

20171117KT: This version of the document includes additional notes from the Rome meeting, during which the entirety of the document was reviewed (given that not all EGAD members had had the opportunity to participate in recent teleconferences).

- Part 1, Part 2, and Part 3 (#1-10): additional notes from the Rome discussion have been added, where possible.
- Part 3 (#11-16), Part 4 (#1 only): had not been discussed prior to Rome. Notes have been added.
- Part 4 (#2-6): not discussed by EGAD as a group. Will be considered by the Relations sub-WG struck in Rome, tasked with revising the relations section of RiC-CM for the second draft.

Note that the decision was made in Rome not to share this document with the community; rather, a list of issues being discussed/considered by EGAD could be shared (without explanation for how the issues would be resolved), OR an FAQ version of a selection of issues could be developed, with answers. In either case, a reminder would be given that a second version of the CM would be available for comment and feedback in the near future.

RiC-CM: Draft Digest/Discussion Questions

Please see the draft digest strategy document¹ for more details on the origin and purpose of this initiative.

In brief, these are high-level topical questions based on feedback received from the international community on the draft Records in Contexts Conceptual Model (RiC-CM) in 2016-17. They represent some of the most pressing issues raised in the feedback and are intended to:

- serve as a tool to foster EGAD discussions on how to complete development work on the model in consideration of the community's feedback; and
- potentially be posted to the public RiC-CM list-serv, alongside EGAD-crafted responses, as part of responding to the community's call for more openness and communication by EGAD in relation to the developing model.

They are a companion tool to the organized/consolidated community feedback that was created.²

They are draft suggestions, comprising an incomplete list of possibilities.

They typically focus on broad, or high-level issues; questions on most of the details within RiC-CM (e.g., comments received on each and every property; comments received on specific relations) are omitted here.

¹ https://www.dropbox.com/preview/EGAD-All/egad_1_2012-2016/WP%204%20-%20ConceptualModel/RiC-CM%20v0.1%20Consultation%20feedback/03%20Digest%20communication%20strategy/RiC%20CM%20feedback%20-%20Digest%20strategy%20-%20draft%2020170710.doc?role=personal

² https://www.dropbox.com/preview/EGAD-All/egad_1_2012-2016/WP%204%20-%20ConceptualModel/RiC-CM%20v0.1%20Consultation%20feedback/02%20Organized%20and%20consolidated%20feedback/Consolidated%20RiC%20feedback%20v2%20-%20DRAFT%2020170515kt.doc?role=personal

Part 1 – RiC-CM General Issues

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | <p>(Foundation) What is the scope, purpose, and goal of RiC-CM? Is it an expression of the conceptual underpinnings of the record (a conceptual model), a metadata schema (a standard for description), or both? Is it modelling the description of records, or the records themselves and their creation/custodial management processes?</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stating exclusions can be helpful (what something is not). - Comparing RiC to ISAD(G): RiC is abstract and broader in scope and ambition. Its introduction may not be approachable or clear for some segments of the audience. Describe what RiC is in 2-3 paragraphs. - Suggestion to move the current introduction into a separate document (e.g., Appendix). - A revised introduction to RiC could be modelled on the style of ISAD(G). |
| 2 | <p>(Foundation) Is the archival description RiC supports also intended to enable custodial management tasks by archives?</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, custodial management is not within RiC's scope, with exception perhaps to digital preservation. Want to intersect with PREMIS, but not overlap with it. - Refer to PREMIS to help when working on digital issues. |
| 3 | <p>(Foundation) Clarification around the definition and treatment of provenance is needed. For instance, does it include functional provenance? At some points it seems conflated with authorship. Also, provenance and context are not interchangeable. Further, principles beyond provenance and respect des fonds are relevant - e.g., good recordkeeping, access, and accountability. What are the applicable principles shaping RiC-CM?</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Core principles were articulated in RiC. Still, others may be relevant. - Suggestion to create a list of 6-7 key principles that RiC seeks to embody; make them explicit. - Could ask commenters to make concrete suggestions re: other principles to incorporate that they felt were important. |
| 4 | <p>(Modelling) What is the difference between an entity and a property, and what is the rationale behind the choices that have been made regarding this distinction in the draft conceptual model? For example, why is Date an entity and not a property of other entities? At the same time, why/how is date a shared property of relations?</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These terms aren't universally defined. - The concepts used in RiC-CM (entity, relationship, property) are borrowed from entity-relationship models. - Daniel has done some work on articulating a response |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | | <p>to this, starting with a presentation given this past spring in Sweden.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EGAD should explain how it is using these terms in RiC. |
| 5 | <p>(Modelling) RiC does not explicitly mention other semantic models (e.g., PROV-O). Re-using portions of existing ontologies is encouraged, wherever possible, for reasons of economy (not re-inventing the wheel) as well as fostering interoperability with the rest of the semantic web community. Did RiC take existing ontologies or models into account, and if so, how so?</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [<i>pending</i>]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EGAD was inspired by other ontologies and intends to do crosswalks. Could mention that other ontologies were consulted. - RiC does not mention other ontologies to avoid misinterpretation or misrepresentation of them. - Prov-O: to track history of changes in archival description. Has a role to play in the presentation of description. - Suggestion to keep CM and ontologies separate when explaining RiC's relations to them. E.g., RiC-CM relates to A, B, C conceptual models. RiC-O relates to D, E, F conceptual models or ontologies. - Explain the relation between RiC-CM and RiC-O. |
| 6 | <p>(Modelling) How are descriptions themselves being modelled, including the describers (archivists who make descriptions; users who contribute to descriptions)? What happened to the control information elements in existing ICA descriptive standards?</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [<i>pending</i>]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Modelling descriptions is being addressed in RiC-O – e.g., assertions about an entity or relations between entities. - Modelling diagrams would be helpful. |
| 7 | <p>(Modelling - Relation to other standards) How does RiC relate to the existing four descriptive ICA standards? Is it a replacement, a supplement, an over-arching roof, or some combination of these?</p> | <p>Draft Statement:</p> <p>RiC is intended to replace the four current ICA descriptive standards. While they will still be available for use, they will no longer be actively maintained. Current policy will state that RiC replaces them and the community will be encouraged to transition to using RiC.</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adrian's draft text addresses this issue. - Crosswalks will help concretely illustrate RiC as a replacement standard. - Future task for some EGADers: undertake systematic exercise to review four ICA standards to create this crosswalk. Will also identify any gaps in RiC (missing aspects). Some gaps may be desired: should explain how so. Other gaps may be unintentional: should add the missing components into the next version of RiC. |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Crosswalk will likely be in table format. Can review EGAD's original analysis of four ICA standards as a starting point. |
| 8 | <p>(From multi-level to multi-dimensional) Please clarify how hierarchies found in multi-level description are a type of graph, and so fit within RiC's graph-based approach.</p> | <p>Draft Statement: [<i>pending</i>]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to find language that is technically correct but accessible to a broad audience. - In brief: a hierarchy is a directed acyclic graph that unfolds in only one direction. Every child has one and only one parent. In a full-blown graph, by contrast, any node could have multiple parents. - Also: RiC doesn't disparage or reject hierarchy; rather, it expands upon it, accommodating both hierarchy as well as a multi-dimensional approach. Hierarchies could sit within a larger encompassing graph. - Visualizations, even simplified ones, could help illustrate this. |
| 9 | <p>(From multi-level to multi-dimensional) What are the implications of the infinite complexity permitted by RiC's multi-dimensional model? What is sufficient thoroughness when describing entities and their relationships?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [<i>pending</i>]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - While intellectually addressed in the introduction, not really addressed from a technical point of view. This question is closely related to #8 above. - Suggestion to make it clear that RiC doesn't dictate any particular amount of cataloguing – it remains up to the individual to decide what is appropriate for their purposes. - RiC is comprehensive for the sake of modeling, but this doesn't mean that all of it must be implemented. - Suggestion to include information on obligation (mandatory, optional, conditional) in the core product, with more fulsome information (e.g., scenarios such as single-item funds; partial funds; whole funds; identify what is sufficient) provided in the implementation guidelines. The community will want this guidance and will likely not want to wait until the implementation guidelines are completed to obtain it. - Small EGAD group to be assigned the task of going through RiC systematically (entity-by-entity, property-by-property, relation-by-relation) to identify basic obligations. - Desire to re-use existing work on this (decisions and rationales) – e.g., in the Finnish context, Australian |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | context, etc. |
| 10 | (Linked open data approach) More information is requested on the impact of this approach in RiC - for instance, the dispersal of archival information makes it vulnerable to loss over time; whether narrative components of description will still be accommodated; how relationships are documented using specific technologies or data models referenced in RiC; and how RiC aligns, fits in, or interoperates with existing semantic web standards. | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Issue of trust in technology; needs to be addressed in implementations. Intellectually this issue is acknowledged already in RiC. - Assuring referential integrity over time is an issue in all relational designs. - More anxiety in this area is potentially caused by the fact that in linked open data scenarios, links are made to others' information; meaning that control is not established in any one place. - However, arguably this is already the case, with descriptions that may be fragmented over time, or are otherwise shared or distributed. Linked data technologies simply build upon this to a greater level of granularity. - While this is not something that EGAD can solve, it can acknowledge it. - Regarding how relationships are documented, RiC will be illustrative rather than prescriptive. Examples will be provided to give some guidance. - RiC-O will explain how RiC interoperates with existing semantic web standards. Intent and desire to align with such standards as CICOC-CRM, FRBRoo, and PROV-O. Interest by CRM to extend it to include the archival domain. - RiC-CM and particularly RiC-O will provide a reference vocabulary and formal model that could serve as a basis for building interoperable systems, if used widely. - EGAD can state what's planned regarding these issues, rather than how it will eventually all work out. |
| 11 | (Treatment of digital records) The community noted gaps regarding digital records' description, including: needing more granular information, such as to better distinguish between information, representation and carrier; and needing more information about the technological context of creation and management. How will EGAD address these concerns? | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RiC's treatment of digital records was a known issue when releasing the draft CM. - Some RiC-CM properties (e.g., Media type, etc.) leaned heavily on RDA – it's time to revisit them. - Moving forward, look at PREMIS and e-ARK with the goal of ensuring that RiC-CM dovetails (aligns) with them; want RiC to align with the emerging consensus of those working on digital records management and preservation issues. |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | | <p>To do (KT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create a detailed list of all issues raised in the feedback concerning the treatment of digital records so that each can be considered and/or resolved in turn. <p><i>Available in Dropbox in the WP4 Conceptual Model / Consultation Feedback / Organized Feedback folder ("20171004 Feedback excerpt - digital records issues")</i></p> <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Digital issues: when to include detail in the CM, and when to point externally to something else? - Don't want to replicate something like PREMIS (or be seen as endorsing it). A matter of extensibility: how to reference or link up with other standards? - Distinguish between digital preservation and description of digital records. - Both a scope and presentation issue: focusing on archival description AND pointing out to specific parts of other standards. |
| 12 | <p>(Interoperability) Some commenters advocated for closer alignment with records management – for instance, making more explicit how RiC addresses records at all stages of the life cycle and incorporating the idea of recordkeeping events. How will gaps such as these be addressed?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some records management experts viewed RiC-CM as a promising start. Do they have specific recommendations for making the linkages/seamlessness between archives and records management more explicit? - As a standard for describing records, any distinction between records management and archives may be a false one: RiC could cross the whole continuum. - ICA is explicitly interested in RM (it has an experts group). - Could add content to RiC's introduction to make the linkages more explicit, along with providing a mapping from RiC to ISO 23081, the recordkeeping metadata standard, at least at the entity level. - Would like to have an open communication line with the RM community, including getting feedback on the RiC-CM to ISO 23081 mapping. |
| 13 | <p>(Presentation) Many commenters felt that RiC was text heavy, needing more diagrams. At the same time, the text was often incomplete (e.g., missing definitions, examples, scope notes). The presentation of the content impeded</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These presentation issues are acknowledged and will be |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| | <p>comprehension in some cases. How will these concerns be addressed?</p> | <p>addressed (i.e., completing the text and providing additional diagrams).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will investigate reducing the number of core entities, to help reduce confusion (e.g., clarifying Function, Activity, and Mandate). - Will provide an explanation for decisions made regarding what are selected as entities, properties, and relations. |
| 14 | <p>(Implementation) What tools, guidelines, or training supports will EGAD develop to help with transitioning to and implementing RiC?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Application guidelines are planned, but their content is not yet determined. - EGAD is not in the business of creating software tools, but may have related guidance or advice, including for less technologically-sophisticated tools, such as spreadsheets. - Prototypes of the RiC ontology are being developed, to help demonstrate feasibility. For example, prototypes are being developed in France that conform to RiC-O. It is also hoped that a web application (SPARQL end point containing RDF archival metadata) might be released along with RiC-O, once a stable version of the ontology is established. - EGAD is available to help educate the community about RiC (e.g., at workshops at conferences). - Once RiC is completed and published, EGAD could work with ICA training experts on developing products for the community (e.g., online modules). - 'SNAC School' (virtual training at a distance) could be a model to consider. |
| 15 | <p>(RiC's development process) Please provide documentation explaining the development process of RiC-CM alongside information about the rationale behind decisions made.</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impression that RiC's general development process was not shared or explained, including but not limited to decisions made on building the specific components of the model (entities, properties, relations). - The development process was not transparent and the community was not consulted throughout it. - Some commenters were also concerned about EGAD membership (lack of transparency regarding how members are selected; lack of representation from certain parts of the world). |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>- To address these concerns, can add content to RiC's introduction or in scope notes – e.g., an overview of the decision-making process and how conclusions are arrived at. Also, will review/explain rationale behind decisions made. While it's not practical to explain all decisions (some are at the micro-level), some general information can be shared.</p> |
|--|--|--|

Part 2 – RiC-CM Entities

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>(Foundation) What is an entity? It is not defined.</p> | <p>Draft statement: Entity and other modelling terminology used in RiC, like entity, property and relation, will be defined.</p> |
| 2 | <p>(Suggestions for additional entities / Suggestions for converting current entities into properties) Collectively the community proposed several new entities for the model, to enable deeper description (be able to assign properties to them) and new relations between entities. Of approximately a dozen suggestions, here are five, each suggested by multiple commenters. What does EGAD think of each of these suggestions for new entities or changing current properties to entities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Name: if changed to an entity, this would allow one to accommodate multiple forms of a name (authorized, variant, parallel) and relate them to an Agent; to allow properties to be assigned to names (e.g., form – authorized, variant, parallel; rules or conventions used to form the name; language and script of the name; to identify the time period of use; etc.). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ If not an entity, then how can name authority control be accomplished, since assigning relationships between properties is not possible (e.g., name_v1 isVariantOf name_v2)? • Event: some actions performed on a Record could be expressed by relations (conditions of accession, actions of | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <p>Name:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current property, name, was intended to be used for all of these aspects. - Name is a class in RiC-O. Note that several properties in RiC-CM are classes (categories of objects) in RiC-O. - The level of detail in the comments here is suggestive of implementation guidance being needed more so than a modelling issue. <p>ROME NOTES Name as an entity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Spanish model has 9 types of name; name is an attribute of 4 entities; must clarify with type of name. - Finnish model has 3 agent Names; Name is a separate entity -- preferred, variant and former (from RDA); when using Name, must specify the type. - Recommend following the library approach for authority control of Agent names. - Name is a class in RiC-O; making it an entity in the CM would add complexity - Suggestion to defer modelling Name as an entity because would add complexity, and name control is not central to the CM (in some people's view). - Could explain that parallel, variant, etc. names need to be addressed but will not be addressed as an entity/class in the CM, rather as a repeatable attribute (although will |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>consulting, destroying or converting formats) or be considered as events; documenting recordkeeping events is vital in the digital context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationships: to support the persistence of relationships; to support having properties assigned like date and place; in LoD relations are resources in their own right. • Content/Carrier: need to better distinguish between content (intellectual characteristics), carriers (physical properties) and containers (physical storage properties); necessary in order to distinguish between manifestations like prints, facsimiles, and copies. • Rights (Access Conditions / Use Conditions): to allow for relationships with Records, Agents, and other entities; because rights are contextual and bounded by time and space, requiring description and tracking over time. • Classification: to allow for relations to be made between classification codes and records management tools to contextualize them; as Documentary Form is to Record, so Classification is to Record Set. <p>The community also proposed that some RiC entities would be better modelled as properties of other entities. These are explained in some of the other questions below.</p> | <p>be a class in RiC-O).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If trying to limit the number of entities in the CM, leave out Name because it is less central. <p>** Note: this issue was not fully resolved; decision on what to do with Name in the CM (being an entity or not) is still pending.</p> <p>Event:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Event is a class in RiC-O. It's possible that it might become an entity in RiC-CM also. - Can be recursive: records document events; metadata documents events that happen to records ('event history' log) after point of capture (AKA creation). - Modeling event as a class/entity allows one to make statements about it (e.g., what happened, who was responsible, when it happened). - Digital curation and recordkeeping events: EGAD could identify fairly general events, analyzing options in CIDOC-CRM, PREMIS and ISO 23081; there is a danger in being too granular. <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Curatorial events -- relations are interconnected with events (both have a duration of time). <p>To do (KT):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide a list of all suggestions for new entities or converting current entities into properties; EGAD will likely release some documents in the future explaining how all such suggestions were treated (i.e., accepted or rejected, with an explanation why). <p><i>Available in Dropbox in the WP4 Conceptual Model / Consultation Feedback / Organized Feedback folder ("20170918 Feedback excerpt - suggestions for new entities")</i></p> <p>-----</p> <p>Relationships:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Relation is formally defined as a class in RiC-O with many sub-classes. - It is not clear what persistence means in this case, but it is an implementation issue. EGAD can provide guidance on best practices. - Another interpretation is that there should be persistence of relations explicitly (and perhaps those |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>implicitly established in and among the records with respect to content) established in Record Keeping systems in the context of origin and use of records in the Record Keeping systems of archival context. Adrian commented that this is none other than Respect for Original Order.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Added to this is that Archival Record Keeping Context, ideally, would preserve the original order, but also enable other orders to be imposed, which is to say, that in RiC we explicitly acknowledge that a record may participate in different “orders” at one and the same time, and different orders over time, provided the original order is maintained. Preservation of original order is the first and foremost responsibility.- Caveats for original order are acknowledged (e.g. that it cannot always be known or perceived; that there may only be ‘received order’, or the order at the time of acquisition; that original or received order are discarded when it seems more suitable for discovery purposes to create artificial arrangement, such as for private papers; etc.). <p>Content/Carrier:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Acknowledged that much more work needs to be done in this area, and this in relation to Record, Record Component, and Record Set, as these are all interrelated. <p>Rights (Access Conditions / Use Conditions):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Yes, access conditions and use conditions may change over time, and do! Thus, we must be able to qualify the conditions of access or use by the time within which it holds; it is also the case that a condition is qualified by place (or space) as well. DP surmises. <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Access: at the level of properties, RiC-CM had mashed together intellectual and physical concerns; technical access conditions were not distinct in the original list of properties, but there was a property that addressed mediation.- Rights as an entity: could be separated out, at least in database constructions; could be made repeatable, and qualified with dates. |
|--|--|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Classification:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes. A classification scheme may exist as a controlled value (terms or codes) system (thesaurus: broader, narrower, synonyms, related) in the same manner as function (as a concept rather the function in a particular context), or occupation. In which case a classification term or code exists as an independently maintained "entity." - Partly an issue of terminology (entity, property), which must and will be explained more clearly in the revised RiC-CM. In some views, classification is an entity in its own right. <p>Note: other suggestions for converting properties to entities will be considered one at a time.</p> <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Classification: currently decontextualized in the CM without reference to the classification schema. - Sometimes have access to the original schema, at other times it could be lost and there would just be codes remaining; or could have had multiple schemes applied over time, including within the archives. - Proposal to have Classification as an entity of the Controlled Vocabulary type (<i>see other Rome meeting notes for details on this new type of entity, along with others proposed to follow this approach</i>). - Cardinality 1:M (one record can have many classification terms or codes, may be controlled or uncontrolled). - If the source of classification (schema) is known, identify it. - If scheme is not present or unknown, describe the arrangement practice. - Could link to external schemes. - Classification as a separate entity with its own attributes (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). - Possible attributes: term, code, descriptive note, source (which scheme, or who), PID. - In other words, presented in the CM as an attribute of Record/Record Set, but being modelled 'out there' as a separate classification entity... sort of unacknowledged, at least in the CM. - Conflating describing description with demarcating entities? Are the codes and terms in a scheme its attributes, or its 'contents' in a sense? |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| 3 | <p>(Categorization/organization/ranking of entities) Would it be useful to organize the entities into primary and secondary categories, to highlight which are truly indispensable to recordkeeping? Or consider three levels in a hierarchy (primary, subsidiary, tertiary), in which the properties of the primary entities are the subsidiary entities, and the properties of the subsidiary entities are the tertiary entities. Would an organizational structure such as this help highlight additional relations between entities as well as highlight the significance of certain entities over others?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, EGAD agrees with the suggestion to organize entities into related or hierarchical categories. This would improve their presentation in the model. Which organizational scheme will be used is yet to be determined. |
| 4 | <p>(Extensibility) Is RiC intended to be extensible (allow for the addition of new entities, properties and relations)? If so, please explain how this would work.</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Meaning local extensions, or continuous development of the RiC standard? - Will define relations and relation types, for example, in a hierarchical fashion. Users of RiC would be free to define more specific types of a relation (e.g. a particular type of ownership, such as for a company that owns another company). - Local extensions have implications for sharing data broadly. - Generally local extensions will be discouraged, and RiC will be actively maintained over time. - Can provide guidance, rules, or best practices on what would constitute acceptable extensions. - Extensibility is a design principle for RiC-O. One can select only portions of RiC-O, as a system of multi-hierarchies for classes and properties, as needed. Also, new subclasses and sub-properties can be created as needed, when greater accuracy is required. These would inherit features of the upper classes or properties along with having their own features. One could also specify some literal values for some properties, link some classes to vocabularies, and define restrictions that are more complex. |
| 5 | <p>(Modelling Record entities) Distinctions between Record, Record Component and Record Set are not always clear, as well as compound Record, leaving them all open to interpretation. If ambiguous and over-lapping, then is it useful to distinguish among these? Would it be preferable to have a single</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At the time of releasing the draft, EGAD was aware that the distinctions among these hadn't entirely been made |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>Record entity instead, which could represent any single, compound, or aggregate of records, with the same properties available to each?</p> | <p>clear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Actually, it may not be possible to achieve this; generally there does not seem to be a single consensus or shared view in the archival community. - There is overlap between resolving this issue and clarifying the distinctions between carrier (physical) and content (intellectual). - If a Record can be seen as a Record Component in a particular context: EGAD cannot account for each and every case. - It may be best to avoid trying to hard-wire these distinctions, instead keeping them flexible. |
| 6 | <p>(Modelling Agent) The current model is too simple: we need to distinguish between entities and their identities (separate things from their appellations); and we need to define certain Agent sub-entities (person, group, corporate body, delegate agent) to support machine-actionability of properties that currently apply only to one Agent type. How will EGAD address these concerns?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some work done on Agent identities – see Daniel’s presentation from winter 2017. - “Machine-actionability”: the problem is that currently properties can only be assigned or inherited in some cases after having assigned a ‘Type’ value (P32) (i.e. Type = Person; Type = Corporate Body). - This is an implementation concern, more so than a modelling one. - In RiC-O, the Agent class has several sub-classes for Agent, such as Person, Group, Family, Corporate Body, and Software Agent). |
| 7 | <p>(Modelling business entities) There seems to be some redundancy or overlap among the business entities (Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate, Occupation and Position). Definitions and examples need to be clearer; guidance is needed regarding how to distinguish consistently among them; and there is potential to model some as sub-entities of others (e.g., Activity as a part of Function; Mandate as subordinate to Agent). There is also overlap between Occupation and Position; it may be difficult to distinguish between them in practice. Plus, why not make them properties of Agent? Or, if retaining Occupation as an entity, why not have Position as one of its properties instead of as a separate entity? And why have Function (Abstract) while not also having abstract counterparts to other business entities (e.g., Activity (Abstract))? Rationale for modelling decisions made for the business entities would be</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One possibility is to treat Function and Activity as a pair rather than separately. Function is the purpose/goals/objectives, while Activity is what is done in order to achieve those objectives. - Had separated Activity because of the M:N relation with Function. - Can see how it might be difficult to distinguish between Function and Activity in practice, at times. - Function is conceptually distinct from Function (Abstract); the former pertains to a particular place and time. - Could keep Activity as separate, but it may have a M:1 relationship with Function. However, if activities could be shared, could be modelled as M:N with Function. - Could rename Function (Abstract) to ‘general’, for |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>appreciated.</p> | <p>instance, to try to make it clearer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Decided to defer resolution of the issue of Function/Activity overlap; could merely be a presentation issue, rather than a modelling issue (making the distinctions between the entities clearer). - Position and Occupation are clearly distinct. Examples may help further clarify (e.g. General Council position at the National Archives; occupation = lawyer). - Both Occupation and Position relate to a context; the former to a broader context (society), and the latter to being within a particular group. - Potential to add an upper entity, such as Role. - Both Function and Activity can be represented conceptually. - Want to retain Function (Abstract) in some way; there is value in having a statement at that high level (e.g. water management function that may occur in different contexts). - While Mandate is directly related to Agent, it is not subordinate to it. - Confusion over what Mandate referred to: the Record in which it is codified vs. the action of having been ordered to do something. Had tried to make it clear in the draft, but must try to improve this. - However, would be rare to describe a Mandate without having a specific Record to refer to (e.g. rare cases, such as UK Constitution, in which no written version of the Mandate exists). - Refer back to #3 (organizing entities such as into a primary/secondary hierarchy). These comments might be more about presentation issues than conceptualization issues. May wish to reduce the number of core RiC entities for improved presentation. |
| 8 | <p>(Personal vs. business contexts) Is RiC intended to address personal and business records contexts equally? The definitions of Occupation, Position and Mandate, along with the examples provided, disproportionately address corporate records above the records of individual, families, community organizations, etc.</p> | <p>Draft statement: Yes, RiC-CM is intended to address both personal and business records contexts. Unofficial or uncodified mandates, for instance, may apply to persons. EGAD acknowledges that the presentation of ideas in RiC regarding how it applies to informal or personal recordkeeping contexts could be improved.</p> <p>EGAD Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, intended to address both personal and business contexts, but perhaps not equally. - Both Occupation and Position apply to a person. - Mandate could cover more than activities of a corporate group, for example, if uncodified or informal. </p> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | <p>- Additional examples could be added to show a stronger connection to personal funds.</p> <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The intent was to address both; could add more non-business examples (e.g. poet). - Could also include examples that show minimal application of RiC components (e.g. not focusing too much on business entities). |
| 9 | <p>(Documentary Form) Many wondered why this was not a property of Record entities instead, since it is principally applicable to and descriptive of them. What is the rationale for making it an entity?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acknowledged that generally we need to provide an explanation for modelling choices (entity vs. property). - Documentary Form is at least a controlled vocabulary (list of terms) with a M:N relation to Record. - Or, Documentary Form should remain a full-blown contextual entity. It has a history and evolution, and forms change over time (e.g. birth certificate of ages past vs. modern birth certificate). - This is akin to the idea of Function vs. Function (Abstract): birth certificate (generally) vs. birth certificate of a certain era/context. - This entity is important in relation to diplomatics. - This discussion has introduced the possibility of having a new abstract entity akin to Function (Abstract) while also maintaining Documentary Form as a list of controlled terms. |
| 10 | <p>(Modelling Date) While many voiced the opinion that Date should be a property of other entities, not an entity in itself, some supported it being modelled as an entity. Some confusion was caused by it being simultaneously an entity as well as a property of relations. Some felt that it should be just a property of all entities and/or a property of relations. Further, some wondered how a date could or should function outside of the context of an Agent or Record entity, and others wondered about its relation to the named periods and events defined as within the scope of Concept/Thing. Clarifying the rationale for modelling decisions made for Date would be appreciated.</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need to provide an explanation regarding our approach to modelling it. - Having it as an entity allows us to specify a calendar, the normalizing scheme (if applicable), and the nature of a relation to an Agent or Record (e.g. creation date, birth date, etc.). - Have several date entities in RiC-O: date, time span, period. May have shared and unique properties. - Envision recording imprecise dates with the ability to declare the level of certainty about them. - Non-contiguous dates: multiple ranges and/or individual dates, combined. - Part of the issue may also refer back to #3: the need to |

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| | | <p>categorize RiC entities into core and supporting entities. Date and Place may both be supporting entities.</p> <p>ROME NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Date cannot be a shared property (don't want to assign dates to the Date entity); but could be shared by many of the other entities - would need to be clear when/how date could be a property without making it universal in the CM. |
| 11 | <p>(Modelling Date) The current properties assigned to Date give the impression that it is about naming a time-span, rather than representing an actual time-span. For instance, two separate Date descriptions would be created for one unique time-span, when the calendar used to depict the time-span differs. How would these two expressions of the same date be related to one another? Would there be authority records for dates (i.e., to collate different 'names' representing unique time-spans)?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not entirely clear what this comment is about. Will have to be investigated further. - Do know that we want to distinguish between simple dates; spans of dates; discontinuous sets of dates. <p><i>See "20171018 Digest issue on RiC-E12 Date entity.pdf" in WP4 - ConceptualModel / Consultation feedback / Digest communication strategy.</i></p> <p>ROME NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This particular issue was flagged for follow-up as part of re-examining date (as an entity and/or property within the CM). The above document (the text of the original comment) was not reviewed. |
| 12 | <p>(Modelling Place) What is the rationale for having it as an entity? It is confusing because it seems to be both location (e.g., holding location) and physical positioning (i.e., geographic coordinates). It is also too simply modelled, needing more relations to allow for nesting of several instances of Place (one place containing another place). Why not have it as a shared property that could be applied to all entities?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Place is a first-order entity that has characteristics that we'd like to record. Need to retain it as an entity. - Nesting of places: could use an association relation to accommodate this (Place is associated with Place). People could extend this (make it more specific) if they wish. - If a property, then it could be used with all other entities, showing that it could be an entity in itself. |
| 13 | <p>(Concept/Thing) The scope of this entity seems too broad and is unclear. How does it relate to the other entities? Could it be modelled as a top-level entity including all others? Otherwise, how can they be kept distinct, avoiding overlap? Is there any danger with this entity being too broadly</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Suggestion to distinguish concept from thing. While all concepts are things, not all things are concepts (e.g. real- |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>scoped, as it may be implemented as a catch-all? Why not have it as a shared property that could be applied to all entities?</p> | <p>life people).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Other models (CRM, RiC-O) distinguish them, and Thing is the top class in RiC-O. - Concept/Thing was intended to be an over-arching category including all other entities in the model plus anything else that was excluded – basically, anything in existence that could be the subject of a record. Was intended as a catch-all. Not appropriate to have it as a shared property. - Issue of presentation: show that it is the top-level entity that encompasses all others. <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If Concept/Thing is at the highest level of the entity stack, could assign common properties there. - Qualify scope of concept/thing within RiC - won't address everything in existence. - Suggestion to distinguish Concept from Thing; former is a social construct, latter is physical; however, things can also be concepts? - Just have 'Concept' as high-level entity, omitting thing? Concepts are abstract things. - Spanish model: concept, object, event are packaged into 1 entity. |
|--|---|---|

Part 3 – RiC-CM Properties

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | <p>(Presentation) Some commenters suggested defining certain properties that apply to several entities only once (e.g., description, history, type, etc.), as this might be a more efficient way of presenting them. What does EGAD think of this suggestion?</p> | <p>Draft statement: <i>[pending]</i></p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, it's true that certain properties are repeated: they happen in relation to different entities; when they do occur, they occur once. - Suggestion was referring to reducing bulk in the presentation of RiC properties. - Potential to expand shared properties? - Some properties are shared by all entities, and some are shared only by some entities. - This issue will be worked on when thinking of the presentation of the model as a whole. - Support the idea of economy of presentation, but not at the expense of clarity. |
| 2 | <p>(Data types) Some felt that specifying data types</p> | <p>Draft statement:</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>for properties went beyond the scope of a conceptual model, and belonged instead in implementation guidance or RiC-O. However, others felt that data types should be specified in the conceptual model and that the information provided should be even more specific (e.g., preferred/expected number, text, date formats, strategies for resolving ambiguities with dates, etc.). What are EGAD's plans at this point with regard to data type information?</p> | <p>[<i>pending</i>]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Different parts of the community have different perspectives and needs, and it may not be possible to accommodate all of them. - This issue relates to the broader issue of us clarifying what we mean by 'conceptual model' and how it relates to the ontology, which would provide further technical details. - Somewhat inclined to retain data types in the conceptual model, but this issue requires further thought on how to resolve it. - This issue also forms part of the broader issue to improve presentation of the information presented in the conceptual model, as a whole. <p>ROME NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could move this detail to the RiC-Application Guidelines? Also consider the transformation of certain RiC entities following the 'Controlled Vocabulary' approach (these would have a controlled vocabulary datatype). - Spanish model: datatypes specified in some attributes, and are included in the specification of how to implement the model. NEDA guidelines are currently being worked on. Suite of three products: 1- conceptual model; 2- vocabulary; 3- minimal data for describing records, agents, actions. - NEDA attribute template: identifier, computer-friendly label, name, description, group (groupings of attributes), possible specification or qualification of attribute (e.g. data type), extensibility (with other attributes or relations), repeatability, possible use of list of categories for use with attribute (e.g. could be applied as date range), general comments, examples. |
| 3 | <p>(Choice and presentation of properties: uneven, unclear, unfinished) Overall the properties seemed uneven at times, with a high level of detail and nuance present in some cases, in contrast with vagueness in other cases. Some properties seemed possibly irrelevant or out of scope (e.g., gender, opening times, language of agent), as well as unclear, given missing scope notes and examples. What are EGAD's plans for improving the current state of RiC properties, in light of these issues raised?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [<i>pending</i>]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This critique is likely true but hard to address at a high level, in response to this statement. It will be addressed when revising the conceptual model (going through it, piece by piece). - Re: gender – will have a proposal for this, based on the SNAC Project's approach to demographic classification, which is not prescriptive and allows for classification of |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>an individual person.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re: language of Agent: we believe it is relevant. - Re: opening times: this is derived from ISDIAH, and since all of the existing ICA standards were accommodated in RiC, it was retained. - Fair point re: missing scope notes and examples. This will be addressed when revising the RiC-CM. |
| 4 | <p>(Suggestions for new properties) In response to perceived gaps, there were many suggestions for new properties including, among others, additional properties for: describing digital records; relation types; dates; other facets of identity; and life cycle or custodial management. What gaps does EGAD currently perceive with respect to RiC-CM properties, and are there plans to add new properties, including these mentioned here, or any others?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Previous group teleconference discussions acknowledged the issues with describing digital records, that certain aspects of the model are underdeveloped (e.g. Record Component). Had suggested looking to PREMIS and other standards or initiatives, to align with what the greater community is doing rather than create something new in this case. - Need guidelines for RiC extensibility: under what circumstances might people be able to add their own properties or incorporate them from another standard. - Extensions for different types of material (e.g. music, geographic) are enabled in the Spanish model for archival description. - Could have guidelines for different types of records. - Tension between devising a common standard that would be broadly usable vs. accommodating local additions. Desire standardization at a high level at least, to support harmonious co-existence of aggregated descriptions. - Possibility for the community to submit proposals for RiC extensions to EGAD in the future, as EGAD will be a standing body that will actively maintain RiC over time. - Relation types: two extremes – provide limited and primitive types vs. provide an extensive list of relations. Working on a strategy in RiC-O – a hierarchical approach to defining relation types (or properties/predicates in RDF). For example – “is associated with” – could be a higher-level relation, with a family relation as its subordinate, under which about half a dozen basic types of family relations could be enumerated (e.g. ancestor of, parent of, child of, sibling of, etc.). This list could be extended in a particular implementation. - Lifecycle or custodial management: where does records management stop and description begin, and to what extent should this overlap be addressed in RiC? - RiC ought to be applied regardless of custodial |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | <p>circumstances (e.g. location of records, legal responsibility or custody) and be able to accommodate metadata about these types of things. RiC should not just apply to records held by custodial institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We want to reflect issues of history, custody and the way that records have been managed, but believe that it is out of RiC's scope to accommodate a full array of events for tracking the management of records. This is complementary to but not central to RiC. - ISO 23081 recordkeeping metadata standard: includes a detailed history of events. While we don't want to replicate it in its entirety in RiC, we do want to accommodate the custodial history of the record, and disposal actions that might have been taken on particular parts of Record Sets. Certain key events should be included in RiC. - Events are being included in RiC-O, particularly with respect to modelling the role of the archivist in description. RiC-O models the event of making an assertion about an archival entity. |
| 5 | <p>(Shared properties of all entities) Some basic suggestions for improvement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have common properties belong to a super-entity (e.g., Concept/Thing; Universal Recordkeeping Object) - Model identifier as an entity, or as a single property with types detailed in RiC-O - Model name as an entity to allow for authority control (e.g., parallel, bilingual names) - Add other shared properties such as date, place, and concept/thing (i.e., subject) - Clarify the scope of 'General note' <p>If EGAD revises the RiC-CM shared properties, how might these suggestions be taken into account?</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, we would like to present RiC entities in a hierarchy that includes a super-entity, so that common properties could be inherited, at least to the extent possible. - Agree with Name being modelled as an entity: this will be accommodated in some fashion, and it is being done this way in RiC-O. Name would have its own set of properties and attributes. - Shared properties like date, place, concept/thing: this had been discussed, and we had the intention to incorporate them in this way, but they were not included in this manner in the initial draft. - We will do our best to accommodate and address these concerns. Exactly how is yet to be determined. <p>ROME NOTES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identifier is one way of naming, aside from Name. Possible to add section 'Appellation'? |
| 6 | <p>(P5 Authenticity and Integrity Note, P8 Quality of Information, and P16 Physical Characteristics Note) Several commented on overlap among these properties and questioned whether all three were needed to convey the underlying concepts. For</p> | <p>Draft statement: [pending]</p> <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We will need to go back and look at how these |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | instance, P5 and P8 both refer to the ‘wholeness and completeness’ of a Record, and both P8 and P16 are about the physical characteristics of a Record. Can EGAD precisely clarify the distinction between these? | properties were defined in relation to this critique. We did have clear distinctions in mind, but need to refresh on the text to clarify what they were and how to tease them apart better. |
| 7 | (P6 Content Type, P7 Context Extent, P10 Encoding Format, P12 Media Type, P15 Physical or Logical Extent) Commenters were concerned about the lack of clarity and the overlap among these properties, as well as the uneven level of detail – for instance, having granular properties concerning media format, production technique, and encoding, yet lacking an appropriate place for checksum/hashing algorithm information aside from P5 Authenticity and Integrity Note, which did not seem to be an ideal fit. What are EGAD’s plans to clarify the scope of each of these properties, to address these types of concerns? | Draft statement: [pending] EGAD Discussion: - Yes, we need to reconsider these properties. They were intended to be distinct, but if they are not yet clear enough for readers, then we have to revise them. |
| 8 | (P17 Classification) Many felt that this was too vague, making it difficult to understand. Its definition seemed inconsistent with its scope notes and examples. Which classification codes were within scope? Whose classification codes could be recorded? What if multiple classification codes were assigned? Can EGAD please clarify this property? | Draft statement: [pending] EGAD Discussion: - We agree with the criticism that classification was not presented clearly enough. This will be discussed further at EGAD’s face-to-face meeting. |
| 9 | (P18 Conditions for Access / P19 Conditions of Use) Some felt that these were treated too simplistically. For instance, access control frameworks in digital environments are highly nuanced. What of system dependencies for access? It is too much for one property to represent both intellectual and physical access. Some also recommended that these become entities, because they have relationships to other entities (e.g., Record, Agent) and because it’s necessary to track a history of them. What is EGAD’s plan for addressing these types of concerns? | Draft statement: [pending] EGAD Discussion: - This must be revisited, given this critique. Our initial approach was to adhere to how these were presented in the existing ICA standards. <i>KT: My audio connection was disconnected several times and was generally unstable during this portion of the meeting. Can anyone supplement these notes? I believe there was some talk about systems controls for restricting access?</i> |
| 10 | (P20 History) Commenters questioned why history was a narrative property, instead of being modelled as a series of events. And what of properties for specific kinds of events or activities, such as appraisal? Could EGAD explain the | Draft statement: [pending] <i>KT: Again, can anyone help with the notes here?</i> |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | <p>envisioned approach toward documenting the history of a record?</p> | <p>EGAD Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The idea was to allow for a prose description to summarize the events. - Two options: auto-generated, versus manually composed. - Notion of a chronological list of events. - Talk about EAC-CPF... - Could have list of events qualified by date and time. - If event was an entity, could have other relations to it. It would be more elaborate than EAC-CPF. - Agree that events need to be discussed further. <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - History (property of Record): keep an alternative to a narrative -- history could be done as a series of events/relations with Agent. - Provide two options (in RiC-AG?): simple prose narrative, or elaborate timeline. - RiC-O: event is a class, but this is not yet in the CM - need to work out the details around this. Decision on how to accommodate event in the CM is pending. Need to divide what we currently have between endurants and perdurants. |
| 11 | <p>(Properties of a Record Set / Properties summarizing the members of a Record Set / Properties shared by all members of a Record Set) Some commenters felt that these properties were not sufficiently clear. What are the distinctions between them? Why differentiate between shared and summary properties? What if only some but not all members of a particular Record Set share a particular property? Can not a Record Set be formed on a basis of something other than a shared property, such as in the case of miscellaneous Record Sets, which may not share a common property? Other RiC properties not listed could also be conceivably shared in common. Can EGAD clarify the scope, intent and application of these Record Set properties?</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Although an explanation was provided in the draft, it was not sufficiently detailed to convey the intended meaning. Needs more textual description, examples and diagrams. - If some members share a property but not all: account for it in the summary description. - The wording of the draft implies that the list of properties must be shared by all members (this property AND this property AND this property); “OR” was what was intended. - Shared property is an attribute of the Record Set, not of the Record (although the attribute is an attribute of a Record, too, in its own description). - This is “bottom-up inheritance”, for instance, ‘correspondence’ (if treated as a controlled term for Documentary Form). However, bottom-up inheritance cannot always be true, for example, in cases where a Record Set contains other Record Sets. RS-A with provenance A contains RS-B with provenance A (same provenance). Want to say that A&B belong to the same Record Set but the provenance of the larger Records Set is not the same. - A Record Set containing other Record Sets doesn’t |

| | | |
|----|---|--|
| | | <p>necessarily behave the same way as a Record Set containing only Records.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Another example could be a series resulting from an activity. Another series may result from the same activity, but the larger series that contains these two may not be related to the same activity. - Another issue is the fact that the 'shared property' might in fact be the sharing of the same value of a property (e.g. property:language = English), rather than the fact that both Records have a language property (regardless of the value). - ISAD(G)'s idea of top-down inheritance: not actually true. Nested context is true, but technical inheritance is not the case. - If records share a property (share a common value for a property) or share a relation, that may be why they were grouped as a set. This is the only case in which bottom-up inheritance would work. |
| 12 | <p>(P33 Identity Type) There were some concerns about this Agent property, as well as some confusion. What was the scope or application of 'assumed' identities? Is distinguishing between given and assumed names truly useful? Is it within the power of the archivist to evaluate whether an identity is 'real'? Can EGAD provide more information on this property, in response to these concerns?</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In brief, it is the archivist's job to describe based on available evidence. - American trend or focus recently on social justice issues: taking things too far? |
| 13 | <p>(P36 Gender) Numerous concerns were expressed about this property. Gender is more complex than how it is portrayed in RiC. Further, is it the role of the archivist, or is it even within his/her authority, to make gender assessments? Do the benefits of including this property outweigh the efforts that would be required to resolve all of the ethical and practical issues raised?</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposing to eliminate gender and follow the SNAC approach: have 'demographic classification', which would include Agent language and a note for extensibility. This would allow for other types of classification like gender, sexual orientation, nationality, ethnicity, religion, political party affiliation, etc. - Library of Congress: comparable list also had occupation or field of work. ("Demographic Group Terms") - Demographic characteristics could apply to different types of Agents. |
| | <p>(P38 Services to the Public / P39 Contact Information / P40 Operating Hours / P41 Facilities) Many felt that these properties were out of place within RiC, that they disproportionately favoured corporate bodies when they could apply to several Agent types, and that accounting for these particular properties of ISDIAH was not</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These properties were present because RiC had aimed to specifically accommodate all properties of previous ICA standards: some readers of the draft questioned whether this was the best choice (vs. taking a fresh approach). - ISDIAH is implemented in Europe (Apex project). |

| | | |
|----|--|---|
| | <p>necessary. Can EGAD explain the value of these properties, as well as any plans for adjustments to them?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could these types of properties be used to develop something similar to the demographic classification idea? - Is there any overlap with what Schema.org covers? Is currently addressing libraries as a kind of business – contact point, properties re: policies and ethics. - Could some of these properties be reflected through relations to Activity? - Not just about repositories, but corporate bodies in general. - Are these properties too detailed for the CM? - Archival repositories as corporate bodies can be fully described (using various RiC entities) and are thus already accommodated. - They could be removed, replaced with a pointer elsewhere – to Schema.org, for example. - Suggestion to keep P38 Services to the Public in a sense, but remove P39, P40 and P41. P38 could be accommodated as an example of an Activity – description of national archive, one of its activities is engaging with the public. |
| 15 | <p>(Properties of business entities (Occupation, Position, Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate), as well as properties of Documentary Form, Date, Place and Concept/Thing) In general, the most common comments about properties for these entities was that they were not fully explained, and often had missing or unclear scope notes and examples. Will EGAD provide complete information in the next version of RiC so that the meaning and value of these properties can be ascertained?</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This issue is acknowledged here because it was raised by many commenters. The basic solution is to complete the text. |
| 16 | <p>(Shared properties of a relation) Why are only date and place shared properties of relations but not others (e.g., certainty of the assertion, timestamp, precedence or order, type or genre, identifier, name)? Further, the way dates are described would not be functional (e.g., handling non-ISO compliant dates). Would having an Event/Relation class be a better approach than assigning properties to relations?</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This comment points to three things: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. information about the ICA control elements (description about description) being missing from the draft; 2. issues with the way P68 Date (as a shared property of a relation) was explained in the draft (for example, limitations of ISO 8601 in comparison to imprecise archival dates) 3. re-surfacing the idea to have an Event/Relation class. - ISO 8601 – possibility of enabling extensions to this date standard to allow for uncertainty to be reflected. If this is implemented, it would likely post-date the draft RiC-CM’s |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>release though.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Finnish implementation of EDT syntax – use of certainty qualifiers, etc. A parser was created. - RiC-O has other attributes applicable to Relations like certainty, etc. - TEI approach – way of ‘translating’ imprecise dates for computer manipulation. - RiC-CM is not the place for details on dates – point out to RiC-O or RiC-AG. |
|--|--|--|

Part 4 – RiC-CM Relations

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 1 | <p>(Comprehensiveness / presentation) Some felt that too many relations were listed in the draft RiC-CM. This might make them seem overwhelming or unusable. Perhaps enumerating this many possibilities could be done in RiC-O instead; or, some basic relations could be provided in RiC-CM along with guidance regarding how an implementer could expand upon them. Too long a list could be difficult to maintain over time, too. Furthermore, the current presentation seemed bloated, which made it difficult to assess unique relations and how comprehensive the list actually was. What is EGAD's current plan with respect to the number of relations provided in RiC-CM?</p> | <p>ROME NOTES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Presentation in RiC draft was not approachable or comprehensible to many readers. - Relations occupy their own ontological space. Proceed from associative to subclasses of this – e.g. social relations, resource relations, Agent to resource relations. - Gavan has done work collapsing them down to 16 categories. - EGAD sub-group has been tasked with clarifying the presentation of relations (hierarchical ordering, or some other kind of graph – some relations might be either A or B). - A lot of work on classifying relations had already been done in RiC-O. - When describing the relation: will the name of the relation be a property/attribute of it? - Technologically do not need to name the relation - but how will relations be presented in the CM? Using names, or types to categorize them? - No point in providing a name? - Relation is not an entity in the model, so don't need to assign a name. |
| 2 | <p>(Binary relations) Some felt that more than binary relations would be needed (e.g., n-ary, tri-, quad-). Otherwise relations could be ambiguous, particularly with Dates. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Date:1911 was start date of Position:Teacher o Date:1911 was associated with Person:Ellen o Person:Ellen occupied Position:Teacher o Unclear if this means that Ellen occupied | <p><i>KT: The remainder of these questions were not discussed in Rome. I believe the strategy suggested was that the sub-group tasked with working on the relations section of the next draft RiC-CM would take them under consideration.</i></p> |

| | | |
|---|---|----|
| | <p>that position starting in 1911, or if 1911 was the start of that position in general, with some other association with Ellen.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggest establishing Date as a property of entities instead, giving start/end dates for each entity plus contextualizing the relationship: Position:Teacher (1900-2016) was occupied from 1911-1930 by Person:Ellen (1890-1955) <p>Is it possible to avoid this type of ambiguity with RiC's relations as they are currently explained? Will n-ary relations be permitted or encouraged?</p> | |
| 3 | <p>(Inverse relations) Some felt that these could be presented more economically, or that including them wasn't necessary, since inference (e.g., with OWL processing) would be possible. Instructions or guidance on inferring inverse relations was requested. What is EGAD's current plan for inverse expressions of relations?</p> | -- |
| 4 | <p>(Past/present tense expression) Many felt that this was unnecessary and untenable. It could impose a maintenance burden over time that few could meet. Using date information could obviate the need for having both a past and a present tense expression of a relation. Some questioned the usefulness of making the distinction at all, from a semantic point of view. In general, past/present tense expression was discouraged. What is EGAD's current position on this practice?</p> | -- |
| 5 | <p>(Presentation – reducing redundancy, explaining choices) Suggestions for improving the presentation of relations included: winnowing down the list to semantically distinct relations, as well as reducing redundancy by finding alternative solutions for inverse and past/present expressions of unique relations; providing explanations and examples for relations; and dynamically presenting relations rather than in a static table. How will EGAD address these concerns?</p> | -- |
| 6 | <p>(Categorization of relations) Suggestions were offered to help reign in the long list of relations in the draft CM, including categorizing relations by types to help eliminate redundancies. Typing relations could also help with their management, if</p> | -- |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>rules could be applied per type rather than per individual instance.</p> <p>Different categorization schemes were suggested including categories such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• provenance, succession, containment, association, formation, governance, belonging, transmission, documentation features, existential features, etc.; or• dependency, association, aggregation, composition, generalization, etc. <p>Another suggestion was to explicitly specify hierarchical relationships, such as between the most general 'is associated with' relation and all others, which would be specializations of it. Does EGAD plan to categorize RiC relations in the next version of the CM?</p> | |
|--|--|--|