Daniel does this?) and after that all will go through list and see if everthing is at its place.

Inheriting issues with attributes. Attribute and value of attribute confusion, some attributes need to be used at aggregation level of description if there is no record-level descriptions available. Ie. conditions of access are not usually stated on aggregation level. Value of any of these attributes is shared by other members- all members could have the same attribute but not the same value.

One identifier-attribute and different types/qualifiers. Identifier could be repeatable. No appellations-entity in RIC-CM. IN RIC-O most of these attributes will be classes. Entities, attributes, relations, do we really need extra layer on this? are we doing explicit ER-model (is it stated somewhere?) in our modeldesign? Are these all categorizing-entities, but we handle these as attributes.

"Appellations" will be "complex attributes" not classes at the most of the cases. Names, identifiers are attributes. Date and place and conceptual things/classifications,events etc. are entities.

Premis don´t use properties-term but semantic-units and semantic component. RIC-CM is not going to specify the parts of name etc.

Daniel showed the attributes list.

TODO: To go through (task for everyone) is these attributes true with all recordresources entities/recordset/record etc.. This version doesn't yet have relations etc.

Recordset-type is new term to make distinction between other kinds of types.

Need for new attributes? Appraisal is a kind of event, but not be separated attribute.

Attributes of agent; Identity type need to re-evaluated (is that classification)?

History (maybe some other attributes also) need to be explained how to use it on different entities.

Democraphic classification/groupterms new. Demonym? way of classifying ones e where they come from. We put these here as a hook for different kinds of demographic classification (religion, sex, gender,

occupation etc..) *need to make a list/ recommending of examples of this kind of classification*. This also could go to classification-entities.

Spanish have special charaterics attributes. ie. musical record, these attributes can be included when describing this kind of material.

What is context we describe? Context where records are being managed and described. some like "opening hours" are not context information but public service information- do we need them here? → NO. This needs short explanation, but one can have and deliver that information but model don´t. Thera are other groups that shoud be concerning these kinds of issues.

Other section need to be filled- attributes of agent (? who does?) event (task to Florence)

Attribute description needs also descriptions about them- this needs to be started. First lists (Daniel does) and then descritions- we need to take "to be delated" attributes away. Multicolumn tables, no identifiers now, we have tagname/nametoken and natural language name (ontology uses these also).