Agenda Item 1-II.A.

Society of American Archivists
Council Meeting
August 17-18, 2015
Renaissance Cleveland Hotel
Cleveland, Ohio

Consent Agenda: Ratify Interim Council Actions

(Prepared by Executive Committee Member Tanya Zanish-Belcher)

BACKGROUND

Current parliamentary policy agrees on validating board decisions made remotely, and ratifying the Council's decisions made via online and conference-call discussion via the Consent Agenda does not conflict with any existing SAA policy.

DISCUSSION

Given the Council's robust use of an email discussion list to function as a group and make decisions remotely, approving interim Council actions via the Consent Agenda contributes to streamlining the group's work and improves access to the interim decisions of SAA's elected decision makers.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the following interim actions taken by the Council between June 1 and August 7, 2015, be ratified.

- Unanimously adopted the May 28-30 SAA Council meeting minutes.
- Approved Revision Proposal for Encoded Archival Description (EAD3) submitted by the Standards Committee. (July 16, 2015) (See Appendix A.)
- Adopted recommendations that three individuals be awarded the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award. (July 17, 2015) (See Appendix B.)

APPENDIX A
Interim Action Item

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
July 9, 2015

Standards Committee:
Revision Proposal for Encoded Archival Description
(Prepared by Co-chairs Dan Santamaria and Meg Tuomala)

The Standards Committee certifies that the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) has complied with Council-adopted procedures relating to standards development and revision, and recommends the adoption of the revisions to the EAD standard as submitted by TS-EAD.

This proposal is the culmination of a process that began in 2010, when the Standards Committee charged a new Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) to oversee the maintenance of the standard. Recognizing that EAD needed an update, its charge instructed TS-EAD to complete a revision of the standard within five years. This was a complicated process that included substantial community feedback as summarized below. The revision to EAD is known as EAD3 and would replace EAD 2002 as the current, official version of the standard.

In addition to substantive changes to the EAD schema and DTD TS-EAD is proposing to change the maintenance of EAD3 to an ongoing maintenance model (as is currently employed by TS-DACS) and recommends consolidating the technical subcommittees charged with maintaining archival data structure standards (TS-EAD, TS-EAC-CPF, and the Schema Development Team) into a single group (the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Standards). The consolidation of subcommittees requires further discussion and will be dealt with in a separate agenda item. The Standards Committee also supports this change.

BACKGROUND

Extensive background is available in the Appendix, EAD3 Submission Information, which was compiled by the TS-EAD chairs. The full submission packet compiled by TS-EAD also contains extensive documentation of the revision process. A briefer summary is included here (text in italics is directly quoted from the TS-EAD submission to Standards):

In the years between the release of EAD 2002 and 2010, when the revision process that led to EAD3 began, the technological landscape surrounding archival description evolved enormously. Collection management systems, such as the Archivists' Toolkit, Archon, and ICA-AtoM, offered the robust advantages of modeling descriptive information in relational databases, but exposed

the difficulty of adapting the EAD document model in data-centric applications. Linked Open Data emerged as a viable methodology for creating a semantically meaningful Web, for which EAD was poorly prepared. New and closely related metadata transmission standards were developed, most notably Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF), opening new frontiers in archival metadata. Finally, over a decade of working with EAD gave archivists a general sense that it was too complex, too forgiving, and too flexible for its own good.

In 2010, the SAA Standards Committee charged a new Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) to oversee the maintenance of the standard. Recognizing that EAD needed an update, its charge instructed TS-EAD to complete a revision of the standard within five years.

Early in the revision process TS-EAD published four points of emphasis to guide us as we weighed the benefits of changes to EAD.

1. *Achieving greater conceptual and semantic consistency in the use of EAD.*
2. *Exploring mechanisms whereby EAD-encoded information might more seamlessly and effectively connect with, exchange, or incorporate data maintained according to other protocols.*
3. *Improving the functionality of EAD for representing descriptive information created in international and particularly in multilingual environments.*
4. *Being mindful that a new version will affect current users.*

All of the changes made in EAD3 can be seen in the context of these four points. Throughout the revision process, the most difficult decisions concerned proposals that highlighted tensions between them, especially between making EAD more consistent and aligned to other standards and mitigating impact on current users.

DISCUSSION

The Standards Committee considers the consultation process for this revision thorough and appropriate for such a major project. The revision process involved an initial call for comments, and opportunities for feedback on alpha, beta, and gamma versions of EAD3. A timeline and overview of these comment periods is available in the Appendix, under the heading "Documentation of the Consultation Process." In addition to the public comment periods, TS-EAD conducted all technical development work and logged comments in a publicly accessible repository on GitHub, regularly presented at the SAA Annual Meeting and elsewhere, including internationally, and sent updates to appropriate email lists as work progressed.

A summary of significant changes is available in the Appendix as well as in the emails, presentation, and supporting documentation provided by TS-EAD in their submission packet. Decision-making during such a large-scale project is complicated and in select cases consensus was difficult to achieve. TS-EAD describes their decision-making process as follows:

TS-EAD's decision-making process focused on detailed analysis and consensus building within the committee. As we received proposals from the community or fellow committee members, individuals or small groups did additional work to better understand the request, clarify the specific impact on the schema, and make recommendations to the committee. Many issues were revisited multiple times as we collectively came to understand better our goals and their impact. Although healthy differences of opinion persisted throughout the revision process, ultimately only one issue had to be decided by an executive decision by the co-chairs. In the alpha schema element and attribute names were converted to camel case, as is the convention in EAC-CPF. This met our goals of conceptual consistency and interoperability with EAC-CPF, but we received strong feedback from the community arguing against the change. Entrenched and opposing opinions – all with strong justifications from our points of emphasis – remained within TS-EAD; ultimately the co-chairs decided to honor precedent and sensitivity to the impact on users and opted to remove camel case.

Another case of disagreement was the inclusion of the <relations> element within EAD3, which is detailed in the Appendix. Related substantial feedback came in comments from TS-EAC, also summarized in the Appendix, and detailed in the file EAD3Gamma-commentsFromAngjeliWisser.pdf in the TS-EAD submission packet. In summary,

TS-EAD acknowledged their feedback, but made no subsequent changes to EAD3. The areas of concern identified by TS-EAC all reflected different interpretations of the points of emphasis that guided the revision. Within TS-EAD there was a stronger consensus around mitigating impact to existing users than would have allowed some of the changes preferred by TS-EAC. There were also fundamental differences of opinion between the two groups about what mechanisms best support the exchange of data.

The Standards Committee notes that the proposed maintenance, described below, is designed to help better coordinate and plan development of descriptive standards through combining TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and SDT into a single technical subcommittee.

Maintenance Plan

In its proposed maintenance plan TS-EAD also proposes to move maintenance of EAD to an ongoing maintenance and review model. The Standards Committee supports this change as it should allow additional flexibility in maintaining the standard and help make future revisions less overwhelming than the eight-year gap between the release of EAD2002 and the start of the revision process for EAD3 (and the resulting gap of 13 years between finalization of the two versions).

The Standards Committee also supports the restructuring of the technical subcommittees to combine TS-EAD, TS-EAC-CPF, and the Schema Development team (SDT). TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and the SDT are closely interrelated, both formally (the co-chairs of each subcommittee are ex officio members of the others and all SDT members are ex officio members of the subcommittees) and through other professional and informal networks. The exact composition of this committee requires further discussion and will be presented in a separate agenda item.

RECOMMENDATION

THAT the revision to Encoded Archival Description as submitted by the Standards Committee on behalf of the Technical Subcommittee on EAD (Appendix) be adopted and that EAD3 replace EAD 2002 as the current, official version of the standard.

Support Statement: The revision resulting in EAD3 was a major undertaking and represents a significant step forward from EAD2002 and in achieving TS-EAD's goals of achieving greater conceptual and semantic consistency in the use of EAD, exploring mechanisms whereby EAD-encoded information might more seamlessly and effectively connect with, exchange, or incorporate data maintained according to other protocols, improving the functionality of EAD for representing descriptive information created in international and particularly in multilingual environments, and being mindful that a new version will affect current users.

Impact on Strategic Priorities: This addresses SAA's strategic goals of providing content that reflects the latest thinking and best practices in the field (2.1), delivering information via methods that keep pace with technological change (2.2), and participation in standards development (3.1).

Fiscal Impact: Staff time associated with updating related publications including the EAD tag library, likely to be offset by tag library sales.

Appendix

June 29, 2015

Standards Committee
Society of American Archivists

Dear SAA Standards Committee,

It is our great pleasure to submit EAD3 to the SAA Standards Committee on behalf of the Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD). The process of revising EAD was tremendously challenging yet rewarding, and we feel that EAD3 represents a significant enhancement to the most important metadata standard in our field as well as a solid foundation for further development.

Please review the following pieces of supporting documentation:

- Introductory Narrative
- Bibliography
- Documentation of the Consultation Process
- Maintenance and Review Plan
- EAD3 Version 1 (pre-release)
    - See https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/releases/tag/v1.0.1-beta or EAD-Revision-1.0.1-beta.zip.
- EAD3 Tag Library
    - See EAD3 Tag Library.docx
      [Note this is still undergoing final revisions at the date of submission, primarily to check and supplement examples.]
- Example EAD3 instance
    - See beinecke.hayward_ead3.xml

We are ready and happy to provide clarification or additional documentation.

Thank you for the opportunity to invest our time, effort, and expertise into a standard we care deeply about. Revising EAD was a significant undertaking, and the support and patience of the Standards Committee was a necessary pre-condition for a successful outcome.

Sincerely,

Mike Rush
Bill Stockting
TS-EAD Co-Chairs

Introductory Narrative

Encoded Archival Description (EAD) is the international metadata transmission standard for hierarchical descriptions of archival records. Developed by the EAD Working Group of the Society of American Archivists and first published in 1998, EAD is an XML markup language used by archivists around the globe. A second version with greater international alignment, EAD 2002, was released as a DTD in 2002 and in 2007 as Relax NG and W3C schemas. The development of EAD made it possible to create electronic finding aids within a specifically-archival data structure compliant with *International Standard Archival Description (General)* (ISAD(G)). This innovation was a crucial impetus behind the swift migration of archival description to the internet, the acceptance of national archival descriptive content standards like *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS), and the emergence of a professional consensus that archival description existed to be shared widely and shared well.

This new version of Encoded Archival Description – EAD3 – exists thanks to the efforts and support of many people, but it exists because of the many archivists and repositories around the world that saw the utility of EAD, used it in diverse and inspiring ways, and continue to recognize many ways in which it might work better.

In the years between the release of EAD 2002 and 2010, when the revision process that lead to EAD3 began, the technological landscape surrounding archival description evolved enormously. Collection management systems, such as the Archivists' Toolkit, Archon, and ICA-AtoM, offered the robust advantages of modelling descriptive information in relational databases, but exposed the difficulty of adapting the EAD document model in data-centric applications. Linked Open Data emerged as a viable methodology for creating a semantically meaningful Web, for which EAD was poorly prepared. New and closely-related metadata transmission standards were developed, most notably Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF), opening new frontiers in archival metadata. Finally, over a decade of working with EAD gave archivists a general sense that it was too complex, too forgiving, and too flexible for its own good.

In 2010, following an update to its by-laws concerning standards maintenance, the SAA Standards Committee charged a new Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Description (TS-EAD) to oversee the maintenance of the standard. Recognizing that EAD needed an update, its charge instructed TS-EAD to complete a revision of the standard within five years.

TS-EAD completed the revision of EAD with the help of the SAA Schema Development Team and with many contributions, large and small, from the international EAD community. EAD3 is the result of four public comment periods, countless feedback, three working meetings, numerous conference calls, regular presentations to the EAD Roundtable, and lots of careful analysis, spirited discussion, and hard-won compromise. Notable milestones in the revision process include the initial comment period, which shaped our early agenda; a three-day TS-EAD working meeting at Yale University's Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, which established a clear direction; and the alpha, beta, and gamma schema releases, which gave the EAD community concrete examples to test and critique.

Early in the revision process TS-EAD published four points of emphasis to guide us as we weighed the benefits of changes to EAD.

5. Achieving greater conceptual and semantic consistency in the use of EAD.
6. Exploring mechanisms whereby EAD-encoded information might more seamlessly and effectively connect with, exchange, or incorporate data maintained according to other protocols.
7. Improving the functionality of EAD for representing descriptive information created in international and particularly in multilingual environments.
8. Being mindful that a new version will affect current users.

All of the changes made in EAD3 can be seen in the context of these four points. Throughout the revision process, the most difficult decisions concerned proposals that highlighted tensions between them, especially between making EAD more consistent and aligned to other standards and mitigating impact on current users.

TS-EAD's decision making process focused on detailed analysis and consensus building within the committee. As we received proposals from the community or fellow committee members, individuals or small groups did additional work to better understand the request, clarify the specific impact on the schema, and make recommendations to the committee. Many issues were revisited multiple times as we collectively came to understand better our goals and their impact. Although healthy differences of opinion persisted throughout the revision process, ultimately only one issue had to be decided by an executive decision by the co-chairs. In the alpha schema element and attribute names were converted to camel case, as is the convention in EAC-CPF. This met our goals of conceptual consistency and interoperability with EAC-CPF, but we received strong feedback from the community arguing against the change. Entrenched and opposing opinions – all with strong justifications from our points of emphasis – remained within TS-EAD; ultimately the co-chairs decided to honor precedent and sensitivity to the impact on users and opted to remove camel case.

Of the changes made in EAD3, the most extensive departure from EAD 2002 is the replacement of <eadheader> with <control>. Borrowed from EAC-CPF with some enhancements, <control> offers a better model for representing information about finding aids, including its identifiers, status, languages, conventions, maintenance history, and sources. One notable change to <control> as modelled in EAC-CPF is the inclusion of <filedesc> from <eadheader>. As an aggregation of descriptions of all the material in an archival collection, finding aids have bibliographic attributes, such as a title or a publication statement captured in <filedesc> that are not necessary when documenting authority records.

The elements available within <did> (Descriptive Identification) were extensively updated in order to better support the exchange of key descriptive data between EAD3 and other systems. Some <did> elements were modified to remove mixed content and other ambiguities, including <origination>, <repository>, and <langmaterial>. The existing <unitdate> and <physdesc> elements were felt to be too lax to constrain and still provide a forward migration path, so new <unitdatestructured> and <physdescstructured> elements were added. These "structured" elements provide nuanced data models for capturing temporal and physical description, while the original elements remain in modified form as unstructured alternatives and to allow for forward

migration from EAD 2002. Whereas these new elements provided additional structure, the <daogrp> element, which allowed the creation of extended links to digital archival objects, was simplified to <daoset>, which binds two or more simple <dao> elements.

The access point elements available within <controlaccess>, e.g. <persname>, <subject>, <genreform>, etc., were modified in several ways. Each may now contain one or more <part> elements so that multi-part terms may be accurately represented in EAD, allowing for example the capture of an individual's surname, forename, and life dates, etc. They also now share a common set of attributes to improve interoperability with external vocabularies: @identifier, for the code or URI associated with a term, @source, for identifying the originating vocabulary, and @rules, for recording how terms are formulated. The <geogname> element now has an optional child <geographiccoordinates> for encoding a set of geographic coordinates.

Support for multilingual description was addressed by adding @lang and @script attributes to all non-empty elements in EAD3, making it possible to explicitly state what language or script is used therein. Additionally, some elements were modified to allow them to repeat where previously they did not, thus enabling the inclusion of the same data in multiple languages.

Early in the revision process there were multiple requests to simplify EAD, and one suggested measure was reducing the number of elements. However, TS-EAD decided that consistency and semantic clarity was a better measure of simplicity, not the number of elements in the schema. The <note> element is a useful case study. In EAD 2002 <note> was available in 8 distinct contexts, each representing a subtly different usage; in EAD3 the <note> element has been replaced with context-specific elements, including <didnote>, <controlnote>, and <footnote>.

Many other changes can be categorized as supporting the drive for greater conceptual and sematic consistency in EAD. Major descriptive elements that previously could be contained in other descriptive elements were removed in those contexts. For example, <arrangement> is no longer a permitted child of <scopecontent>, <unitdate> is no longer a permitted child of <unittitle>, and <dao> is now only available within <did>. Block and formatting elements like <list>, <blockquote>, <quote>, were modified or created to more closely resemble their HTML counterparts. The <chronlist> element was updated to incorporate <geogname> to convey the locations where events occur, more closely aligning it with its namesake in EAC-CPF. Mixed content models were streamlined to three progressively-inclusive sets of elements allowed to intermix with text. Attribute names were disambiguated throughout the schema: @role on access point elements was changed to @relator to distinguish it from @role on linking elements, @type was renamed through the schema to @localtype where no values are supplied by the schema, and to @*elementname*type (e.g. @listtype and @unitdatetype) where specified values are supplied. Linking elements – of which there were many in EAD 2002 – were consolidated to a handful and limited to simple links, eliminating overly-complicated extended links. The XLink model for linking attributes was preserved, but the XLink namespace, which had been added to the schema versions of EAD 2002, was removed due to the onerous and needless complexity that namespaces introduce when processing XML. Elements that existed solely to support formatting and presentation or were otherwise deemed out of scope for archival description were deprecated, including <frontmatter>, <descgrp>, <runner>, <imprint>, and <bibseries>.

The feature of EAD3 that caused the most heated discussion within TS-EAD was the inclusion of the <relations> element. Introduced in EAC-CPF and added to EAD3 with some modifications, <relations> is available at any level of description and contains one or more <relation> elements. A <relation> describes – in a Linked Open Data-friendly way – the relationship between the records being described and a corporate body, person or family; an archival or bibliographic resource; a function; or other external entity. That relationship can be an actionable link and may be qualified by supplying relevant dates or geographic names. XML describing the external entity may be cached for local processing within the <objectxmlwrap> element.

TS-EAD could not reach a consensus regarding the inclusion of <relations>. Some members felt strongly that including <relations> was essential in order to support rich Linked Open Data applications, align with EAC-CPF, and acknowledge draft guidelines on relationships in archival description published by the ICA Committee on Best Practices and Standards. Others felt that it duplicated functionality present in <controlaccess>, added unnecessary complexity, and that incorporating robust support for Linked Open Data was premature. We ultimately negotiated a compromise: <relations> would be included in EAD3 as an "experimental" element. As an experimental element, it is not guaranteed that <relations> will persist in the next version of EAD. However, TS-EAD encourages its use so that the EAD community will learn more about how the <relations> model works within archival description. Put simply, a consensus will require more data and experience, and including <relations> provisionally makes that possible.

The revision of EAD 1.0 to EAD 2002 established a precedent that obsolete elements would first be deprecated – suppressed within a DTD but available if necessary – before being removed from subsequent versions. All elements deprecated in EAD 2002 were removed from EAD3. TS-EAD endeavored to honor the commitment to deprecate obsolete elements, however the extent of the changes in EAD3 made comprehensive deprecation impossible. Elements to be removed entirely from the standard remain available in the undeprecated versions of EAD3. These include <frontmatter>, <descgrp>, <imprint>, <bibseries>, and <runner>, as well as the @tpattern attribute. Elements that were replaced by other elements offering commensurate functionality, or whose availability within the standard changed are in most cases not supported in undeprecated EAD3. Two exceptions to that rule are the full EAD 2002 version of <physdesc> and <unitdate> within <unittitle>, both of which are available in undeprecated EAD3.

EAD3 replaces EAD 2002 as the current, official version of EAD. EAD 2002 was available as a DTD, Relax NG schema, and W3C schema. Additionally, the DTD could be edited to enable the inclusion of deprecated elements. EAD3 continues to be available in DTD, Relax NG, and W3C versions. For repositories who choose to continue to use deprecated elements, an undreprecated version of EAD3 is available in DTD, Relax NG, and W3C varieties. Due to differences between DTDs and schemas, the <objectxmlwrap> element is not available in the DTD versions of EAD3. A Schematron schema is also available to provide further validation functionality for EAD instances, imposing data constraints that either cannot be expressed in DTD, Relax NG, and W3C, or were intentionally removed from the schemas by TS-EAD due to challenges of maintaining code lists outside of our control or to allow alternative data sources or patterns.

EAD3 was possible because of the generous support of the Society of American Archivists, the Gladys Krieble Delmas Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Nationaal Archief of the Netherlands, the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, the Institute for Advanced Technology in the Humanities at the University of Virginia, and OCLC Research. Each member of TS-EAD* made invaluable contributions to EAD3, but two merit special mention: Terry Catapano, Schema Development Team chair, for leading the technical development of EAD3, and Kelcy Shepherd, for leading the revision of the tag library.

Mike Rush
TS-EAD Co-Chair

*TS-EAD members during the revision process included Mike Rush, co-chair, Yale University; Bill Stockting, co-chair, British Library (UK); Kerstin Arnold, Bundesarchiv (Germany); Michael Fox, Minnesota Historical Society; Kris Kiesling, University of Minnesota; Angelika Menne-Haritz, Bundesarchiv (Germany); Kelcy Shepherd, University of Massachusetts and Amherst College; Claire Sibille, Direction Générale des Patrimonies (France); Henny van Schie, Nationaal Archief / Bibliotheek (Netherlands); and Brad Westbrook, University of California, San Diego, and ArchivesSpace. Notable ex-officio contributors included Jodi Allison-Bunnell, Orbis Cascade Alliance (EAD Roundtable); Anila Angjeli, Bibliotheque Nationale de France (TS-EAC); Hillel Arnold, Rockefeller Archives Center (EAD Roundtable); Mark Custer, Yale University (EAD Roundtable); Merrilee Proffitt, OCLC Research; Ruth Kitchin Tillman, Cadence Group (EAD Roundtable); and Katherine Wisser, Simmons College (TS-EAC). Schema Development Team members included Terry Catapano, chair, Columbia University; Karin Bredenberg, National Archives of Sweden; Florence Clavaud, Ecole Nationale des Chartes (France); Michele Combs, Syracuse University; Mark Matienzo, Yale University and DPLA; Daniel Pitti, University of Virginia; and Salvatore Vassallo, University of Pavia (Italy).

Bibliography

EAD3 Discussion

- For a comprehensive explanation of all of the changes in EAD3, please see the SAA webinar "EAD3: What's new?" at http://saa.peachnewmedia.com/store/seminar/seminar.php?seminar=28538. The slides from the presentation are included in the submission package, see EAD3 - What's new_rev.pptx.
- For a nice summary of the changes in EAD3 and their impact on the Archives Portal Europe, see Kerstin Arnold, "EAD3 and the consequences of the new version," APEx (Februray 18, 2014): http://www.apex-project.eu/index.php/en/articles/149-ead3-and-the-consequences-of-the-new-version.

Related Standards

- Encoded Archival Context – Corporate bodies, Persons, and Families (EAC-CPF). http://eac.staatsbibliothek-berlin.de/.
- ICA Committee on Best Practices and Standards. *ISAD(G): General International Standard Archival Description - Second edition*. (2000) http://www.ica.org/10207/standards/isadg-general-international-standard-archival-description-second-edition.html

- ICA Committee on Best Practices and Standards. *Relationship in archival descriptive systems*. (2012) http://www.ica.org/13149/standards/cbps-relationship-in-archival-descriptive-systems.html
- *Describing Archives: A Content Standard – Second Edition*. Society of American Archivists: Chicago, 2013 (revised March 2015). http://files.archivists.org/pubs/DACS2E-2013_v0315.pdf.

Documentation of the Consultation Process

TS-EAD made every effort to make the EAD revision process open and inclusive. Toward that end, we had four public comment periods, conducted all technical development work and logged comments in a publicly accessible repository on GitHub, regularly presented at the SAA Annual Meeting and elsewhere, including internationally, and sent updates to appropriate email lists as our worked progressed.

Comment Periods

TS-EAD accepted comments on the revision of EAD during the following comment periods:

- Call for proposed changes to EAD 2002: October 2010 – February 2011
    - To start the revision process TS-EAD invited proposals for changes to EAD 2002 from the EAD community and beyond.
    - Circulation: The initial call for comments was sent to the following email lists: EAD list, EAD Roundtable, Archives and Archivists, Library and Information Technology Association (LITA), Arcan-l, Canadian Committee on Cataloging and the Canadian Committee on MARC, aus-archivists, Marc 21 Formats, Code4Lib, Semantic Web and Archives, Archivists' Toolkit (atug-l), Archivists' Toolkit Forums, Archon Forums, Archivliste (German and German-speaking archivists), AFNOR, Séminaire de formateurs EAD – EAC, DIGLIB (IFLA), XML4Lib, Metadata librarians, METS, MODS, archives-nra (United Kingdom), scot-arch (United Kingdom), Het Archiefforum (NL), EAD_NL Archives, JISC-Repositories discussion list
    - Method: Accepted via email or submission through a form on the SAA Web site
    - Result: See EAD_Revision_Comments.xls for the comprehensive list of proposed changes.
    - Response: Presented a summary of the results at the 2011 EAD Roundtable Meeting / EAD Revision Forum. See saa11EADForum_Suggestions.ppt.
    - Response: Systematically reviewed and addressed compiled comments during March 2012 working meeting. See TS-EADmeetingminutes_2012-03.pdf for meeting minutes.
- Alpha comment period: March – May 2013
    - TS-EAD released an alpha version of the new EAD schema on February 28, 2013 and invited comments on the early draft.
    - Circulation: Sent to the EAD, EAD Roundtable, and Archives and Archivists email lists
    - Method: Accepted via GitHub issue tracker (https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues) or SAA Web site form.
    - Result: All issues were logged into GitHub.
    - Response: TS-EAD systematically addressed all issues via conference calls or online discussion. All decisions were logged in GitHub.
- Beta comment period: August – September 2013
    - TS-EAD released a beta version of the new EAD schema on August 2, 2013 and invited comments on the second draft.
    - Circulation: Sent to the EAD, EAD Roundtable, and Archives and Archivists email lists
    - Method: Accepted via GitHub issue tracker (https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues) or SAA Web site form.
    - Result: All issues were logged into GitHub.

    - Response: TS-EAD systematically addressed all issues via conference calls or online discussion. All decisions were logged in GitHub.
- Gamma comment period: February 2014
    - TS-EAD released a gamma version of the new EAD schema on February 5, 2014 and invited comments on the third draft.
    - Circulation: Sent to the EAD, EAD Roundtable, and Archives and Archivists email lists
    - Method: Accepted via GitHub issue tracker (https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues) or SAA Web site form.
    - Result: All issues were logged into GitHub.
    - Response: TS-EAD systematically addressed all issues via conference calls or online discussion. All decisions were logged in GitHub.

Following the gamma schema release, TS-EAC co-chairs Anila Angjeli and Katherine Wisser submitted comments regarding EAD3 from the perspective of the group responsible for maintaining EAC-CPF. See EAD3Gamma-commentsFromAngjeliWisser.pdf for their full comments. They conclude that "EAD3 represents a step forward as compared to EAD 2002," but note several areas of concern, primarily in relation to where inconsistencies remain between EAD3 and EAC-CPF. TS-EAD acknowledged their feedback, but made no subsequent changes to EAD3. The areas of concern identified by TS-EAC all reflected different interpretations of the points of emphasis that guided the revision. Within TS-EAD there was a stronger consensus around mitigating impact to existing users than would have allowed some of the changes preferred by TS-EAC. There were also fundamental differences of opinion between the two groups about what mechanisms best support the exchange of data.

GitHub

Immediately following the Schema Development Team meeting in October 2012, all development work on the new EAD schema, along with all comments and issues, moved to a GitHub repository. Using GitHub to manage the EAD revision work had several advantages. It provided a central space for us to receive, log, discuss, and assign issues that ranged from bug reports to foundational philosophical questions. With its version and change tracking functionality it facilitated collaboration on the design of the schema. It also enabled us to package and preserve discrete releases. Most importantly, all of the issues, discussion, releases, and schema development was publicly accessible. Interested members of the EAD community contributed comments and, in a few instances, corrections to the new schema itself.

- EAD Revision issues: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues
    - Example issue with extensive discussion: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/issues/450
- EAD Revision code: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision
- EAD Revision releases: https://github.com/SAA-SDT/EAD-Revision/releases

Presentations

Members of TS-EAD regularly presented to the EAD Roundtable at the SAA Annual Meeting during the revision process. The 2011 EAD Roundtable Meeting served as an extended EAD Revision Forum, where initial revision proposals, technical considerations, and possible

outcomes were discussed. TS-EAD co-chair Mike Rush also taught an SAA webinar on the changes from EAD 2002 to EAD3.

- 2011 EAD Roundtable Meeting and EAD Revision Forum
    - saa11EADForum_Process.pptx
    - saa11EADForum_Suggestions.ppt
    - saa11EADForum_Outcomes.pptx
    - saa11EADForum_Technical Considerations.ppt
- 2012 EAD Roundtable Meeting
    - eadRevisionProgress_2012-08-08.pptx
- 2013 EAD Roundtable Meeting
    - eadRevisionProgress_2013-08-16.pptx
- 2014 EAD Roundtable Meeting
    - eadRevisionProgress_2014-08-13.pptx
- SAA Webinar, "EAD3: What's new?"
    - EAD3 - What's new_rev.pptx

Communication with the EAD Community

TS-EAD communicated with the EAD community via email lists throughout the revision process. Examples emails include the following:

- "Announcing new EAD groups and revision," March 31, 2010
    - email_2010-03-31.pdf
- "Revision of Encoded Archival Description (EAD) – Call for Comments," October 4, 2010
    - email_2010-10-04.pdf
- "EAD Revision - Alpha Release," February 28, 2013
    - email_2013-02-28.pdf
- "EAD Beta Schema Released - Comments Welcome," August 2, 2013
    - email_2013-08-02.pdf
- EAD Revision Highlights #1-6
    - email_2013-08-20.pdf
    - email_2013-08-28.pdf
    - email_2013-09-02.pdf
    - email_2013-09-09.pdf
    - email_2013-09-16.pdf
    - email_2013-09-23.pdf
- "EAD3 Gamma Release," February 5, 2014
    - email_2014-02-05.pd

Maintenance and Review Plan

The ongoing maintenance and review of Encoded Archival Description should be structured to achieve the following goals: ongoing involvement and cultivation of domain experts within the archival field; broad representation, particularly but not exclusively from the international archival community; transparency in the ongoing maintenance process; integration with the process of maintaining related standards in the archival domain and beyond; and a regularly scheduled review process.

Toward those ends, we propose the following:

- Consolidate TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and the Schema Development Team into a single subcommittee

The ongoing maintenance of EAD, EAC-CPF, and EAC-F should be undertaken in an integrated and coordinated way. Combining the technical subcommittees will help achieve this goal through greater efficiency, decreased duplication of effort, easier communication, and a consolidation of expertise and documentation.

The challenge of consolidating to a single technical subcommittee for encoded archival standards will be determining the correct size, composition, and terms of membership. The committee will need to be sufficiently large to incorporate diverse and international representation and sufficient domain expertise with both the application and the design of the standards. The chairs of TS-EAD, TS-EAC, and the SDT drafted a proposal to form a Technical Subcommittee for Encoded Archival Standards (TS-EAS) in 2014. See TSEASproposoal_draft.docx for further information.

- Closely monitor the work of ICA's Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD)

Charged with developing a formal conceptual model for archival description and a supporting ontology, ICA's EGAD is actively engaged in an area that will have a significant impact on all standards for archival description. The ongoing development of EAD will necessarily be heavily influenced by their work, so it should be followed closely. The conceptual model and ontology are scheduled for release in 2016. See http://www.ica.org/13799/the-experts-group-on-archival-description/about-the-egad.html for more information about EGAD.

- Maintain all code in GitHub

All of the development work for EAD3 was done in a GitHub repository. GitHub's change tracking and other features made it possible for the Schema Development Team to collaborate successfully on the new schema and related code. Most importantly all work in GitHub is public. Continuing this practice will promote transparency in the maintenance of EAD.

- Log all bug reports, comments, and feature requests in GitHub

All suggestions received during the first comment period of the EAD revision were received via email and logged into a spreadsheet, which became the bulk of the agenda for the TS-EAD working meeting in 2012. Following the Alpha release, however, rather than logging comments in spreadsheet, we began to log all comments, whether from the community or the committee, into GitHub's issue tracker. This gave us a successful mechanism for threaded conversations, referencing issues when committing code, tracking open and closed issues, and, most importantly, addressing all community input in a single, open, transparent forum. Continuing this practice will promote transparency and will result in a comprehensive record of the maintenance of EAD.

- Release incremental improvements to EAD3 on and as-needed basis

The version control functionality in GitHub will make it feasible for incremental changes to EAD3 to be made as necessary. We recommend fixing bugs and making minor, backwards-compatible changes as they are reported and reviewed appropriately. However, requests for new functionality or other significant changes should be logged as issues and saved until a critical mass accrues and a more thorough revision can be undertaken.

- Review EAD3 and make a recommendation regarding a significant revision no later than 2020

As per the Standards Committee by-laws, EAD3 should be comprehensively reviewed no later than 2020, 5 years after the completion of this revision. A recommendation should be made to the Standards Committee by the occasion of the SAA Annual Meeting whether SAA should reaffirm, revise, or rescind EAD3.

APPENDIX B
Interim Action Item

Society of American Archivists
Council Interim Action
July 16, 2015

2015 Council Exemplary Service Awards
(Prepared by Executive Director Nancy Beaumont)

BACKGROUND

The Council Exemplary Service Award was created in 1980, at the request of the Committee on the Selection of SAA Fellows, to recognize a special contribution to the archives profession (and especially to SAA) that is not eligible for one of the other awards given by the Society. It is given on an occasional basis at the discretion of the Council or upon recommendation to the Council by the Awards Committee. The Council also occasionally chooses to honor a member, group, or other entity with a Council resolution.

DISCUSSION

At its November 2014 and May 2015 meetings the Council discussed potential recipients of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award and favored awards to the Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy, the Digital Archives Specialist Subcommittee of the Committee on Education, and Past President Mark Greene. Tanya Zanish-Belcher agreed to draft the CAPP recommendation and Dennis Meissner agreed to draft the Greene recommendation. The DAS recommendation was drafted by Education Director Solveig De Sutter.

Three recommendations are provided for Council consideration.

RECOMMENDATION 1

THAT SAA's Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy be given the Council Exemplary Service Award in 2015.

Council Exemplary Service Award
Honoring the
SAA Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy (CAPP)

Frank Boles (chair), Barbara Teague (vice chair), Jeremy Brett, James Cross, Debra Davendonis-Todd, Amy Lazarus, Nancy Lenoil, and Dennis Roman Riley

WHEREAS CAPP was established in 2013 to enhance SAA's capacity to address public policy issues and concerns affecting archivists, archives, the archival profession, and its stakeholders; and

WHEREAS CAPP in two short years has created a public policy agenda and an effective process for SAA members to request an advocacy action; and

WHEREAS CAPP has consistently and in a deliberative manner made detailed professional recommendations to the Council on public policy priorities on which SAA should focus its attention and resources; and

WHEREAS CAPP members have examined a host of complex issues, resolving their own individual opinions and putting forth recommendations for the Council to consider on behalf of the organization in its entirety; and

WHEREAS CAPP has prepared important issue briefs that address the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), Archivists and Section 108 of the Copyright Act, Orphan Works, Presidential Records Act of 1978, Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), and State Freedom of Information Laws; and

WHEREAS CAPP members have enthusiastically demonstrated that no issue is too dense or too dry for their spirited consideration;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Society of American Archivists recognizes and thanks the Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy for outstanding service to SAA and the archives profession.

Support Statement: The Committee on Advocacy and Public Policy is a most worthy recipient of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award.

Fiscal Impact: None.

RECOMMENDATION 2

THAT the Digital Archives Specialist Subcommittee of SAA's Committee on Education be given the Council Exemplary Service Award in 2015.

Council Exemplary Service Award
Honoring the
Digital Archives Specialist (DAS) Subcommittee

Liz Bishoff, Mahnaz Ghaznavi (Chair 2014–), Cynthia Ghering,
Lori Lindberg (Chair, 2011–2014), Veronica Martzahl,
Glen McAninch, Thomas Rosko, and Sibyl Schaefer

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee was established in 2011 by the Committee on Education to ensure that the curriculum for SAA's Digital Archives Specialist Certificate Program reflects best practice and remains cutting edge; and

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee, in the span of three-and-a-half years, has shepherded the development of thirty unique courses, including webinars; and

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee has overseen the creation of a one-hundred-question comprehensive examination; and

WHEREAS more than one thousand individuals have taken Digital Archives Specialist courses, with approximately six hundred actively pursuing the Digital Archives Specialist Certificate; and

WHEREAS to date 183 individuals from around the country have fulfilled all the course requirements, passed the comprehensive exam, and earned a Digital Archives Specialist Certificate; and

WHEREAS the DAS Subcommittee has enthusiastically dedicated countless hours to achieve a highly successful program that is a leader in the field;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Society of American Archivists recognizes and thanks the DAS Subcommittee for outstanding service to SAA and the archives profession.

Support Statement: The DAS Subcommittee of the Committee on Education is a most worthy recipient of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award.

Fiscal Impact: None.

RECOMMENDATION 3

THAT Mark Alan Greene be given the Council Exemplary Service Award in 2015.

Council Exemplary Service Award
Honoring
Mark Alan Greene

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has, for the past thirty years, provided significant and continuous leadership to the Society of American Archivists across its sections, roundtables, committees, and governing bodies, culminating in service as its President in 2007-2008; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has, over the course of his career, made numerous impressive contributions to the literary canon of archival science, focusing especially on archival appraisal

but including archival meaning and value, archival ethics, archives management, and arrangement and description; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has worked continuously and enthusiastically to mentor, educate, and train a large number of emerging archivists so that they, too, could achieve success in the archival endeavor; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has consistently and relentlessly demonstrated a vision for the archives profession that has frequently caused him to challenge accepted theory and practice and to champion new approaches and directions, often for the betterment of the profession; and

WHEREAS Mark A. Greene has, in a too-brief career that has been burdened by physical challenges, nevertheless invested himself in this profession to a heroic degree that is admired by so many of his colleagues;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of the Society of American Archivists recognizes, applauds, and heartily thanks Mark A. Greene for his outstanding service to SAA and to the archives profession.

Support Statement: Mark Alan Greene is a most worthy recipient of the 2015 Council Exemplary Service Award.

Fiscal Impact: None.