

EGAD Meeting: Notes
May 27-29, 2015, Romania

DP – Daniel Pitti
JR – Javier Requejo
FC – Florence Clavaud
BS – Bill Stocking
PB – Padré Baroan
AM – Alice Motte
SaV – Salvatore Vassallo
StV – Stefano Vitali
KT – Kat Timms
AR – Aaron Rubinstein
VP – Victoria Peters
BP – Bogdan Popovici
GMC – Gavan McCarthy
VF – Vitor da Fonseca

May 27, 2015

- Goal of this meeting - cement details of high-level conceptual model. Separate product - ontology. Have draft CM for sharing with community for comment.
- Deferred for email or teleconference: more details on attributes (sub-attributes, cardinality, repeatability, etc.)
- Goal: to encourage people to take a multiple-entity E-R approach to archival description vs. monolithic finding aid.
- Would also like to report on EGAD work and progress to next PCOM meeting (September).

Formatting of future draft CM document:

- Suggestion to show a simple finding aid. Then structured in new CM (both flat as well as relational).

Definitions of First Order Archival Entities

Agent

- Remove term "public". Need to distinguish between real people and other types of identities. **FC will provide updated definition**. Work in France - redefining agent using RDA as a starting point.

Record

- Missing from definition: when someone is entrusted to manage a record
- E.g. Birth certificate - relates to an event; evidence of event (i.e., sign or trace – not always a legal connotation); created by authority to document the event - evidence of the organization's conduct of their business (their function); record is a by-product... or in case of this, a product?
- Birth certificate - more than evidence of organization carrying out its function.
- Recordkeeping - objectifying facts to make them not subject to memory
- Evidence of activity, or evidence of other facts or acts; recording as witness of activity

- 2nd definition is narrow in comparison to first. **BP offers a concise definition (below)**
- "Record: Information captured/recorded in any form, evidencing a person, social or organizational activity. For being authoritative, a record has..."
- The second line will leave a door open to "bad" records – i.e., those that do not meet all of these criteria of authoritativeness but are still managed as records

Record Set

- Shares properties with Record but not the same beast
- Clearer to keep separate from Record (for the community)- Important to recognize the difference between them. If separate concept, reusable outside of archival context
- Discussion of "member" vs "element" - mainly seems that member is the best choice of term (consistent with terminology for set theory in general). Member here means "one of"
- Discussion of record vs. authoritative record (i.e., missing some of the criteria to make it a "good" record - e.g., one of authenticity, reliability, etc.)
- Formal and informal sense of record
- Want broad or multi-faceted definition of record to accommodate variety in reality - i.e., records missing some criteria are still used and depended on as records
- Could provide broad definition and local policy could further interpret or refine it as needed
- **AR to revise definition of record set**
- Have a more archival definition - part of broader definition - provide bridge between broad definition and specifically archival context
- Records not exclusive property of archivists - but Record Set of archivists - created according to archival principles
- Can have Record Sets grouped by different types of agents – can also be dynamic (e.g., grouped together for a specific purpose such as in response to a query, for an exhibition, for preservation purposes, etc.). So, Record Sets can be determined/created "in time".
- Record Set has no fixed context or structure (vs. Record, which has these)

Business Process and Mandate

- Word "business" - problem for Latin languages. Connotation - association with commercial enterprise - vs. what's your purpose, what do you do
- Suggestion there are actually three entities here not two - authorizing; purpose; activities. Combine authorizing and purpose - get Mandate; combine purpose and activities - get Business (as were previously defined). There is an overlap here (purpose).
- Three aspects: 1) act of authorizing; 2) what you authorize (purpose, duty, task – assigning the responsibility to somebody); 3) activities engaged in to realize the purpose (process).
- Practical reality - difficult to separate, though
- Archivists not describing much in the Business or Mandate areas anyway - worthwhile to make more nuanced
- Need intellectual clarity first - then decide how to represent it that's practically feasible and that will be intelligible for archivists

- Authorizing - one agent give another agent the authority to do something. Agent that has authority and assignment to do it carries out the assignment, engaging in certain activities in order to do so. Act of authorizing (could be codified and contained in a record, or orally delivered).
- Need to determine how to handle this (purpose is shared by Mandate and Business).
- Could also just have one entity containing within it the three aspects
- Finnish model - only includes mandated functions; if not mandated, not a function. Excludes functions assumed but not mandated (e.g. implied understood constitution in Scotland).
- So, need to be able to accommodate non-written rules and authority
- Controlled vocabulary function (abstract) vs. functions as characterized within a particular context. These are two separate things that are related. Local examples would be "instances of" the abstract (e.g., water management as abstract functional concept vs. local instances of water management in specific contexts). Over time - history of function - could be managed by different agents.
- Fourth idea: "Rules" or "Regulations" ?
- Note: the ontology had Purpose as a class.
- Individuals with occupations - accountant; government agencies responsible for accounting; activities - overlap in what takes place between personal level and organizational level; where do occupations fit in? occupation; time-indexed role
- MARC authority format - "field of activity" - ideally controlled vocabulary here, but there isn't one.
- Suggestion that "authorization" is not an entity but rather an event or relation or property (something an agent does) -- the three components are rather Purpose, Activities, Rules.

Entities shared with other cultural heritage institutions

- Note: both this term and "first order archival entities" are to be tweaked. Intention: to distinguish between those essential to archivists vs. those also essential to other communities
- There are already well developed ontologies and vocabularies for Place
- Library community - mainly concerned with authority control
- Comment that Date needs to be an entity
- Note also that the notion of time is being added to FRBR
- LCSH and other similar subject heading controlled vocabularies - occupations are embedded but not isolated and identified as occupations per se. Same for Function (abstract)
- Other communities include these controlled terms but don't formally bring them out
- Suggestions for ontology: Date entity; Activity entity; Purpose entity; Event entity
- For Conceptual Model - define Place; in Ontology - could borrow classes from other models; or use "sameAs" to identify equivalent classes
- Preference that RiC ontology has own name space and can be mapped out to other existing ontologies.
- Discussion over how to describe and group the entities - separate "first order" from "other" or just one list? Political statement re: what are archival. But are claiming others in archival space also.

- Another viewpoint: we have essentially 6-7 entities in our space with Place and Time as connecting glue (as well as being entities themselves)
- Agent claimed within archival space specifically because more than authority control. It's about identities and co-location. Library world creeping toward broader description of agent, driven in part by VIAF.
- Note that function and occupation should be considered in same discussion as Business and Mandate. Goal - to differentiate between abstract concept and instance grounded in a context.
- Suggestion – could use nearEquivalentTo an LCSHS term (vs. archivists having their own controlled vocabulary). Long term goal: build an archival controlled vocabulary
- Dates – did not discuss. Will be modelled. Will include single date, date range, set of non-contiguous dates. **AR and JR to itemize possible types per entity – i.e., the most important dates for use in the RiC.**
- Question: will we be creating mappings to other models? TBD.
- Question: what is the difference between Function (abstract) and ambient function?
- Note: M:N relationship with first order archival entities.
- Re: Named Event, Named Period, Movement: we are being more specific here; all are in LCSH but we are typing them here.

Shared Properties

- Global Persistent Identifier - as noted, likely not to have one single global identifier. Mentioned well-established schemes in place - e.g. ARK. Must commit to maintain these (persistence). If use URIs, need a mandate and rules to maintain the identifiers.
- Local Identifier - not useful in global sense. But can be extremely important.
- Name - discussion of name vs. title (or even appellation) -- essentially the same. All designations of what you call an entity - difference in format – both describe the same real-world thing. Spanish model - identity cluster includes name and identifier
- Could also have dates associated with the usage of a name
- Note that other types of information may help identify something when accumulated together - e.g., even Place. Names alone are actually weak identifiers - need grouping of information to make strong identification.
- Focus here is on entities, not descriptions of them. Modelling the entity vs. modelling the description. Description – an assemblage of statements. AgentArchivist – observes X – describes X.

Agent Properties

Agent

- Agent Type: Note Proxy-agent includes probes, software. Acting entity. Semi-autonomous, go out and collect data that is treated as records. Person-like-Agent – e.g., Mickey Mouse.
- Dates: different types per different types of agents. These will be listed.

- Binary relations, complex, unary relations.
- Otherwise - for complex unary relations, agent A in relation with Agent B (beginning and ending dates).
- Legal status - for corporate bodies only. Local concept - i.e., juridical system will vary. Relates to Corporate Body, which in the ontology is a sub-class of Agent. Legal status - could be a lengthy list that could grow over time. Could use a thesaurus. Could decide to be more granular with how sub-divide government bodies, for example. Suggestion to not use label "Classification" for this property, as it could be confused with other uses of the same term. Also, if re-define the concept, do not use the label Legal Status (from ISAAR).
- Note – in some contexts, Legal Status is used to help distinguish between public and private records.
- Question of granularity – one could choose to provide many sub-divisions within a corporate body
- Will have some way of having globally-shared Type category as well as having Legal Status as a property - will clarify under what legal regime (jurisdiction) that terminology is derived.
- Verdict - leave Legal Status in as a property - useful in helping to distinguish between public and private agents (and their records). Discussion had floated alternative of making it a type of corporate body (within Agent class and sub-classes), or just implied, but decision to keep as explicit property because is useful. Will have to clarify how is connected within the ontology.
- Language - used by agent? Redundant because have Language used by Record. However - Language is widely used (VIAF) - also in MARC authority format.
- Useable for a person and for a corporate body (e.g., Library and Archives Canada has two official languages)
- A piece of identifying information about the agent; optional
- Human-intelligible language (vs. computer code); spoken or written.
- Gender - list examples. Current list is not sufficient (too binary). Need to be sensitive to political issue.
- It is a fundamental identifying category for people.
- National Affiliation: suggestion to remove as property and use related Place instead (e.g., agent is citizen of or is resident of Place). However, nationality may not be a place necessarily - may be a community or ethnic group.
- Suggestion to have umbrella "affiliation" property that could be used to link to gender, language, nationality, etc.
- Verdict: **National Affiliation REMOVED as a property**. When relating Agent to a Place, can be more specific there re: the nature of the relationship.
- History - of agent. Could be formatted in several different ways.
- General Context: agree not to call it Historical Context; keep separate from History. History - of agent; General Context: broader. Question: could this be a cultural affiliation.... or Named Movement - also cultural affiliation?

- ISAAR definition quoted – change “corporate body, person or family” to “agent”
- Relation Notes - to allow for description of related entities in a non-ER flat model
- Question: should these be in the list of shared properties? No, they would be treated differently in the case of each entity – or a note would be provided to explain how to use these with different entities. In the case of multiple relationships to different agents, put all in one note or make it repeatable.
- Services to the public: remove this as a property - use business and mandate cluster (e.g., activities and rules (policies))
- Providing services; to whom (clients) - codified in policy; also hours within rules or function\activity (e.g., cafeteria or handicapped washroom can be described as functions)
- mention of schema.org Bibex - standardized way of expressing operating hours, contact info, website, etc. Re-use. Also - FOAF model - contact info and website

Verdict:

- **Services to public - will be described as a function. REMOVE as property.**
- **Location - will be described as a Place. REMOVE as property**
- Otherwise - Contact Info - keep as is. Clear. Operating Hours - verdict? Facilities - verdict?
- To be worked out? Not clear. Deferred - on the to-do list. Some of the ISDIAH elements will be subsumed, others will remain explicit.
- Discussion of website as a location or not – one point of view is that it’s not – it’s a collection of data. FOAF directs to a Page. Another point of view is that virtual place is a type of location
- Discussion of whether or not these ISDIAH-based elements belong at all. They do have broader applicability to other types of corporate bodies (beyond archives). Suggestion to omit them from core list of attributes and have extension lists of attributes made available for use when needed for certain types of entities. Note that we do have to subsume and replace all of ISDIAH.
- Comment that better to have ISDIAH-remnants here for political reasons as well as practical reasons (they are arguably useful for describing archives and the services they provide)
- In principle do not have to use just for archives. In the ontology, make them available broadly. In the CM, emphasize their availability for describing archives. Under most circumstances would not use more broadly, though technically not exclusive to archives.
- Will be described as "additional properties" that could be used to describe archival holdings and other corporate bodies providing services (but will not elaborate).
- **Verdict - properties will mainly stay the same - except services as function, location may be place (not 100%). Otherwise will likely keep the rest. To be further clarified later, plus ontology discussion may help.**

Agent Relations

- Familial relation - can have sub-properties (e.g., is parent of, is child of, etc.)
- History of "is associated with" - was used when more specific relation could not be identified (in ISAAR-CPF) such as hierarchical, etc.

- Next steps: scoping of some of these relations is needed - as they can be applied differently depending on the type of agent. List also needs review and also ensure that reciprocal relations are present in the other part of the document
- Small discussion of pseudonyms: often treated as a separate identity. EAC provides a choice (because people treated it differently). 1) treat as an alternative name 2) treat as an alternative identity. There is existing guidance out there re: what may constitute a new identity vs a variant name
- Most generic – isAssociatedWith. beneath this: isAffiliatedWith; isMemberOf (or is this generic?)
- Note: organization ontology from W3C (<http://www.w3.org/TR/vocab-org/2014>) has "member" as highest most generic term (includes affiliation idea) – comment that this use of "member" is the same as the use of member for definition of Record Set
- Comment that memberOf implies hierarchical (not on same level) vs. association or affiliation does not have this connotation
- Discussion of terms association, affiliation, and membership: which is the most generic? How are these terms related to one another?
- Comment that ISAAR(CPF) & EAC's hierarchical and chronological relations are useful to people but not for machines (no cardinality and cannot tell which is at the top of the hierarchy)
- Relations with Record: need clarification for difference between author and creator. Terms in diplomatics - author was responsible for intellectual content of the item while creator was at broader level - i.e., at fonds (provenance)? Comment that Dublin Core also treats creator in a broader sense.

May 28, 2015

- New strategy - will not cover any more relations, will just stick to reviewing the properties (due to time constraints).

Record Properties

- Dates – AR & JR to work out. RM dates can be extensive. Assignment - not to be exhaustive, but to identify the key ones. Look at key Events. Mention of ISO standard re: dates - does not deal well with imprecise dates. California Digital Library work done on dates for cultural heritage context. Will need to distinguish between dates of creation from dates of copy, etc. John Kunze - EDTF Extended Date Time Format (LoC) <http://www.loc.gov/standards/datetime/>
- Amalgamation of "Record Type" with "Document Form" - interpreted as genre (e.g., memorandum, diary, etc.). Label: "Documentary Form"
- Assuming that aggregation type = item will be self-evident, though not made explicit now (vs., in Record Set - Record Set Type = term identifying level of aggregation). Wondering about impact of lack of term identifying aggregation within Record properties. If needed in a local implementation, could be added (made explicit)?
- Discussion of components. Spanish model has an entity for components.
- Record has as a component part another record.
- Being a component is a type of relation.

- Two records related through a component relationship - would they become a type of Record Set? Is this irrelevant as one would not necessarily be describing them as a Set? Conceptually relevant, though likely no practical implication.
- **New entity - Documentary Component.**
- This type of record set - bound by relationship between record and documentary component in a different way than the binding relationships in other types of Record Set. To be clear - state that a Record Set is not a Record in and of itself (differing itself from Scenario 1 below).
- However, current definition of Record Set is that it is comprised of one or more records.
- Concepts need some reconciliation here.
- Idea of Null Set?
- Situation A: Record 1 encompasses Record 2. Together they comprise Record 3.
- Situation B: Record with Components that are necessary for its recordness.
- Physical or logical components or sometimes both? How we model this needs to be able to accommodate both.
- Can have a Record Set comprised of one (e.g., file with one item in it).
- Scope & Content - no issue, no discussion. Assuming scope is applicable to 1 record.
- Question about integrity - checksum or authenticity indication. It was previously removed because considered accommodated by other metadata schemes (e.g., preservation) - not entirely descriptive. **Now suggesting to add Integrity Note. YES ADD**
- Note field. May not be limited to checksum information.

Extent

- question about Scale - RAD Mathematical Data area 5.3B Statement of Scale. Spanish model - have extensions or plug ins for special materials including cartographic materials.
- Particular "Documentary forms" - there are sets of attributes that are particular to certain documentary forms
- Cannot deal with all of these specialized subsets of attributes at this point - can deal with them later.

Summary of decisions on this page:

- 1- Do not use Record Type - okay to not have any attribute for Level of Description in Record (it's obvious)
- 2- Documentary Form - retain this label to indicate genre of records (e.g., minutes, memorandum, etc. - often a controlled vocabulary)
- 3- New property: Documentary Form Characteristics - now a note - leaving open a chance to map out to more detailed subsets of attributes for particular "record types" such as carto, graphic, etc.
- 4 - New Property: Integrity Note - note re: authenticity, may not be limited to checksum (as was the attribute in the AGRkMS - the origin of this property).
- 5- In supplementary documentation for RiC will need to explain how it connects to other metadata standards like PREMIS.

Discussion of Form of Expression and related properties

- Suggestion to use Rep Info (OAIS) as an umbrella term where could group a bunch of elements re: how content is represented. Example of 1 map that is photographed - content is the same, 2 different representations.
- Spanish - "Nature of Record"
- Talking about end-user experience - e.g., text, map, etc.
- Comment that map is Documentary Form (already covered)
- I am thinking that broader level categories like textual material, graphic material, cartographic material, etc. - General Material Designation. RDA superseded GMD with cluster of three elements - Content Type, Carrier Type and Media Type

<http://www.rdatoolkit.org/content/325>

Terms in the Content Type vocabulary refer to the intellectual or artistic content of a resource, such as text or notated music; terms in the Carrier Type vocabulary refer to the means and methods by which content is conveyed including volume, sheet, computer disk; terms in the Media Type vocabulary specify the general type of intermediation device (if any) required to view, play or run the content of a resource.

<http://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/rdacontent.html>

<http://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/rdacarrier.html>

<http://www.loc.gov/standards/valuelist/rdamedia.html>

Content Type (also: Spanish - Nature of Record) - will replace Form of Expression in chart

Media Type - will replace Method or Form of Transmission or Communication

Carrier Type - will replace Medium

Will retain RDA labels for these properties (a chance to improve on ISAD(G) labels)

Caveat: these are limited controlled vocabularies in RDA. Are these sufficient for RiC purposes? Do we want to retain the concepts (how they are distinguished) but not use the established RDA vocabularies? Instead expand a bit on possible terms/interpretations?

Status of Transmission - prefer label "Record Status"

- InterPARES - does combine original, copy, draft, with different types of copies (see terminology document for details - defined as primitiveness (i.e., order in time), completeness & effectiveness (ability to achieve its purpose) of a record -- 3 states: draft, original, copy)
- Issue with draft being a different beast than original/copy
- Discussion - each draft has some degree of independence - content may change – version
- Vs. original and copy - of a complete/stable/document
- Draft - temporary version of a record prepared for purposes of correction
- Original - 1st complete and effective record
- Copy - reproduction of a record in any state of transmission (i.e., can be applied to either draft or original). InterPARES has a short list of types of copies.
- Can express this all through relations also.
- Relationship to Integrity/Authenticity Note (not the same but are in close proximity to one another)

- InterPARES – level of perfection means level of completion
- Note field? In cases where original no longer exists

New Property - "Production Technique" (or possibly like RDA "Production Method" -- need to confirm this is where they would record something like manuscript or typescript)

- Label of this property not 100% decided yet.
- Not decided if this property will be one of those under the "Documentary Form Characteristics" umbrella.

Documentary Form Characteristics includes under its umbrella:

- Script/Language (human languages)
- Extent
- Content Type
- Carrier Type
- Media Type
- Encoding Type
- Production Technique/Method (?)

Addition of Classification Code to Record and Record Set properties - may be different from the same property in the Business list because does not have to be based on functional classification - so may have overlap, but this is okay because want it explicit as a property for Record and Record Set

Format

- Is it related to Media Type (RDA)?
- Is it related to Production Technique?
- Call it encoding (original intent was AGRkMS digital records - pdf, jpg etc.)
- Do not push off to PREMIS because relevant to access (so has a place in descriptive metadata as well as technical metadata)
- Production technique - process; product - result - i.e., jpg file; unicode + xml + tei (3 layers of encoding)
- Broadening scope to beyond digital (e.g., analogue is also encoding)
- Discussion of how it is in proximity to Media Type (rendition device)
- **Encoding Type - New label.**

History of the Record

- prose or series of relations (events with agents)
- not just pre-acquisition but could also include archival management activities including preservation
- no changes and not much discussion

Disposition Information

- Question: could this be subsumed under History of Record?
- Less commonly used for Record than Record Set - still necessary here
- Archival management events - all in the past (vs. 23081 also had planned events (more pertinent to upcoming recordkeeping actions))
- Comment that there may be use for this to document records not acquired (nod back toward empty record set again)
- One rationale for leaving it as a separate property would be to make it explicit (rather than bury it in History of Record)
- EAD - separated material (not in current version - became Related material)
- Lengthy discussion of possibilities of describing absence (stuff no longer there) and stuff there. Explain what was kept. General description of missing things and why they're not there.
- Disposition - keep separate and explain why. Inclusive of transfer and anything subsequent?
- Note - not all archivists do appraisal of state records.
- Different situations - when records are appraised pre-transfer. Or some selection occurs post-transfer (confirmation of value).
- Ontology - W3C provenance
- Comment - everything is an event. But on a practical level do we want all description to be explicit events (triples).
- Comment - could have another umbrella structure where sub-attributes of history of record could be made more explicit (i.e., disposition information kept on the forefront)
- **Decision: Disposition Information now included within History of Record**
- custody, appraisal, transfer, acquisition, etc.

Conditions of Access

- Classified secret; physical conditions. Whether it's available for use.
- Discussion about point b (physical conditions; particularly - info about software hardware necessary to access the unit of description). Comment that this is tied to what has been specified in Media Type - what has been identified as necessary as mediating access to the record is directly associated to this type of information.
- 1 - Condition - security, legal restrictions, issues of privacy - based on rules, it's restricted. Similar to legal status of the record.
- 2 - Condition - e.g., picture damaged or faded. May affect access. How to incorporate this issue of reduced quality? Also related potentially to Integrity/authenticity note.

Scrap the above.

- 1) Security/rules - constraints
- 2) Quality - poor quality affects access/use
- 3) Restrictions on re-use

From ISAD(G) Conditions Governing Access & Conditions Governing Reproduction

Scenario - can I have access?

Y, N, Under X Conditions + explanation for each

If Y - why? If N, why? If conditional, which conditions?

Three answers - because classified/secure; because of privacy concerns; because too fragile

Issue of quality of record affecting access (understanding or re-use?) of a record

Distinguishing between quality of object (i.e., physical condition) vs. quality of information contained within (more subjective) (Me: I think often these would be one and the same – i.e., poor physical condition would obscure the ability to perceive and interpret the information. If often the same, is there benefit in creating two separate properties? Also, the “informational content (i.e., text, image) is not always the focal point of the investigation – i.e., material literacy, interest in physical aspects of records).

Conditions of Access - retain label.

- The conditions could include those enumerated in B.
- RAD - it was under 1.8B9a Physical Condition - e.g., emulsion flaking, scratches.
- next to 1.8B9b Conservation - i.e., treatments received or underway

New property - needs label: Something re - Quality of the information content. Something affecting quality. Could be native to the original record as it was captured (e.g., radio photograph) or could be the result of deterioration - has lost information over time. Intelligibility or readability or legibility of the record - focus on the content. Not on physical status or condition (though may be one and the same thing). **Possibility - this could be slotted as part of Scope and Content of the Record.**

With the above focusing on the content (and not the physical aspect of the object), we don't currently have a place to provide physical condition or conservation status information. Deferred....?

EAD - Conditions governing use; Conditions governing access

ISAD(G) - Conditions governing reproduction

Conditions of (re)Use

- with respect to intellectual content of record (or a copy of it) are there intellectual restrictions on what you can or cannot do
- terms under which people can do things (separate from Service Policies for example if images are served up only in small resolution)
- Label - "Rights"? Spanish - "Rights of Use"?
- Folks like **"Rights" as a label**. The definition should include that the purpose of this property is to affect reproduction actions on the record.
- More discussion - effect on Use.... effect on Re-use
- Policies in archives governing general use - i.e., use of digital cameras for example
- Different from intellectual property rights such as copyright or licensing.
- Europeana and DPLA - joint policy statement on the issue of rights

Physical Description –

- Question - what is missing that is not already covered elsewhere? E.g., extent; "quality of content"; format, medium, etc.
- EAD bundles it differently - includes extent
- TEI - has a bundle of physical description
- Comment conservation info is not domain of archival description (related)
- Suggestion: Physical description note. Could be extended and developed.
- Documentary Form Characteristics - includes extent. So, it include physical characteristics (?).
- French librarian list: Carrier, Extent, Binding, Packaging, Collation, Layout, Dimensions - list describing physical characteristics.
- **FC to make a short list from this source – to avoid having one Physical Description blob (undifferentiated note). Will enumerate which bits would be appropriate to include in this. As examples, open-ended list, not prescriptive.**
- **Label - Physical Characteristics. Note field** - could be a blob. Or could sub-divide into multiple note fields with type.

May 29, 2015

Discussion re: Arrangement

- As applicable to records (individual) - some applicability because of relations between records, relations between records and components
- Arrangement may be what's given, or may be what's imposed
- Concern for structure, components and relations

Record Set Properties

Record Set Type

- Essentially level of description - necessary for legacy purposes - type of set
- Note that we're talking about the type of set (about the records) not talking about the description of the set
- Comment that one record could belong to more than one record set; situations in which re-arrangement has occurred at some point in time
- Hierarchical structure not necessary all the time - could also have sequential relationships (horizontal)
- Need to have a way to accommodate both types of situations
- Europeana data model - provides a means to do hierarchy as well as sequence. Arrange in a hierarchy, and within that hierarchy, arrange in a sequence
- Need opportunity to make clear decisions made by archivists with how they arrange so that insight into logic and process is provided; so it doesn't seem completely arbitrary
- Note that most archivists subscribe to monolithic hierarchical finding aid, but we are opening up new possibilities; accommodates AU series approach
- Should include examples of Record Sets that are not "archival" (e.g., those compiled for exhibitions)

- Archival arrangement - one perspective one can take when forming Record Sets (others are possible and viable)
- Possible to have sub-classes of Record Set - to differentiate between archival/true/natural (via archival bond) and the other situation.
- **Label: Record Set Type (remove level of description).** We want the examples kept but not have it be prescriptive. Could say - typically, archivists create record sets based on particular principles (e.g., fonds - provenance; share the property of coming from the same original context). Include this information in the definition of Record Set
- Archivists are more than witnesses to what they receive as archives. Also shape and form, use judgement. Ask archivists to be explicit re: their decisions or impact on arrangement (creation or identification of record sets)

Origin of Record Set

- Essentially intact as received; or.... modified
- Origin and history of record set is what we're after.
- Provenance of the set.
- Would also be a relationship to an agent (who created the set)
- Discussion of keeping it separate or incorporating as part of History of Record Set
- Provenance of record set may be the same as provenance of the records (i.e. original order)
- Custodial provenance vs. Production provenance
- Intent - isolate who is responsible for the aggregation of these records.
- Definition of Record Set - members share one or more properties; so, any of those properties is a candidate (not all equal) or two of them combined could be the basis on which the record set is assembled.
- Comment - conflict between History of Record... and History of Record Set? Need to be consistent. One attribute for provenance, and think of transfer (custodial history) separately
- (Canadian use of provenance includes both aspects - creatorship and custodianship - blended - "created and/or accumulated and used...")
- Optimally we want people to use relations to depict this information - most accurate
- More discussion on use of term "provenance" to indicate provenance (origin, creator responsible for) of the record set
- "Aggregator" or "Assembler" of Record Set. Co-locator - co-locating things by intellectual components. May conflict with use of this term in the literary community. Need a label here for this concept - aggregator good but folks don't like the sound of it.
- Need to make distinction between what's in a Record Set and what may comprise a physical aggregation - may or may not be the same. We are talking about an intellectual assemblage that may be related to a physical assemblage, but not the same thing.
- Need a list of possible relation properties that would be used in this scenario - responsibility roles - who is responsible for selecting what goes in a Set, who is responsible for arranging the records within the record set, (could be 2 different relations)
- **Decision: Merge with History of Record Set.**

Dates of Contained Records - label may change; AR & JR to work on date types in general

Accruals

- Related to or part of History of Record Set (merge?). No - not part of history - is about anticipated future acquisitions (note in RAD - for open fonds - future accruals expected - can also indicate frequency and volume if known)
- Argument to retain separately - part of management of records
- Is an event and a relationship - modification or creation of new record set
- ISAD(G) future expected acquisitions
- Discussion if an accrual is a new Record Set - at least in an administrative sense - i.e. need to deal with it - describe and incorporate/relate to existing Record Sets – i.e., a "management unit"
- Question if this is another Record Set Type - issue of whether or not to retain it as a separate attribute.
- Could use this element to indicate connection or relationship to an accession
- (Accrual is how one type of Record Set is related to an existing Record Set)
- Open fonds - dynamic and accumulating over time. Want to be able to indicate that it's open/dynamic as well as potentially indicate timing
- Purpose of this element is for the user, not for management of record set, though information that populates this may come out of archival management information
- If new accessions (Accruals) are acquired, then this would be indicated as part of History of Record
- History of Record - can be narrative as well as structured chronology
- Note that we are not modelling archival management activities - just description - future: possibility to extend to RM (me: thinking of Canadian development of standard for describing accessions)
- Full information needed to describe accessions for archival management is out of the scope of this conceptual model. Accession (accrual) is a type of record set - in a local implementation, would create a link between the archival management accession record and the description of the records that are being supported by RiC CM

Arrangement

- (We had added to Record - Classification). So, we need it here too.
- Arrangement has a relationship to Classification, but are two distinctly different things
- Def'n in ISAD(G) glossary definition - mentions both intellectual and physical processes - they are related but are not the same activity. Differs from ISAD(G) element -
- Intellectual grouping - assigning of members to a Set; then, arrangement of the set.
- Selection and arrangement - have an intellectual relation - properties on which you base selection of what goes in Set is related to the way in which you arrange it.
- ISAD(G) element: internal structure, order and/or system of classification of the unit of description (doesn't include physical). More detail - asks to note how the set has been treated by the archivist.
- Need to relate this information with information on the origin of the Record Set; aggregation of Record Set was prior in sequence to this (arrangement). When people decide what's in a set, are already thinking of how they will arrange it.

- ISAD(G) also notes relationship to information in Scope & Content (also links to determination of selection and creation of a Set). ISAD(G) provides alternative option to include arrangement information in Scope & Content.
- History of Record Set - description of origins of what's in the Set & what happened to it.
- Arrangement -
- Scope & Content -
- **Decision - keep these three separate.** EAD3 also keeps them separate.

Scope and Content

- Remove idea of level from current ISAD(G) definition otherwise essentially good - may need some tweaking to help clarify and eliminate any overlap with other elements

Documentary Form

- Was suggested here because Record Set may have been assembled based on a common documentary form
- Clarification - not the documentary form of the Record Set, rather the documentary form of the contained record(s)
- One documentary form (if applicable to whole Record Set) could be implied or extracted based on information in Record.
- Idea is that it is one documentary form (non-repeatable) ** needs confirmation -- or specify each and every documentary form of the members of a set (in this scenario, one documentary form was not the uniting principle underlying a particular record set)
- Mention of how yesterday Extent was slotted in two places - Physical Description or under Documentary Form Characteristics.
- Two possibilities - general description of documentary form in scope & content if don't have full info or resources; or, separate repeatable information field, especially if in ontology, documentary form is an entity that can be more fully described
- Was confusion between umbrella Documentary Form Characteristics and controlled list of terms for Documentary Form (i.e., Record Types - memo, correspondence, minutes, etc.)
- NOTE - need to add to list of controlled vocabularies for authority control -- add Documentary Form here *needs controlled vocabulary
- Confirmed that Documentary Form is not within umbrella of Documentary Form Characteristics
- Comment that it's highly problematic but not impossible to have a universal controlled vocabulary for documentary forms. We want to enable it. Cannot mandate it.

Documentary Form Characteristics (umbrella) - should this be present at Record Set level? If have all the pieces under the umbrella in common, do we want to be able to state this at the Record Set level?

- Extent at Record level - dimensions, duration, size, # of pages.
- Extent in two places - two different scopes at the moment, using the same word
- 1 Record - 3 p.
- Record Set level - how many - e.g., 36 diaries

- Propose - retain same structure of umbrella as with Record. Need to explain the difference in how these are applied though. Individual record - how big, how long, dimensions, etc.
- Will be some difference in explanation and definition, but fundamental nature of the properties are the same. Examples will help elucidate.
- Do not have the time today to discuss all of the pieces under the Documentary Form Characteristics umbrella. Will become clear during process of writing and development (next steps).
- In principle - everything you can say about a Record can be said about a Record Set, but may not say it in the same way or from the same perspective. Note - relationships will not be the same. Symmetry between Record and Record Set. Will make clear - talking about contained records (within a Set).
- Note that in some cases may be redundant when repeating some of these umbrella concepts at the Record Set level. This is a local implementation consideration.
- Scenario where have a file comprised of records. There are 7 properties within Documentary Form Characteristics. Could include 3 of them at file level (if they are common to all records in the set) and the other 4 are particular to the records (because they are not shared among all records in the set). Comment to the contrary -- that all 7 should be described at file level (describe all records in the set, not only part at file level to be supplemented at the Record level) - EXCEPT if these properties are optional (in general) - i.e., could omit them at the file level (because optional and because do not apply to all members of the set).
- Comment that Documentary Form Characteristics is an umbrella containing X number of distinct properties as well as being a Note field. Possibility of providing general summary of the type of information contained in the properties vs. enumerating each and every property separately. Might be useful in this example of a file level description - may wish to only provide a blurb re: some/all of the types of information found in the properties under this umbrella.
- Extent - may wish to say things about the whole Record Set (at the Record Set level) as well as distinct features of extent of the contained Records. Wish to have focus of extent on Record Set (and not of contained records).
- Extent of Record Set - relation to scope & content and arrangement
- Record Set - has distinct separate of properties (describing the set)
- Record - distinct properties
- May wish to provide information about distinct properties of the Record(s) contained in a Set at the Record Set level

New list - Properties of contained records in Record Set

- 1) Properties of Record
 - 2) Properties of Record Set
 - 3) Shared properties of contained Records or Record Sets (within a Record Set which may be described at Record Set level)
- Concern that there might be too much redundancy if permit information of Records at Record Set level
 - Comment that noting that there are maps contained in a Record Set, but don't know which records are maps (if do not have item description)

- Record Set contains 10 maps and 4 photos. This is a property of the Record Set because are describing the characteristics of the Set (not specifying the individual Records).
- Comment that this is the sum of the content of the Record Set.
- Dates of Record Set. X # of items. 1851, 1852 (etc. enumerate all of them). Vs. 1851-1852 (inclusive dates).
- ISAD(G) - 4 rules of multi-level description. Be specific; do not repeat information. Issue of inheritance and how this works. These rules seem good on the surface, but when take them together as a group, not clear and they don't fully work.
- Notion of inheritance needs to go (or be clarified).
- Idea is that things are shared (vs. inherited)
- Moving out of monolithic approach (in which you wouldn't want to repeat information), may wish to repeat certain bits of information
- Idea of shared characteristics of what is contained in a Record Set (vs. idea of inheritance)
- Say more at levels at which that detail has more value.
- (Me: thinking of literature re: non-repetition of descriptive information not being very useful when putting finding aids online. People may keyword search to specific results; may not navigate through hierarchies. May be useful to have contextual information repeated for each lower-level description in this type of interface).
- Comment re: provenance of Record Set vs. provenance of contained Records. Not the same thing (me: could be, but likely an issue of specificity - i.e., individual document creators vs. organization to which they belonged which could be designated as provenance point at the aggregate level).
- Comment that using same term provenance will be confusing. Again - creator vs author (these terms still require firm definition and clarification).
- Distinguish between what are inherent properties of Record Set.
- Suggestion that if a property is shared, only provide at Record Set level.
- A rule of applying properties/attributes in the CM, but not part of CM design.
- Distinguishing between a common property of contained Records in a Record Set VS sum of properties of Records contained in a Record Set (summary/overview)
- Example of going to a digital folder and viewing properties - what are the contents of that set - derived properties vs. summary (scope and content) (manually created). Inheritance - broad context - contextualizes description of contents. Some information at Record Set level is also valid at Record level (but not all). Philosophical or mathematical sense of inheritance - doesn't work. What is inherited is intellectual and contextual understanding. What cascades down is the broader understanding that contextualizes the whole. More context for a specific component (Record) amplifies the context of the broader. Records in context!

Date and Place - as just properties and relationships - or also as entities - **FC and AM will lead discussion on list-serv to help resolve this**

Function/Business/Mandate

- Proposition was to create three entities - Purpose, Activities, Rules
- Purpose: why you are supposed to do something

- Activities: what you engage in to realize the purpose (process)
- Rules: ...
- Authorizing & purpose = mandate
- Purpose & activities = business
- Overlap between mandate & business = purpose
- Idea of authorizing - is an event - transfer of power. Agent A authorizes Agent B.
- What is the purpose of the assignment?
- If the activities are identified, can associate them with the event of authorization
- What can be self-authorized, or no explicit mandate. But want to know that this agent has this purpose.
- Event - of empowering, also assigns responsibilities or purpose, can include specification of activities. Can be codified in laws, rules, memorandum, etc. The codification of it is independent of the representation or description of it.
- Sense of occupation here. Is related to function and goals and involves activities as well (what you do to perform that occupation).
- Difference between the occupation and the purpose of the occupation.
- Occupation: a node that gathers. Another way of attaching functions and activities.
- Note distinction between function (abstract) and function within a particular context -- instances of the abstract function.
- Many different functions can share a common purpose. (GM had separated function from purpose). Preference that they not be distinguished.
- DP: Function/objective/purpose/responsibility - why do you exist, what is your purpose for existing, what is the end result desired of you?
- GM: Business Process - requires both Function and Purpose. High-level purpose and specific Function come together to define what a business process is.
- GM: Mandate - related to Function and Purpose and strongly tied to Jurisdiction.
- DP - function/purpose/objectives/goals - 1 entity. Teleological. Aimed toward arriving at an end result or outcome. This is the assignment - produce that product, produce those results. the "What for"
- DP - Activities - engage in order to achieve the result/goal. Rules - govern the activities and/or purpose
- These three entities together - can describe that an Agent has this Responsibility (purpose) to achieve those goals by engaging in those activities that are constrained or informed by these Rules
- Agent 1 - mandate (authorization) event: assignment of authority to carry out the act. Agent 2 may develop own rules and policies in order to fulfil it. Or Agent 1 may prescribe these rules.
- N-ary authority: this authorization event took place on this Date in this Jurisdiction. A1 could also assign a jurisdiction to it - one of the rules that it assigns could be that you have the authority to do X at Y place for Z time period. Many options for qualifying this. Authorization event would be codified in Record ABC (known as a mandate).

Next steps (** Incomplete – see Bill's list)

#1. Bill, Daniel, Kat. Solidify notes from these meetings - i.e., next version of list of properties for the entities. Due by June 8th. Bill will send his notes early next week. Daniel will help me to finalize.

#2. - To complete a draft of the Record Set section. Vitor, Stefano, Aaron, Gavan, Bogdan, Javier
1- Summary of things to be said about Record Set (directory system in OS - so many folders, files, how much space, rough sense of their organization)
2- Take properties, if creating summary overview of the contained records, what does this look like? Which properties would be needed. Go through different intellectual levels -- e.g., start with a file and work up, or do the opposite. What is that I want to say that is contained within? Either a record set contained within or records?
Due ca. June 22.

**** I missed part of the discussion here****

#3 (part-way through discussion ...)
Ontology - need namespace from ICA that will be actively maintained
Ontology group has developed most of their work plan for now

#4 Communication plan
- will need to develop at some point - how to inform community, market info, conferences, etc.

#5 Final document
- map out content to be included
- W3C, FRBR, CRM -- all of these have had different approaches to presenting the information
- previous ICA standards - start with this as a template for style
- Bill, Kat, Daniel - look/feel rhetorical plan, identify components for outline of document

Monash U - Greg Roland (?) - Phd student studying archival conceptual model.
Another - Mike Jones (?) - museum informatics mixed with archival informatics
Other contacts that could do a pre-review of our drafts prior to general community feedback?

Rough time line
- end of August - draft for comment CM
- January - alpha ontology

End meeting ***

Summary of Changes

ENTITIES

1. New Entity: Documentary Component

PROPERTIES

1. Agent
 - a. National Affiliation REMOVED as a property
 - b. Services to the public – REMOVED as property. (Will be described as a function)
 - c. Location – REMOVED as property. Will be described as a Place.
Note: Remaining ISDIAH properties (Contact Information, Operating Hours, Facilities) – to be determined if they will remain explicit or not, and how they will be included in the model (see meeting notes for further information).

2. Record
 - a. Record Type – REMOVED as property (amalgamated with Document Form, which was renamed Documentary Form)
 - b. New property: Integrity Note.
 - c. New (umbrella?) property: Documentary Form Characteristics - includes
 - i. Script/Language (human languages)
 - ii. Extent
 - iii. Content Type
 - iv. Carrier Type
 - v. Media Type
 - vi. Encoding Type
 - vii. Production Technique/Method (?)
 - d. Form of Expression/Modality of Expression renamed Content Type (RDA concept)
 - e. Medium renamed Carrier Type (RDA concept)
 - f. Method or Form of Transmission or Communication renamed Media Type (RDA concept)
 - g. Status of Transmission renamed Record Status
 - h. Format renamed Encoding Type
 - i. New property: Production Technique (or Method, as per RDA)
 - j. New property: Classification Code
 - k. Disposition Information REMOVED as property (subsumed under History of Record).
 - l. Potential New property: Quality of the Information Content (suggested label – to be confirmed) – or incorporate this as part of Scope and Content.
 - m. Conditions of Use – renamed Rights.
 - n. New property: Physical Characteristics (may also include Extent)

3. Record Set
 - a. Record Set Type (Level of Description) renamed Record Set Type
 - b. Origin of Record Set – REMOVED as property (amalgamated with History of Record Set)
 - c. Document Form renamed Documentary Form
 - d. New (umbrella?) property: Documentary Form Characteristics - includes
 - i. Script/Language (human languages)
 - ii. Extent
 - iii. Content Type
 - iv. Carrier Type
 - v. Media Type

- vi. Encoding Type
- vii. Production Technique/Method (?)
- e. Form of Expression/Modality of Expression renamed Content Type (RDA concept)
- f. Medium renamed Carrier Type (RDA concept)
- g. Method or Form of Transmission or Communication renamed Media Type (RDA concept)
- h. Status of Transmission renamed Record Status
- i. Format renamed Encoding Type
- j. New property: Classification Code
- k. Disposition Information REMOVED as property (subsumed under History of Record).
- l. Potential New property: Quality of the Information Content (suggested label – to be confirmed) – or incorporate this as part of Scope and Content.
- m. Conditions of Use – renamed Rights.
- n. New property: Physical Characteristics (may also include Extent)

Kat Timms, 3 June 2015.