

# **Consolidated version of comments received from the international archival community on RiC-CM, draft v0.1, during the consultation period of September 2016 – January 2017**

Compiled by Kat Timms, Library and Archives Canada  
EGAD Corresponding Member

May 2017

## Note to readers:

My process for organizing and analyzing the feedback received from the international archival community on the draft RiC-CM (v0.1), during the consultation period of September 2016 – January 2017:

1. Each commenter's submission was assigned a filing number (to help EGAD trace back comments to the source submissions). According to my way of counting, there were 62 submissions from individuals or institutions in 19 countries, plus two international bodies.
2. Phase 1: I thematically organized the comments into a set of tables, according to the major sections of the RiC-CM v0.1 document.
3. Phase 2: I distilled and consolidated the original comments, to help identify patterns and themes. Comments were paraphrased, for the most part, according to my own understanding and assessment of them. General comments received that did not pose questions requiring resolution were omitted.

This document comprises the results of Phase 2, the consolidated version of the consultation comments.

/kt

## Contents

1. General Issues.....	1
1.1 Foundation.....	1
1.2 Modelling.....	2
1.3 Descriptions as assertions .....	4
1.4 Treatment of digital records.....	5
1.5 Interoperability with library, museum and records management sectors.....	6
1.6 Presentation .....	7
1.7 Transitioning to RiC.....	9
1.8 RiC development process, membership, consultation, and translation.....	12
2. Entity Issues .....	13
2.1 General Issues.....	13
2.2 Record Entities (E1, E2, E3) .....	16
2.3 Record (E1) .....	17
2.4 Record Component (E2) .....	18
2.5 Record Set (E3) .....	19
2.6 Agent (E4) .....	20
2.7 Issues across business entities (E5, E6, E7, E8, E9, E10) .....	21
2.8 Occupation (E5) .....	23
2.9 Position (E6).....	23
2.10 Function (E7).....	24
2.11 Function (Abstract) (E8):.....	24
2.12 Activity (E9).....	24
2.13 Mandate (E10) .....	25
2.14 Documentary Form (E11) .....	25
2.15 Date (E12) .....	26
2.16 Issues across E12 Date (P69 Date), E13 Place (P69 Place), E14 Concept/Thing .....	27
2.17 Place (E13) .....	27
2.18 Concept/Thing (E14) .....	28
3. Issues regarding Properties .....	29
3.1 General Issues.....	29
3.2 Suggestions for new properties .....	30
3.3 Shared properties .....	30
3.4 Properties of Record .....	31
3.5 Properties of Record Component.....	35

3.6 Properties of Record Set.....	35
3.7 Agent Properties.....	37
3.8 Properties of business entities - Occupation, Position, Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate.....	39
3.9 Properties of Occupation.....	39
3.10 Properties of Position .....	40
3.11 Properties of Function .....	40
3.12 Properties of Function (Abstract) .....	40
3.13 Properties of Activity .....	40
3.14 Properties of Mandate.....	40
3.15 Properties of Documentary Form .....	41
3.16 Properties of Date.....	41
3.17 Properties of Place.....	41
3.18 Properties of Concept/Thing .....	41
3.19 Shared Properties of a Relation.....	41
4. Issues Regarding Relations .....	42
4.1 General Issues.....	42
4.2 Presentation of relations .....	44
4.3 Classification or categorization of relations .....	46
4.4 Digital copies, renditions, manifestations .....	47
4.5 Comments about specific kinds of relations.....	47
4.6 Comments about Record-entity relations .....	48
4.7 Comments about Agent relations.....	49
4.8 Comments about Business-entity relations.....	49
4.9 Documentary Form relations.....	50
4.10 Concept/Thing relations .....	50
5. Appendices .....	50
5.1 Comments on Appendices I and III .....	50

## 1. General Issues

<b>1.1 Foundation:</b> purpose, role and scope of RiC-CM, including suitability for personal papers; audience; underlying principles; theoretical foundations (provenance; diplomatics); multi-dimensional (linked data) approach; purpose/role of description (discovery/custodial management)	
1.1.1	<p>Is RiC-CM intended to encompass a metadata schema (a standard for description), an expression of conceptual understandings of the record (a conceptual model), or both? Is RiC-CM modelling the description of records, or modelling the records themselves and their creation processes?</p> <p>RiC-CM currently appears as a blend of conceptual model and descriptive standard. It expresses more than the abstract underlying reality of descriptions, while not including enough detail to use the data elements in descriptive practice.</p> <p>What is the scope, purpose and goal of RiC-CM? These are currently unclear.</p> <p>Clearly state that RiC-CM is a theoretical and conceptual representation of archival description (an abstraction), which excludes technological developments or functional requirements to develop a specific archival description system.</p>
1.1.2	<p>Which aspect of archival description is the focal point of RiC as a transformative product? To enable archival description using Linked Open Data, or to standardize and make more mainstream a worldview of archival description?</p>
1.1.3	Is the archival description RiC supports also intended to enable custodial management tasks by archives?
1.1.4	<p>Does RiC's scope only include records within archival care?</p> <p>The focus on 'archival materials' seems contrary to the stated commitment to integrated access to cultural heritage materials. Suggest confirming RiC's intention to be inclusive.</p>
1.1.5	RiC as a model does not adequately address discovery of archival resources, accommodating multiple users and uses. Its objectives or strategies in relation to user needs are not provided.
1.1.6	Suggestion: consider a more restricted set focusing on mandatory features of the proposed vocabulary; the current scope of the standard is very wide-ranging and too large a vocabulary could negatively affect search strategies.
1.1.7	<p>Situated at the conceptual level, and focusing on contextualization, RiC can be recognized as bridging the traditional descriptive models of custody versus control. RiC is intended to be the conceptual model on which descriptive rules would be built. However, this is not yet stated clearly-enough, particularly given that current manuals for descriptive standards have often served as the model, rules, and how-to instructions all together.</p> <p>Providing guidance on how to build standards or other tools that align with RiC-CM and enable its implementation is needed.</p>
1.1.8	<p>Principles for archival description underlying RiC-CM are not explicitly named, only inferred. Principles beyond provenance and respect des fonds are also relevant - e.g. good recordkeeping, access, and accountability. What are the applicable principles shaping RiC-CM?</p>
1.1.9	<p>Clarification around the definition and treatment of provenance is requested. For instance, does it include functional provenance? Further, presentation of its relation to respect des fonds and original order does not correspond with professional literature.</p> <p>Also, at some points, it seems to have been conflated with authorship. Lastly, provenance and context are not interchangeable, though at times it was phrased as such.</p>
1.1.10	RiC lacks indigenous perspectives on social memory. Could this be accommodated through RiC's inclusion of multiple provenance points?
1.1.11	Who is the intended audience of RiC? Archivists, researchers, records managers, creators, developers of RIM systems?

	The link to the records management community could be more strongly stated, as well as having RiC-CM align more closely to the model in ISO 23081 series of standards. RiC's introduction implies that the 'archival' perspective is retrospective, which does not accommodate traditions in which archives include active records. For those traditions that divide records management and archives, RiC should accommodate both.
1.1.12	From multi-level to multi-dimensional: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It could be more clearly explained that hierarchies (based in multi-level description) are a type of graph, and so are accommodated in RiC's graph-based (multi-dimensional) approach.</li> <li>Dispersal of archival descriptive information in linked data format makes it vulnerable to loss over time. Reconsider decision to follow current IT trends.</li> <li>Will narrative components of description be sacrificed due to the linked data approach?</li> </ul>
1.1.13	General support for linked open data approach, though clarification requested regarding how relationships (between entities) are documented via the technology or data models referenced by RiC. More information is requested to demonstrate how RiC aligns, fits in with, or interoperates with existing semantic web standards. How RiC supports multi-dimensional (vs. hierarchical) description could be made clearer (e.g. with examples).
1.1.14	What are the implications of infinite contextual complexity permitted by RiC's multidimensional model? E.g. what is sufficient thoroughness? Multi-dimension description (of separate but related entities) may lead implementers to believe that every individual item must be described, as how RiC aligns with ISAD(G) (top-down, hierarchical description) is not made explicit.
1.1.15	Suggestion to note an additional role of records descriptions, that they are a source of research data in their own right. Consider the relationship of descriptions (conceptualizations) to real entities, and where the dividing line lies between them (if there is one).
1.1.16	Where does the practice of diplomatics fit into RiC?
1.1.17	RiC is not well-suited to personal papers. While the definition of Record is inclusive, related entities (e.g. Occupation, Function, Mandate) are best suited to an institutional context.
1.1.18	Is there a distinction in RiC (CM or Ontology) between real world objects (RWOs) (real agents, real records, etc.) and representations (descriptions) of those RWOs?

<b>1.2 Modelling:</b> design principles; rationale for designating something an entity instead of a property, or vice versa; relation to higher-level domain ontology(ies); should RiC be based on existing ICA standards to begin with	
1.2.1	What is the difference between an entity and a property? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In some cases it's not clear why something is an entity instead of a property. Also, some properties apply only when another property (e.g. Type) assumes a specific value. Rationales underlying decisions to model X as an entity or property should be provided.</li> <li>Core concepts of RiC's structure like entity, property, and relation are not defined, making it unclear how they are intended to be understood or used.</li> <li>RiC's foundation is weakened due to the lack of a foundational ontology, or reference to a pre-existing upper level ontology. References to professional</li> </ul>

	<p>literature on knowledge representation theory, ontology theory and semantic web are also encouraged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The differences between record/record set and what they represent (functions, activities) and what is represented about them (archival description) are not clearly explained.</li> <li>• Please explain design principles underlying RiC (entity vs property) both at a high level as well as for specific entities/properties.</li> <li>• Distinguishing between properties and relations is a complication. Suggest to unite them as 'properties', and it would be an implementation decision to populate it with a literal or a link to another resource.</li> <li>• For entities beyond our core business (of Records, Agents, Functions), clarify rationale for separating them out and having them as entities instead of properties.</li> </ul>
1.2.2	<p>What will the rules for inheriting property information from higher levels of description be?</p> <p>Not situating Concept/Thing as a top-level entity makes the implementation of the four shared properties problematic (they could not be inherited from the high-level entity). Suggestion to reduce repetition of similar properties between different entities by allowing for inheritance from a higher-level entity, similar to LRM and CIDOC-CRM.</p>
1.2.3	<p>Order (including original order) should be modeled because it needs to be captured and portrayed to users.</p> <p>The modular description paradigm, which breaks the fonds apart and tracks only relations between records, seems to make information on the arrangement (hierarchy) obsolete.</p>
1.2.4	<p>Increase flexibility of the model by allowing for extensions (e.g. define new properties or compose new values for existing properties).</p>
1.2.5	<p>There is nothing in the draft that prevents an entity (Record, Record Set, Function etc.) from including itself either directly (e.g. a Record Set contains itself) or indirectly (e.g. a Record Set contains a second Record Set which contains the first Record Set). Is this flexibility intended in the RiC standard?</p>
1.2.6	<p>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.</p> <p>It is unclear if RiC took existing ontologies or models into account.</p> <p>What RiC-O will comprise is unclear, as is its relation to RiC-CM. Lacking information on RiC-O restricts the ability to comment meaningfully on RiC-CM.</p>
1.2.7	<p>How do descriptive standards such as RiC fit in with other metadata standards (e.g. structural, administration, rights management)? A standards framework would be useful to illustrate how they fit together.</p> <p>How does RiC relate to EAD and EAC? Usability of XML (EAD) with RiC?</p> <p>Clarify that RiC is intended to be used with other standards.</p>
1.2.8	<p>How does RiC relate to the existing four ICA standards? Is it a replacement, a supplement, an over-arching roof, or some combination of these?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The four existing ICA standards are well-accepted, so why abandon them?</li> <li>• Will the four existing ICA standards be maintained for those unwilling/unable to move to linked data? An ontology and a conceptual model fulfil different roles than a content standard. Interpretations and implementations of RiC could be more varied; how will consistency of descriptive practices be supported and assured?</li> <li>• Crosswalks are necessary for understanding and adoption of RiC, including migration of legacy data. Certain ISAD(G) elements are not found in RiC (e.g.</li> </ul>

	<p>immediate source of acquisition or transfer; appraisal, destruction or scheduling information) as well as certain ISDF elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is not clear how existing descriptions would fit within this new model/standard, nor how to migrate them.</li> <li>• Make it clear that the old ICA standards can still be used and descriptions adhering to them do not need to be changed.</li> <li>• Unclear how the current ICA descriptive standards have been included in RiC in terms of structure (while content and context have been more clearly accommodated).</li> <li>• If portions of existing ICA standards are seldom used (e.g. ISDIAH), why incorporate them into RiC? Was any analysis done to substantiate why it was sensible to build RiC on the foundation of the four existing ICA standards?</li> </ul>
1.2.9	The development of RiC was methodologically flawed since it did not follow the Deming cycle (Plan, Do, Check, Act (PDCA)), which would have identified the most appropriate development path.

<p><b>1.3 Descriptions as assertions:</b> modeling the role of the archivist as describer; considering the users – participatory description, multiple viewpoints; ascertaining authenticity/trustworthiness of descriptions</p>	
1.3.1	<p>Modelling the role of archivists (and others that make descriptive assertions about records) should be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Descriptive metadata are assertions made by custodians, users or other agents. These assertions can be seen as records in their own right, with their own contexts.</li> <li>• Can there be a means to identify a particular assertion as having been made by a particular party with a specific degree of certainty? There should be a way to qualify the quality of the information (reliability).</li> <li>• Allow for possible degrees of uncertainty by the archivist in their identification and representation</li> <li>• This includes relations, which need to be qualified with information about that relationship (e.g. confidence, date, source of assertion)</li> <li>• Modelling the archivist's role should have been done before RiC reached this stage of development. Archivists and other recordkeeping professionals should be modelling as an entity of archival description.</li> <li>• Post-modernist views recognize the archivist as playing an active role, including via description.</li> <li>• Records may be archival prior to entering a repository (record continuum thinking); RiC needs to capture actions performed on the record throughout its lifetime.</li> <li>• The Control sections of existing ICA standards have not yet been included in RiC (acknowledged by EGAD as being on its 'to-do' list).</li> <li>• How to convey ownership/creation/control of descriptions - e.g. if an agent record is later modified, how would the date and nature of the alteration be recorded for others to see?</li> <li>• RiC only appears to require URIs, which provide only source information. More detail is required to support trust and autonomy in a linking, interoperable context.</li> </ul>
1.3.2	Descriptions themselves should be modelled as entities.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should Description itself be an entity, which could enable relating different versions of a particular instance (e.g. being able to isolate a particular view or compilation of a Record Set's description at a particular date/time, since members may fluidly enter and leave the Set).</li> <li>Descriptive tools (finding aids) need to be modelled as entities, and relations between them (e.g. Record describes Record Set) should be included.</li> </ul>
1.3.3	<p>How does RiC include the user in the descriptive process (e.g. user-contributed descriptions)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RiC does not seem to reflect the movement toward user participation.</li> <li>How does RiC accommodate multiple perspectives/viewpoints on the same entity? Consider parallel provenance or multiple simultaneous provenance: allowing alternative models of description to co-exist with 'official' interpretations.</li> <li>Users' roles should have been considered in the modelling of RiC earlier on, before modeling classes, properties and relations. Consider something akin to IFLA FRBR-LRM's Users and User Tasks.</li> <li>Enabling multiple perspectives does not contribute to the description's objectivity, however.</li> <li>The perspective of the user seems to be missing – e.g. provenance is not sufficiently explained for a general user.</li> </ul> <p>Regarding the inclusion of use/re-use in RiC (s.1.6.3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does re-contextualizing affect description? Does it form part of the description, or does it affect the level of appropriate description?</li> <li>Use/re-use, largely omitted from existing descriptive standards, needs more attention in RiC (narrative and modeling of examples).</li> </ul>
1.3.4	<p>How does RiC serve the user?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RiC is inward-looking.</li> <li>Which aspects of RiC are essential for user search and discovery? What search strategies might be suggested, or predefined data models/tools to aid in search? Which entity descriptions must be searchable by users, at a minimum?</li> <li>RiC does not address the concept of detailed access by users.</li> <li>ISAD(G) was difficult for users to understand, given the separation of information into different levels. RiC separates information by entities. How can we help users understand?</li> <li>RiC is oriented toward user needs but not toward archivists' needs.</li> </ul>
1.3.5	<p>How can authenticity of descriptions be demonstrated, particularly when outside of the source/native system? What kind of recordkeeping system (e.g. blockchain) would be needed to validate them?</p>

<b>1.4 Treatment of digital records: uneven/inadequate</b>	
1.4.1	<p>RiC does not meet the needs of electronic records; OR, RiC is too geared toward electronic records</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater granularity required for digital records does not work for analogue.</li> <li>RiC does not meet the needs of analogue and digital.</li> <li>RiC does not contain sufficient information regarding handling digital records.</li> <li>RiC seems primarily concerned with electronic records' issues.</li> <li>RiC seems tailored to electronic records, making it problematic to use for analogue records.</li> <li>Should there be an extension to RiC for born-digital material?</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RiC needs more examples of digital documentary forms if it is intended to emphasize digital documentary practices in a networked environment.</li> <li>• The language and examples seem overly paper-based. Further consideration of the characteristics of digital records is required (e.g. granular-level: complex digital records; broader-level: database systems).</li> <li>• Need better description of digital preservation metadata reflecting preservation actions, particularly in a networked (non-carrier) environment.</li> <li>• RiC reflects old-school thinking. The definition of record is paper-centric, as aspects of it do not mesh with the digital paradigm.</li> <li>• RiC should not replace the existing ICA standards; rather it should be seen as an additional model suitable for describing electronic records.</li> <li>• Re: copies and renditions, should have the ability to record reasons for making these and details about who, under what mandate, and when. Copies and renditions would have their own metadata as per the Record entity.</li> </ul>
1.4.2	<p>Need granular data to manage digital records; descriptive processes are connected to other archival management processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current descriptive practices lack the ability to incorporate social media style data accumulation and management techniques, conceptually and physically.</li> <li>• There is a close connection between archival description, archival management and archival appraisal. Need to use algorithmic approaches to valuation, acquisition, management and discovery.</li> <li>• Precondition of being rooted in existing ICA standards may handicap ability to manage digital records (e.g. granular data).</li> </ul>
1.4.3	<p>RiC doesn't adequately distinguish between information, representation and carrier and its properties don't suit analogue and digital resources equally.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RiC needs more information on digitization copies and rendition copies, such as explicit relationships and attributing responsibility for their creation.</li> <li>• RiC is missing the concept of Representation as explained in PREMIS, which is central to digital records.</li> <li>• RiC should address derivative or aggregated records, as exist in 'big data' situations.</li> <li>• Differentiation between descriptions of intellectual and physical/technical properties is insufficient. This is important for the digital context. Existing standards can be drawn on to help with this.</li> <li>• Introduce Record property 'Representation'.</li> </ul>
1.4.4	<p>RiC does not adequately address the technological context in its properties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• System dependencies are underplayed in RiC-CM (P18). There are concerns beyond access conditions; the system of creation and its inherent dependencies affect how records are created, stored, transmitted, discovered and managed.</li> <li>• System should be addressed as a component of context.</li> </ul>
1.4.5	<p>No acknowledgement in RiC that records are mediated by technology and by culture. Mediation goes beyond what is covered by P12 Media Type (whether a device is needed to render an information object). Information about cultural biases of preserved records could be communicated through an exchange tailored for a Designated Community (OAIS model).</p>

## 1.5 Interoperability with library, museum and records management sectors

1.5.1	RiC could be a starting point for enabling collaboration and convergence within the cultural heritage sector.
-------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Both libraries and archives are focusing more on managing digital resources than analogue</li> <li>Conceptual models may help with mapping metadata (economy and efficiently)</li> <li>Collaboration could help better serve user communities.</li> <li>There is interest in RiC by the library community, especially given the current objectives to foster interoperability and use of RDA within archives.</li> <li>Consider the flexibility afforded by RDA's rejection of data-typing, aiming to accommodate both structured and unstructured description, for example.</li> <li>The categories in the list of RiC relationships appear to be compatible with RDA relationships and their refinements as 'relationship designators'.</li> <li>How does RiC align or interoperate with other conceptual frameworks and content standards (e.g. RDA, ISAD(G))?</li> <li>It should be emphasized that the RiC aims to widen access to culture through the integration of archival description with the solutions used in museums or libraries.</li> </ul>
1.5.2	<p>Support closer alignment with records management (the business of recordkeeping)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example, incorporating recordkeeping events (AS/NZS 5478:2015) and considering ISO 23081, should a more detailed or technical version of RiC be created.</li> <li>Support additional integration with records management theory and practice (e.g. using terminology that is commonly understood).</li> <li>Continue to involve records managers in the development of RiC.</li> <li>In order to be usable by records managers, RiC needs to include and define concepts regarding the records' life cycle more precisely.</li> <li>Not fully clear that RiC can accommodate current/active records as well as those with an inactive (historical) status.</li> <li>RiC is missing metadata that would support management of records in a holistic fashion – e.g. it lacks sufficient metadata to support processes such as registration, classification, appraisal and selection.</li> </ul>
1.5.3	<p>No explanation is given for how RiC will facilitate integrated access to cultural heritage by archives, libraries and museums.</p> <p>Map RiC to Dublin Core to illustrate how RiC satisfies the needs of all parts of the GLAM sectors (galleries, libraries, archives, museums).</p> <p>Integrated access across the sector, including recordkeeping institutions, can be accomplished using aggregators, and the details concerning this do not need to be specified in this standard.</p>
1.5.4	<p>How could one make links to non-archival resources via RiC, akin to ISAD(G) fields 3.5.3 Related Units of Description and 3.5.4 Publication Note?</p>

<b>1.6 Presentation:</b> examples; element obligations; formatting; terminology (term choices, definitions)	
1.6.1	<p>Less text, more diagrams</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include a normalized logical entity-relationship data model to illustrate the relationships between the descriptive metadata elements.</li> <li>The text is difficult to read and needs more diagrams.</li> </ul>
1.6.2	<p>Examples are missing, confusing, not explained, unclearly presented, incomplete.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All entities and properties should have examples and scope notes. If lacking, this brings into question the validity of the entity or property.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more specific examples for entities, properties and relations. Some examples should be accompanied by explanations. Contributions from other professionals might help EGAD here.</li> <li>• The current presentation of examples is not clear. Note that people often use examples to understand the concept if the explanation is otherwise unclearly presented.</li> <li>• Examples especially help readers whose native language is not English.</li> <li>• Provide more examples, with more variation in the source of examples, to hint at different application or implementation scenarios.</li> <li>• Numerous sections with somewhat obscure language; could benefit from plain language plus additional examples or scenarios.</li> <li>• Examples provided in entity tables were confusing.</li> <li>• Examples are not given consistently and some are too similar to each other, which does not help with understanding the differences they are supposed to convey.</li> <li>• Need more examples of digital documentary forms.</li> <li>• Provide examples in the form of scenarios, particularly those that are now the norm in modern business settings - e.g. a digital record set being concurrently created in different business applications in a distributed environment.</li> <li>• Provide examples showing how the properties work together as a whole.</li> <li>• Provide a concrete example of an archival fonds and an archival finding aid using RiC.</li> <li>• The current formatting of examples (with semi-colons) makes it difficult to see how many distinct examples there are.</li> <li>• Present each example on a separate line.</li> </ul>
1.6.3	Simplify the presentation of the entities so as to teach the readers about their intended meaning (didactic groupings).
1.6.4	Formatting: for clarity, any reference to RiC entities and properties within the text should be capitalized and include their RiC code (e.g. E1 Record).
1.6.5	Current explanation in RiC is too sparse; prohibits full understanding. The idea of a conceptual model itself is very abstract and at a level that is difficult to connect to.
1.6.6	Spelling: based on usage, 'recordkeeping' is preferred to 'record keeping'.
1.6.7	Tabular form: This presentation will not be intuitive or easy to digest for some readers who are not accustomed to it. The general layout is not always easy to follow. Present properties for each entity directly following the entity's definition.
1.6.8	<p>Identify obligations of entities, properties and relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are there required entities? If so, which ones are they?</li> <li>• Which entities of which properties are mandatory, optional, or contingent?</li> <li>• A 'minimum standard' of description should be identified, particularly given the extensive nature of this standard (there are likely too many elements to practically implement in some settings).</li> <li>• Indicate the minimal level of description (entities, properties and relations). National standards or policy directives could help explain how to comply, along with explaining additional optional description.</li> <li>• If RiC elements are mandatory (unknown), then imposing ISDF-based elements is problematic for traditions in which they are not relevant.</li> <li>• Suggestion for minimum properties for E1 Record: P1 Global persistent identifier; P2 Local identifier; P3 Name (title or label); P7 Content extent. With</li> </ul>

	P9, P5, P20, P8 as additional minimal properties, if desiring a slightly larger base set.
1.6.9	<p>Term definitions are needed for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• creation, accumulation, selection (and the relationships between these)</li> <li>• document</li> <li>• data</li> <li>• normative framework (use instead of mandate)</li> <li>• support (use instead of carrier)</li> <li>• redactional form (use instead of documentary form)</li> <li>• basic concepts in the text like ontology, entity, property, relation, along with an explanation for why they are used in a particular way</li> <li>• 'context' isn't defined and clarity is further hindered by using it in two different ways (internal and external)</li> <li>• In some cases, 'property' has been used in place of 'value' (e.g. summary properties and shared properties of Record Sets)</li> <li>• Analog (s.1.6.2): does it include magnetic media?</li> </ul>
1.6.10	<p>Avoid using the term 'record'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't mesh with non-Anglo-Saxon traditions; use 'archival document' instead.</li> <li>• 'Record' points to a records management or record continuum conceptualization, which does not exist in all traditions (e.g. current archives, intermediary archives, definitive archives (French tradition)).</li> </ul>
1.6.11	<p>General considerations re: terminology and definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use unambiguous, plain English for non-native English speakers.</li> <li>• Impose more control on the definitions, using natural language, and by referencing other entities, properties and relationships.</li> <li>• Examples should always be consistent with the definition.</li> <li>• Sometimes explanations found in the scope notes should instead be in the definitions: scope notes should be used for stating the context of use, and definitions should state what the entity is, its components, and the purpose it serves.</li> <li>• RiC is missing a dictionary/list of controlled text or phrases, hindering understanding of the model and its possible implementation.</li> <li>• Definitions should be consistent with existing definitions (e.g. Record (E1) should mesh with ISO 15489).</li> <li>• Avoid circular definitions (e.g. P1 Global persistent identifier - Globally unique and persistently resolvable identifier...).</li> <li>• Provide clear, unambiguous definitions with supportive examples.</li> </ul>

<b>1.7 Transitioning to RiC: feasibility; implementation guidelines; technology tools</b>	
1.7.1	<p>Is it feasible to implement RiC? Challenge of transitioning to RiC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is it too resource-heavy?</li> <li>• How would RiC change existing practices?</li> <li>• How would RiC work operationally, in a concrete sense?</li> <li>• Do not want to lose pragmatism that is a strength of archival practice</li> <li>• There are too many relationships, no one would have the time to implement them all. ISAAR(CPF) languishes, and RiC seems even more insurmountable. This endangers progress made by ISAD(G).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RiC's granular and less narrative descriptions will be challenging to implement in a human-friendly way, particularly for non-textual materials that may not have separate descriptions for context, structure and content.</li> <li>• RiC is based on technologies (graph databases) that are not well known or understood by implementation communities.</li> <li>• Need more evidence that it will be possible to implement the standard either as a descriptive or access technology, given common resource constraints</li> <li>• Ask that implementation of description, migration of existing data and formatting of finding aids should be suggested, prototyped and tested before the end of RiC's development process.</li> <li>• Shared standards should be written in layman's terms to increase uptake, particularly by small institutions or less-resourced community members.</li> <li>• What is RiC's practical utility? It seems too difficult to implement. Future development work should focus on simplification and popularization of the model. An unimplemented standard is a failure.</li> <li>• Even with RiC's apparent benefits to improving discovery, the difficulty of implementing it might cancel these out. Also, it does not accommodate the needs of custodial archivists as well as users of collections.</li> <li>• Need broad support to enable uptake of RiC (e.g. embed it in systems and applications for RM and data management, have aggregators like Europeana/APE use it).</li> <li>• RiC is much more complex than ISAD(G): it could cause a bigger divide between large and small archives; not all archives may have the technical systems to support it. Could a 'Simplified RiC-CM' be explained for those with less sophisticated in-house technologies?</li> <li>• The flexible, separated, less-guided description via RiC (vs. hierarchical top-down approach) could make it more difficult to understand how to implement it, and could result in confused or unorganized descriptive fragments.</li> <li>• Archivists will not have the time or interest to implement the level of detail in RiC (e.g. multitude of relationships). Would it be better to restore some text fields (vs. relations), at least as an intermediary step of transitioning to RiC?</li> <li>• EGAD mentioned that some institutions can start implementing RiC (s.1.9, p. 11): please provide more detail on these cases.</li> <li>• Does RiC mean the end of printed finding aids? This would inconvenience some users.</li> <li>• Transition to RiC will be gradual.</li> <li>• RiC is of interest to theoreticians and digital humanities scholars, but seems too resource-intensive for the vast majority of archives to implement.</li> <li>• RiC may be too complex for implementation.</li> <li>• While RiC could provide advances in archival description, access and use, its implementation is beyond the capabilities of many members of the archival community (need time, funding, technology, and training).</li> <li>• RiC needs the support of the archival community as a whole to enable its implementation and success (this is not possible at the present time).</li> <li>• Amount of description in RiC not feasible for most archivists: disambiguation of the roles and relationships of the end users, archivist and RiC description might help. Is it the responsibility of RiC (the archivist) to provide that level of detail in archival description?</li> <li>• Resources are too constrained to implement RiC (e.g. many archives don't yet use EAD).</li> </ul>
1.7.2	Specific implementation questions (can some be answered by the ontology?):

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there a requirement to describe the whole record set before describing a record component?</li> <li>• Will the ontology explain how to implement RiC in the following ways: required elements/levels of description; repeatable elements; required/preferred vocabularies.</li> </ul>
1.7.3	<p>Implementation guidelines, promotion, training:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reassuring that implementation guidelines will be available</li> <li>• Have different guidelines geared towards each audience: basic implementation for institutions who are not in a position to adopt the ontology but would like to start using some of the concepts; how to approach resource allocators and advocate for staff time and infrastructure expense to adopt RiC; instructions for tool developers on how to produce a RiC compliance tool; brief guides for other cultural heritage fields (records managers, libraries, museums) with guidance on interoperability</li> <li>• The notion of Record Set is interesting and useful, but how to identify them may be a complex problem that requires in-depth guidance.</li> <li>• Provide comprehensive implementation advice: examples of implementation using subsets of elements for particular purposes; mappings back to existing ICA standards; mappings to ISO 23081-2 and other jurisdictional standards like Australia's series system, RAD, DACs, METS, etc.</li> <li>• Provide implementation guidance as part of RiC's initial release, so that it can be tested as it is developed.</li> <li>• Guidelines for explaining how the standard would work in practice, or case study examples, are needed.</li> <li>• What is planned by ICA for promotion and training?</li> <li>• Need for training and support materials for implementing RiC, upgrading descriptions based on old ICA standards, and on how to develop consultation, research and information retrieval interfaces.</li> <li>• Given RiC's inclusivity and non-traditional terminology for its concepts, provide implementation guidance about how variants of RiC could be expressed in national or local contexts; how it may be extended; and how RiC concepts could be interpreted and applied in traditional senses (e.g. archival record sets) as well as adapted for new uses (researcher record sets).</li> <li>• Provide guidance on implementing entities - particularly regarding the option to implement some as properties instead of entities (e.g. Date, Documentary Form).</li> </ul>
1.7.4	<p>Tools to support implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest implementing RiC in a relational database to show relations beyond the traditional hierarchical ones, and other representations of provenance (e.g. functional provenance, legislative provenance).</li> <li>• How will existing descriptions fit into RiC, or how easily could they be migrated? Will AtoM be supported by ICA in the future? Or does ICA have another technology solution in mind?</li> <li>• Will ICA play a role in developing, coordinating and making available open-access code or software to enable RiC's implementation?</li> <li>• Will ICA globally manage authority files or controlled terms? Recommend global coordination.</li> <li>• What support will be offered to assist in transitioning to RiC? What resources would be required to transition (human, financial, intellectual)?</li> <li>• How will ICA support RiC's adoption, particularly given the need for new systems/technologies and technical proficiency to implement it?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Please keep implementation considerations in mind when finalizing RiC, along with the view that publishing RiC is just the first step toward making it usable by practitioners.</li> </ul> <p>Metadata application profiles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider also the role of metadata application profiles in implementation and interoperability. Guidance is requested because there can be a lot of variability in implementation (e.g. METS by institution1 may not be understandable by METS by institution2).</li> <li>Consider the lesson provided by the Portland Common Data Model: earlier versions were so general it was interpreted and implemented differently, compromising interoperability. Since, specific parameters and a formalized way of documenting a specific application profile have been established.</li> <li>ICA is best-positioned to provide guidance on how to implement its own standard (vs. implementers devising metadata application profiles).</li> <li>Using metadata application profiles could simplify RiC'S role - supporting data consistency by reusing existing vocabularies and ontologies, as well as using extensions where there are existing gaps.</li> </ul>
1.7.5	<p>What is the timeline?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The timeline expected for community uptake/implementation, particularly in place of the four existing ICA standards, is vaguely stated.</li> <li>Recommend ICA funds short-duration projects (e.g. 3-months) to crystalize certain aspects.</li> <li>Indicate for how much longer ICA will support the existing four standards.</li> <li>While larger institutions may be able to implement RiC, what is the timeline for smaller institutions to implement it?</li> <li>Timescales for the new standard, later drafts, implementation and withdrawal of existing ICA standards are needed.</li> </ul>
1.7.6	<p>Migrating existing data to RiC: RiC supports more complex and extensive description than the current ICA standards. Graph-based description requires new technical tools for data exchange. This brings into question the compatibility of info systems based on current standards. How to migrate data to RiC should be explained.</p>

1.8 RiC development process, membership, consultation, and translation: not transparent enough; not inclusive or representative enough; not extensive enough	
1.8.1	<p>Transparency in RiC's development process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide an annotated version of the standard that explains the reasoning behind it.</li> <li>Continue to share discussions, revisions and maintenance.</li> </ul>
1.8.2	<p>EGAD membership issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not representative of the global community. RiC's development process has not been transparent or fair.</li> <li>Limited or no input from Africa or Asia, imbalance in other countries already represented. What are the voting rights in these situations?</li> <li>No EGAD membership criteria published.</li> <li>Asia, the Pacific, and North America not well represented.</li> <li>Suggest adding professionals with other expertise - e.g. on Functions (EAC-F member cross-over).</li> <li>Too many European members.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consult and incorporate related specialists (e.g. architects, data-analysts, hardware/software developers) during RiC's development phase.</li> <li>Consider consulting ICA's "Persist" WG.</li> </ul>
1.8.3	Liaison invitation: RSC Technical Working Group and RDA Development Team would welcome opportunities for further input into RiC's development.
1.8.4	<p>Lack of community consultation during development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient communication prior to release of consultation draft. Request timely and more frequent presentations to the broader archival community to facilitate RiC's development.</li> <li>Have longer consultation periods on drafts - 3 months is too short to provide detailed and meaningful feedback.</li> <li>Consultation draft was nearly complete - should have consulted on earlier drafts. Unfair to wait to this point.</li> <li>ICA should re-start development from scratch on a transparent and fair basis, selecting members according to published criteria. Standards development should be transparent and inclusive.</li> <li>EGAD's consultation process was inadequate - should have consulted sooner.</li> <li>Just because community is consulted and feedback is provided doesn't mean the standard is endorsed.</li> </ul>
1.8.5	<p>Translation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Translate RiC into a language of a currently under-represented country</li> <li>Unacceptable to provide English-only for the consultation draft; unacceptable to translate into French (working language of ICA) when it doesn't reflect world demographics (e.g. there are more Mandarin speakers than French speakers)</li> <li>Facilitate translation by including index terms (linguistic equivalents) in scope notes in other languages (e.g. in Relations)</li> </ul>

## 2. Entity Issues

<b>2.1 General Issues:</b> what is an entity; categorization and organization of entities; suggestions for new entities; phrasing and definitions	
2.1.1	<p>What is an entity? It is not defined</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Entities need to be things you can describe in their own right (e.g. Battle of Somme).</li> </ul>
2.1.2	<p>Choice of entities/missing entities/suggestions for new entities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How would a classification/filing system be described in the existing model?</li> <li>Where would a 'project' fit, e.g. the Human Genome Project?</li> <li>Focus on fundamental entities of Records, Agents and Functions; others may be useful for description but they are generic and not our core business</li> <li>New entity: Scope and Content (so it can have its own properties) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P9 Scope and content: should be a separate entity with its own properties to allow for structured content descriptions; minimal or full descriptions possible.</li> </ul> </li> <li>New entity: Access Conditions (so it can have its own properties) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Access Conditions, Use Conditions: because they have relationships to other entities like records, agents, mandates; because it's necessary to keep a history of them</li> <li>Conditions of Access (P18): ideas like 'restricted' and 'closed' are contextual and bounded by time and place, requiring description;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ would help shift RiC away from being a 'creator-centric' model (user and access conditions would be of the same rank)</li> <li>○ Rights (conditions of access and use): as an entity, could identify the relation to agents and records</li> <li>○ P18 Conditions for Access/P19 Conditions for Use: have as separate entities. Conditions do have relations to other entity types (Records, Agents, Mandates, representing performance of a Function/Activity, Place-specific, etc.). As separate entities, could keep a history of conditions governing access - who had access over time is important context.</li> <li>○ Conditions of Access could be a new entity with the following properties: Availability Conditions, Legal Closure Information, Online Delivery Options and whether suitable for online or on site access.</li> <li>● New entity: Event <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recordkeeping Events: particularly vital in the digital context. RiC elements P5/P8 are insufficient for describing recordkeeping events like migration (a creation event).</li> <li>○ May need to address overlap with 'History'</li> <li>○ Could be part of Activity; partially accommodated by relations; or make Event an entity</li> <li>○ Some actions performed on a Record could be expressed by relations - conditions of accession (transfer, deposit, donation, acquisition, bequest), actions of consulting, destroying or converting formats -- or consider them as events, if event is included in the Activity entity or made into a new entity</li> </ul> </li> <li>● New entity: Relationships: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ to support sustainable, time-bound relationships of RiC entities;</li> <li>○ to support the persistence of the relationships, not just when expressed as nodes in rdf statements</li> <li>○ in LOD, relations become resources in their own right</li> <li>○ the capacity to work with relations as entities (including the capability to attach evidence, mandates, and other entities to relations) is essential for future practice</li> <li>○ Relation as an entity would support the Date and Place as properties (of relations)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● New entity: Authority Records</li> <li>● Documentary Form, Date, Place, Concept/Thing: perhaps useful as entities, but could just be properties of the other entities; specify option to implement as entity or property</li> <li>● If as entities, could be implemented as Authority Records - so, need to specify properties of authority records used in recordkeeping?</li> <li>● New entity: Act</li> <li>● New entity: Performance Role (i.e. related to an arts production)</li> <li>● New entity: Accessions</li> <li>● New entity: Physical Storage information</li> <li>● New entity: Content/Carrier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to better distinguish between content (intellectual characteristics), carriers (physical properties), and containers (physical storage properties)</li> <li>○ Add two additional entities to complement Record, Carrier and Container</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Necessary in order to distinguish between manifestations like photographic prints, facsimiles, copies</li> <li>• New entity: Classification: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Could be an entity instead of property. As Documentary form is to Record, so Classification is to Record Set</li> <li>○ P17 Classification: needs better modeling to associate classification codes to records management tools to contextualize them and indicate their specific meaning (e.g. classification indexes, plans, etc.)</li> <li>○ Needed to allow each classification designation to be related to its classification plan and to the retention schedule</li> </ul> </li> <li>• New entity: Name <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ As a property: considering the co-existence of multiple forms (e.g. authorized form, parallel form), need to be able to distinguish between types of names, if several Name elements are expressed for one entity. Make Name an entity instead?</li> <li>○ Defining Name as a property will mean that names cannot have properties of their own. Reconsider this decision: names change over time and it may be important to know the time period during which a given name applied or the context in which it should be used.</li> <li>○ How does RiC address handling of authorized, parallel, and other forms of names (for ISAAR-CPF, ISDIAH, and ISDF compatibility)? Is the idea to model RiC-O so that implementers could indicate "same as" type of links from Entities to authority records in external systems?</li> <li>○ Current P3 Name doesn't allow for precise indication of name format (variant forms of names).</li> <li>○ Other properties needed for Name: status (authorized, variant, parallel); rules or conventions used to build the form of name; use dates for the name; Source for the form of name; language and script of the name, etc.</li> <li>○ If Name is not an entity, how would it be possible to accurately capture both legal and common names for government departments, for example, as well as their bilingual equivalents?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• New entity: Local identifier: may pertain to physical or intellectual control, need to be able to distinguish between types of local identifiers. Make Local Identifier an entity instead?</li> </ul>
2.1.3	<p>Categorization and organization of entities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinguish between primary and secondary entities, providing the option to extend secondary entities indefinitely (e.g. Media type as entity, Content type as entity, etc.)</li> <li>• Primary: Record entities (Record, Record Set, Record Component); Business/Functional entities (Function, Activity, Mandate); Agent; Place; Concept/Thing</li> <li>• Secondary: Date; Occupation; Position; Documentary Form; Function (Abstract)</li> <li>• Use entity types: Four RiC entities (Documentary Form, Date, Place, Concept/Thing) can be represented as properties of the other RiC entities. The ten remaining are true recordkeeping entities whose properties could be controlled by Authority Records. Conceptually these 10 entities are instances of three basic entity types (Deeds; Doers; Documents)</li> <li>• RiC entities are a mix of two types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ entities that exist(ed) independently of the person doing the description whose properties are established based on some objective evidence</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>(Record, Record Component, Record Set, Agent, Occupation, Position, Documentary Form; Date, Place);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ entities which are created by the describer (Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate) whose descriptions are empirically grounded.</li> <li>○ Problem: a standard should involve an empirical, objective basis for identifying and specifying the properties of any entity</li> <li>• RiC entities should be ranked: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Record, Record Component and Record Set should be primary entities with the following properties that are entities - Agents, Dates, Places, Holding Organizations, Documentary Forms, Concepts/Things.</li> <li>○ The properties of these subsidiary entities (Occupation, Position, Function, Mandate, Activity) would be tertiary entities (indirectly related with the record but directly related to the agent/holding organization).</li> <li>○ Tertiary entities are linked to agents and can be described at least with a date/time frame within which the agent executed a position, mandate, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Clearer to model Occupation, Position, Function, Activity, Mandate (which are all principally related to Agent) as properties of Agent?</li> </ul>
2.1.4	<p>Presentation and phrasing of definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entity descriptions are not consistently phrased: different words are used to express the same thoughts (e.g. why isn't "life and work events" used in Agent, although it is used in the Record entities' definitions)?</li> <li>• Although the world-view in RiC is 'archival', some definitions are too generic.</li> <li>• Should there be 'recordness' or 'documentness' noted in the descriptions of Record/Record Set?</li> <li>• Entities should be defined in a self-contained way, without referring to any other entities, which could imply a dependence or obligation. Clarify that each entity is independent.</li> </ul>

<p><b>2.2 Record Entities (E1, E2, E3):</b> distinction between record/record components/compound records/record sets; having one Record entity instead of three; inconsistent interpretation and implementation; ordering of these entities emphasizes item-level; unevenness of properties</p>	
2.2.1	<p>Distinctions between Record, Record Component and Record Set:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• are not always clear, open to interpretation and confusion</li> <li>• would need to be consistently interpreted across repositories in order to link data</li> <li>• a record component could be seen as a record (e.g. when digitised)</li> <li>• what is the difference between a record component that forms part of a record and a compound record?</li> <li>• is compound record too similar to record set, and is the distinction useful?</li> <li>• practical difficulties of distinguishing between record, record component and record set</li> <li>• whole/part thinking of traditional fonds practice has been replicated in RiC through the distinction between Record/Record Component/Record Set, while RiC is trying to break free from and go beyond this traditional practice</li> <li>• whole/part thinking is unclear: a Record Component is 'part of' a Record, while a Record is a 'member of' a Record Set -- differences in interpretation would make the overall application of these inconsistent</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Allowing for fluid identification of compound records or records containing components is problematic: entities should be unambiguous and non-overlapping</li> <li>Need examples to clarify delineation between Record vs. Record Component; the current examples obfuscate rather than clarify the concept of Record Component</li> <li>Lack of clear use cases for Record Components like signatures (indivisible aspect)</li> <li>While distinguishing between Record and Record Set might be useful for users (the Record is the thing they can order for consultation), a clear distinction between them is not always possible (e.g. Record + Record Components in analog form are treated as Record Set with Record in digitized form)</li> <li>Increased layers of granularity in digital environment muddles RiC distinctions between these entities</li> <li>is Record 'item' in ISAD(G) and Record Set the other levels?</li> <li>Need born-digital examples: is a geo-dataset a record, a record component (part of a map view) or a record set?</li> <li>Differences in proposed properties for these three entities is limited</li> </ul>
2.2.2	<p>Have a single Record entity instead:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It could stand in for whatever is being treated as a record 'entity', whether an aggregation or not</li> <li>Could the properties of Record be expanded to account for Record Component instead of having it as a separate entity?</li> <li>Problems trying to differentiate between these entities - sudden changes could bring new members into a set, invalidating any shared properties of that set; an item could later have its contents described, making it become a record set, changing its descriptive properties</li> <li>Consider AtoM's model, in which all records are 'information objects' with the same available properties, some of which may be inherited from higher levels - a flexible approach that allows for more consistent implementation</li> <li>ISO 23081 - a single Record entity with any number of aggregations permitted</li> <li>Have a single Record entity that is recursive</li> <li>Too great a difference between Record and Record Set (in their properties) to enable mapping from ISAD(G)</li> </ul>
2.2.3	<p>Ordering of these entities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>emphasizes item and sub-item description before aggregate-level: why?</li> <li>is there a requirement to describe these entities in a particular order?</li> </ul>
2.2.4	<p>Record/Record Set - doesn't recognize different manifestations of the same material (original-copy relations for Record, but not for Record Set)</p>

2.3 Record (E1): distinguishing between information/representation/carrier; problematic definition of Record	
2.3.1	How does the distinction between information, representation and carrier map onto the OAIIS model?
2.3.2	Clarify that 'record' refers to the resource, not its description (for the librarian audience).
2.3.3	<p>Issues with the definition of record:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of terms 'linguistic, symbolic or graphic': not disjoint categories, do not cover all possibilities - for example: sound or A/V records; non-symbolic objects such as memorabilia, natural history specimens, etc. (no alternative entity for these)</li> <li>Is a specimen a record - if so, is the act of capture the act of record creation?</li> <li>meaning of 'representation' in relation to the information carried or conveyed;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Representation is used both in the record's definition and in that of the Agent: current wording excludes information received or otherwise acquired by an Agent</li> <li>better to say 'created' than 'represented' ?</li> <li>extraneous text in the definition - should be more streamlined;</li> <li>Record definition strays too far from traditional, established definitions;</li> <li>potential inaccuracy of being evidence of a 'single transaction' - could a grouping of records not be evidence of more than a single transaction?;</li> <li>please define 'single transaction' - how far could it (or should it not) be broken down as an actionable concept in this context?</li> <li>No available basis for determining the boundary of a Record: while E11 Documentary Form helps address this, the concept of 'compound record' confuses things -- a single transaction may be documented in more than one record; a record could be related to an event (which is not a transaction)</li> <li>does not accommodate private papers very well: many are not, by nature, transactional (can be created on a whim or spontaneously);</li> <li>how does RiC's definition relate to requirements in ISO 15489-1?;</li> <li>how would RiC relate to non-records managed by archives? (e.g. publications);</li> <li>the definition doesn't align well with digital records (e.g. persistent form and durable carrier are not necessarily applicable);</li> <li>implications of defining a Record as consisting of both intellectual content and physical carrier/characteristics with respect to multiple manifestations/formats a Record (dividing lines between record1_manifestationA and record1_manifestationB?)</li> <li>omit the concept 'compound' from Record to avoid confusion - the current implication is that several Record Components make a compound Record</li> <li>current definition is problematic - too loose and too specific (e.g. must always be on a durable carrier; is always evidence for events and activities)</li> <li>do not reference a carrier: would exclude all digital objects as records</li> </ul>
2.3.4	<p>Must all records be created by an agent?</p> <p>Not clear what differentiates a record from any other persistent information object, based on its definition, and the definition of Agent does not help clarify (doesn't exclude anything).</p>

2.4 Record Component (E2): unclear boundaries with Record; problematic definition	
2.4.1	<p>Where are the boundaries between Record Component and Record:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Particularly in digital context</li> <li>Considering that records can contain other records</li> <li>Record and Record Component share the same properties</li> <li>Need clearer examples &amp; guidance to help distinguish between them</li> <li>Better to handle as part-of relationship between two Records (if not, please provide rationale)</li> <li>Clear uses for 'objects' within or removed from records (e.g. maps, drawings or photographs as illustrations could then be catalogued individually) but what about register entry (analog: component; digital: record in its own right)?</li> <li>State that the concept of Record Concept is dynamic and context-dependent (Records can become Record Components and vice versa)</li> <li>Modelling alternative: Record A hasComponent Record AA?</li> </ul>

2.4.2	<p>Definition does not make sense; unusual or undefined terminology; unclear for non-archival audience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All parts of a Record would have discrete information content that contribute to the Record's physical/intellectual completeness, and if any part were removed, this doesn't mean that the Record is necessarily corrupted</li> <li>• No objective criteria for determining physical/intellectual completeness were provided, which may have helped</li> <li>• 'Part' and 'completeness' not defined in the document - ambiguous</li> <li>• Is Digital Component equivalent to Record Component?</li> <li>• 'Component' not typically used to indicate things like seals, pictures, or appended records</li> </ul>
-------	---

<p><b>2.5 Record Set (E3):</b> distinction between Record Set and compound Records is unclear; problems with definition/terminology; creating Record Sets; options for Record Set contents; referencing types of sets (fonds)</p>	
2.5.1	<p>Distinction between Record Set and compound Records: unclear need examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does compound record mean that Record is a recursive entity in the same way that Record Set is? (e.g. a letter with an enclosure that has its own enclosure)?</li> <li>• Not enough information provided to establish the difference between compound Record and Record Set. Would the concept of digital component help (see SAA definition of compound record)?</li> </ul>
2.5.2	<p>Definition needs adjustment/clarification; need more use cases and examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does "...specific to the context of the Agent" mean? Specific to the context in which the Agent has carried out the selection and grouping?</li> <li>• "...at some Date": implies that Records were brought together as a Record Set at a particular moment in time, versus being a process that extends over a duration of time. Clarify that it could be a single date or a date range.</li> <li>• 'Record Set' (considering graph theory) implies there can only be one type of a set of records, rather than many types of Record sets defined on the basis of particular properties. Why not use an existing term like 'Record Aggregate'?</li> <li>• "Intellectually brought together": would exclude aggregates that simply accumulated over time</li> <li>• "Brought together" implies a physical action - what about Internet bookmarking, for example?</li> <li>• Not equivalent to / broader than ISAD(G)'s 'archival unit' ('producible unit'): please add something about archival unit, which could be an item or an aggregate, depending on the cataloging circumstances</li> <li>• May not always be physically 'brought together', only intellectually</li> <li>• Stress that some record sets have the same provenance and others not</li> <li>• Problematic to refer to Agent in the definition, which could have different roles (creator, author, collector)</li> <li>• Suggest eliminating miscellaneous example in scope note (not recommended good practice)</li> <li>• Wording suggests manual approach to selecting and organizing Records in the set(s): records can be produced systematically as a result of appraisal work (ISO 15489), and documentation of this forms part of the archival description for the set</li> <li>• Change definition "One or more Records or Record Sets..."</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Definition implies that a Record Set can only contain one body of Records, although the intention is that Record Sets can contain other Record Sets?</li> </ul>
2.5.3	Can a creator as an Agent produce a Record Set, or was this concept only intended to refer to actions taken after the active life of a Record?
2.5.4	How is description of Record and Record Set different in cases where similar properties are used: how to indicate two different contextual perspectives?
2.5.5	<p>Options for what a Record Set can contain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can record sets contain other record sets? Ultimately, all record sets are reducible to records (noting RiC-R140 'member' relationship between Record Sets).</li> <li>Can a Record Set contain a mixture of Records and Record Sets?</li> <li>A record set should always be more than one record, otherwise it is a record.</li> </ul>
2.5.6	<p>Reference to fonds, series, etc.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How is the notion of collection configured in relation to the notion of fonds, in the relations between the archival repository and producer of archives? This theme is absent.</li> <li>Indicate that a Record Set could be a fonds, series, file, etc., or a result of dynamic retrieval (user request)</li> <li>Consider identifying specific archival aggregations within an archival Record Set, to be defined as 'Archival Record Set'; a specific property (type or level), using controlled values, could be used</li> </ul>

<b>2.6 Agent (E4):</b> options for authority control; modelling (distinguish between entity and its appellation and define specific sub-entities); problems with the definition, including specific to delegate-agent, and idea of 'agency'; clarify scope	
2.6.1	<p>Authority control for agents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How many will be interchangeable across archives? Agents can span repositories. Will there be a central authority file?</li> <li>Use existing standards like ISO 15511 International Standard Identifier for Libraries and Related Organizations to help with authority control (name changes over time), particularly for distinguishing between creators agents and repository agents</li> </ul>
2.6.2	<p>Modeling issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distinguishing between entities and their assumed identities: this would be simplified by separating 'things' from their appellations</li> <li>How can agents be qualified as record creators or record subjects? How do we relate these to records?</li> <li>Is the expectation that creators would be added at the file level, with the 'job title' as 'creator'?</li> <li>Is RiC moving toward a flatter structure with mandatory metadata at the file level, or toward more complex poly-hierarchical structures?</li> <li>Model too simplistic for anticipated use cases</li> <li>RiC properties and relations argue for the need to define certain Agent sub-entities, plus de facto ones needed for valid definition of the RiC relations presented: person, group, corporate body and delegate agent</li> <li>Properties that only apply to certain types of sub-agents - how could these be operationalized and validated? Any instance of E4 should be allowed to have its properties, not just a type of E4 entity (not machine-actionable)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggest modeling subclasses: having properties associated with certain values of Type is not workable</li> </ul>
2.6.3	<p>Definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re: the statement "Typically archivists will want to attribute responsibility to the person or persons, or group or groups 'behind' the assumed identity": what is the basis for this belief (standards, best practices, etc.)?</li> <li>Suggest omitting this predictive statement and providing guidelines on the application of the entity instead</li> <li>Consider adopting definition of Agent in W3C Provenance Data Model instead ("An agent is something that bears some form of responsibility for an activity taking place, for the existence of an entity, or for another agent's activity"), or at least indicate alignment with that standard</li> <li>A group is not equivalent to an organization: suggest adding the latter, along with judicial person (to cover category of corporation sole, i.e. an office with legal authority)</li> <li>why is responsibility for effects required? Excludes entities with sovereign/crown immunity as well as Delegate-agents</li> <li>definition too simplistic for anticipated use cases: privilege a singular 'true' identity in the presence of multiple identities or identity facets</li> <li>Definition should explore the roles of the agent - make creator (provenance) role clear</li> <li>Switch order of 3rd and 4th paragraphs</li> <li>Unclear if RiC distinguishes non-human entities (legendary, mythical, fraudulent) or other fictitious entities, and human entities using fictitious identities</li> <li>term 'agent': agency as relational, emerging from the interaction between a thing and other things to which it relates - it is neither an entity type or a property. Use Person and Group as entities instead</li> <li>E4/E14: can a person be a concept/thing in some contexts, and an agent in others?</li> <li>preference shown to creators and collectors as agents over all others (what about RiC supporting complex provenance?)</li> <li>Distinguish agents involved in creation of a record from the holding organization</li> <li>Is Agent synonymous with record creator? as well as Author?</li> <li>Specify categories of agents to help capture actions taken (e.g. creator, custodian, etc.)</li> </ul>
2.6.4	<p>Delegate Agent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Can a robot (delegate agent) be considered responsible?</li> <li>does it include software programs - e.g. speed camera on a highway - is it a creator or a creator's tool?</li> </ul>

<p>2.7 Issues across business entities (E5, E6, E7, E8, E9, E10): overlap/redundancy among these entities (lack of clarity regarding their differences); bias for business contexts; functional provenance; relation to similarly scoped entities in other standards</p>	
2.7.1	<p>Modelling issues: redundancy or overlap among Occupation, Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate, Occupation, Position:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't need Activity if have Function (Abstract)</li> <li>Don't need Function (Abstract) if have Function</li> <li>Sensible to have Function it as a separate entity? Examples show overlap with Function (Abstract) and Agent - use relationships between them instead?</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How would relations between Function/Function(Abstract) be managed?</li> <li>• Function and Function (Abstract): awkward and unclear labels with similar examples</li> <li>• Why both Function and Function (Abstract)? Why not just have a property for Function (Abstract) that identifies its context?</li> <li>• Function/Function(Abstract): preferable in the ontology to define one as a subclass of the other?</li> <li>• Difference between Function and Activity? examples make them seem interchangeable. Need rationale and guidance.</li> <li>• Examples make it unclear the distinctions between Functions and Activities - make examples more consistent</li> <li>• Difference between Function and Activity? Unclear. Occupation too. Need better examples. Clarify definitions and scope notes for these three entities. Or eliminate some to reduce overlap.</li> <li>• What is the advantage of distinguishing between Function and Activity? In ISDF, activities (and tasks, transactions) are subdivisions of Functions.</li> <li>• Recommend modelling Activity as a part of Function</li> <li>• Objective and consistent way to distinguish between functions, activities, processes, tasks, transactions, etc.? Categorization of 'type' of activity is also unnecessary.</li> <li>• Need clearer definitions/distinctions between Occupation, Function and Position</li> <li>• E7 Function is an application of E8 Function (Abstract) to a specific instance of E4 Agent - as such, there is no need for E7 and E8 as separate entities (relations R437 and R439 already accommodate this, too); if defining E7 as a reification of a particular relationship to support additional properties/relations, no evidence of this</li> <li>• Overlap with Agent (examples have agent names as part of function names)</li> <li>• Occupation and Position are very close concepts: the distinction between them makes the description more complex</li> <li>• Occupation and Function are difficult to distinguish</li> <li>• What is the difference between Occupation, Position and Mandate?</li> <li>• Activity could be confused as Occupation</li> <li>• Occupation, Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate: seem to have overlapping and interdependent semantics (vs. RDA's 'roles' relating a WEMI to an Agent)</li> <li>• Overlap between Occupation and Position: in a practical application, could decide that only one is needed, implying the other</li> <li>• What is the logic/rationale for distinguishing between Occupation and Position? Why not make them properties (attributes of Agent)?</li> <li>• Function/Activity distinction useful, as well as Position (for a Person) - relations between Agent-Position-Function / Activity-Record need defining</li> <li>• should Function (Abstract) be in RiC ontology instead?</li> </ul>
2.7.2	Occupation, Position, Mandate: examples disproportionately address corporate/government records above records of individuals, families, community organizations, etc.
2.7.3	<p>Definition and terminology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better stated as a 'business function'?</li> <li>• If keep both Function and Function (Abstract), suggest Specific Function and Generic Function</li> <li>• Seems to borrow incomplete models from related sectors like Function-Activity-Transaction (FAT) approach - not wholly adopted, though</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Abstract' is confusing (publishing term) - use 'Generic'</li> <li>• If distinguish between Function and Activity, make distinction clear (stricter wording in definitions)</li> <li>• Improve description of Occupation and Position to make their distinction clearer</li> </ul>
2.7.4	Provenance: associated with Agent only? What about functional provenance like in ISDF? If so, which one: Function, or Function (Abstract)?
2.7.5	How RiC business entities differ from/compare to ISDF and ISO 23081: Does RiC replace/supplant these standardized conceptualizations?

<b>2.8 Occupation (E5):</b> modelling issues; wording of definition/scope; examples; evolution of occupation terms over time	
2.8.1	Modelling, relation to other entities/properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should Occupation be an entity or a property?</li> <li>• How to assign occupations - at what point is an activity an occupation?</li> <li>• Should it be part of an Agent's description (property)</li> <li>• When must Occupation be used with Function (examples)?</li> </ul>
2.8.2	Wording of definition/scope notes; examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should 'success', 'competency' and 'mastery' be emphasized in the scope notes (not necessarily required). Unlikely archivist could assess professional competency</li> <li>• Add examples for non-remunerated occupations (e.g. artist, poet, philanthropist)</li> <li>• Review existing examples; add 'Notaries' as an example; current examples are only of formal occupations regulated by academic grades</li> <li>• Revise definition to emphasize that there is evidence that an Occupation exists only if the acquired skill/competency pursued is put in practice (stress action of exercising instead of skill/competency)</li> <li>• An occupation (as a profession) is not always performed by someone who has the formal right to perform that occupation</li> <li>• Occupation can have a mandate (e.g. guilds)</li> <li>• Why restrict to a Person (consider a robot Agent)</li> <li>• Specify limitation that Occupation can only apply to a person Agent</li> </ul>
2.8.3	How to account for differing/evolving terminology over time / or context-specific?

<b>2.9 Position (E6):</b> modelling; definition	
2.9.1	Modelling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should Position be a property of Occupation? apparent duplication</li> <li>• Where do honorary titles fit?</li> </ul>
2.9.2	Definition <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Although stipulates a corporate body must be involved, not always the case (e.g. personal assistant, secretary, mentor). Would 'Role' be a better term than Position?</li> <li>• What definition of corporate body is being used here?</li> </ul>

2.10 Function (E7): wording of definition	
2.10.1	<p>Definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Enduring goal, purpose or objective of an Agent": e.g. a war has a single goal, but more than one function.</li> <li>• Many goals/objectives are defined below the level of function - e.g. medical research institute has 1 function, each project has its own objectives</li> <li>• Too particular to a business context: awkward to describe people as having a spouse function, friend function, etc. Excludes personal life; definitions too prescriptive.</li> </ul>

2.11 Function (Abstract) (E8): unnecessary entity? Unclear as currently described	
2.11.1	<p>Modelling; why include it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is Function(Abstract) needed? Could include as first Scope Note for Function that it could be defined either abstractly or within a specific context?</li> <li>• If keep Function (Abstract), be consistent and include abstract counterparts to other entities (e.g. Activity)</li> <li>• Define a property of Function to indicate its scope, level, or applicable domain</li> <li>• No value in including this entity: Why is capturing contextualized functions not enough?</li> </ul>
2.11.2	<p>Wording of definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Second note for Function (Abstract) seems to contradict its definition since a domain is a context</li> <li>• This entity is not understandable - needed clearer terminology</li> <li>• Not clear as currently described.</li> <li>• Not clear how it would be applied</li> </ul>

2.12 Activity (E9): modelling issues; definition's wording/scope	
2.12.1	<p>Modelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have an Activity (Abstract) counterpart? Would this preclude individual instances of activities from existing?</li> <li>• Need to acknowledge that some actions/transactions (activities) include performance by parties with whom the Agent interacts.</li> <li>• Unclear if Activity is description of an abstract idea or actual operations/transactions undertaken.</li> </ul>
2.12.2	<p>Definition wording; examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove 'transaction', as it is included as a subtype of 'action'.</li> <li>• Wording excludes life activities; no one has an implicit/explicit Mandate to live.</li> <li>• Not all activities flow from an Occupation, even for personal archives.</li> <li>• Needs clearer description and better examples.</li> <li>• Current wording: tacit mandatory relation between Activity and Agent, Occupation, or Function. Omits relation to Position.</li> <li>• Too limited in scope: PROV-O/PREMIS activity also includes concept of event (event needs to be specifically accommodated somewhere in RiC)</li> </ul>

2.13 Mandate (E10): modelling, definition/scope; examples; practical implementation; conflict with established concepts	
2.13.1	Modelling: should Mandate be subordinate to Agent? There seems to be a dependency here. Mandates only have meaning as adopted by an Agent.
2.13.2	Definition; scope; examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unclear definition</li> <li>• Needs examples</li> <li>• What are the boundaries on the definition? When might it be a motivation, not a Mandate? Are personal moral or spiritual values Mandates, or must a Mandate come from an organizational structure?</li> <li>• What is an example of a tacit mandate and how would it be documented?</li> <li>• Must it always be external to an Agent?</li> <li>• Definition ignores defining characteristic of a mandate in the ordinary usage: it directs an Agent to do something (stipulates action).</li> <li>• Add that a Mandate typically assigns authority/responsibility for one or more Functions/Activities plus rules for carrying them out.</li> <li>• Lacking qualification, current definition extends Mandate to any rules governing action. But incidental rules may not be part of an Agent's mandate.</li> <li>• Definition doesn't provide basis for differentiating between mission and Mandate.</li> <li>• Stating "within a specific social and cultural context" implies that there is a counterpart outside of such contexts. Context could be described using relations or properties.</li> <li>• A Mandate that has changed in any significant manner is actually a different Mandate - OR - introduce Mandate (Abstract) counterpart entity.</li> <li>• What is a tacit Mandate or imagined/subjective Mandate? If tacit, it is not documented. How can one determine objectively what is not expressed?</li> <li>• Mandate doesn't seem applicable to private (non-governmental) archives because a person wouldn't typically characterize him or herself as having a mandate or mission.</li> </ul>
2.13.3	Practical concerns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Welcome the entity in RiC, but would we actually use it?</li> <li>• Must there be proof someone was aware of the Mandate when following it, or is it enough to document it existed even if it wasn't followed by the creator?</li> </ul>
2.13.4	Conflict with established concepts in diplomatics and linguistics: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diplomatics: dispositive documents (where the issuance of the document is the act).</li> <li>• Linguistics: category of performative texts where written/spoken text is the act.</li> <li>• A document that defines a Mandate is dispositive (require the document to have the Mandate).</li> </ul>

2.14 Documentary Form (E11): modelling (property vs entity), scope of definition, implementation as a controlled list of types?	
2.14.1	Modelling <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be a property, not an entity. Duplicates properties (e.g. physical media).</li> <li>• Principally applicable to Record entities. Better to define as a property of them? (Even if intended to bridge with diplomatics, the current formulation doesn't make this clear).</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too closely linked to diplomatics: not all records would fit diplomatic criteria (e.g. poems, musical scores, diaries).</li> <li>• Akin to vocabulary encoding scheme? A type property in RDA.</li> <li>• Should be an attribute of Record.</li> </ul>
2.14.2	<p>Definition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could lead to misinterpretation? More a genre? Is it required? Alternatives?</li> <li>• Expand the definition to cover documents created ad lib, not under particular rules.</li> <li>• Definition only refers to Record; there is a relation with Record Set, though, which could be useable (a fonds composed of files whose form is identical).</li> </ul>
2.14.3	Implementation consideration: a controlled list of document types would be useful.

<p><b>2.15 Date (E12):</b> modelling (property vs entity – need rationale); entity and its label are not distinguishable; how to relate different labels for the same Date entity</p>	
2.15.1	<p>Modelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be a property.</li> <li>• Rationale for being an entity? What is the advantage? Why an entity and not a property of other entities? Is the objective that we are to consider time outside of the context of an Agent, record, etc.?</li> <li>• Model in more detail? E.g. creation, last modified, birth, death</li> <li>• Glad to see it as an entity, as it allows it to have its own properties</li> <li>• Clarify relation of Date and Named Periods (Concept/Thing) in relation to one another.</li> <li>• P62 Calendar reinforces impression that E12 Date is only a way of naming a time-span, not the actual time-span. So, a date in one calendar (with a P62) would be a distinct instance of E12 than a date in a separate calendar (with a P62). If not an actual time span, then E12 would not be a contextual entity, since two instances of E12 would not be comparable in terms of time, only in terms of whether their strings were identical or not.</li> <li>• Unclear distinction between E12 Date and P3 Name, since P3 has dates as examples: what is the semantic difference?</li> <li>• Consider FRBR-LRM: LRM E10 Time-span (actual time period divorced from any representation in a calendar) and LRM E9 Nomen (a reified relationship between a term and what it signifies) applied to a time-span. This allows for various Nomens for the Time-Span to be related as equivalent.</li> <li>• How would different expressions of the same date (according to different calendars) be related to one another? Using an authority record (for dates) approach?</li> <li>• Date should be an attribute of every entity as well as an attribute of relationships, which need to be time-bound. If relationships are made more central (every action expressed as a dated relationship), then may no longer need Date as an entity.</li> <li>• Why does Date appear as a property of relations, but not other entities? Because relations are not treated as entities?</li> </ul>
2.15.2	<p>Definition; examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fuzzy definition does not help resolve issues of working with dates in a machine-actionable way</li> <li>• Definition needs refinement: state more explicitly that includes precise and less precise dates, time spans, historical periods.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add more examples and explain them</li> <li>• Defined as 'chronological information' with no scope notes and examples of dates in various calendars - not clear if intended to indicate actual time-span or only the ways time-spans are referred to in particular calendars</li> <li>• Provide more examples if retaining as an entity</li> <li>• Which dates are being referred to here: the existence of the entity?</li> </ul>
2.15.3	<p>Implementation guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide guidance on how Date can/should function outside of the context of other entities like Agent, Record, etc.</li> <li>• Provide guidance for determining when an archivist should use E12 Date vs. E14 Concept/Thing for named periods that have a chronological dimension.</li> <li>• Enumerate various types of chronological information that can/should be represented by Date.</li> <li>• Practical problems: time and space are dimensionally interrelated, endlessly divisible, and culturally specific -- need guidance to implement (and explain why it is necessary to have them as entities).</li> <li>• Is it an implementation choice: to have Date as an entity, or as a property of relations? Or can they co-exist?</li> </ul>

<p>2.16 Issues across E12 Date (P69 Date), E13 Place (P69 Place), E14 Concept/Thing: modelling issues</p>	
2.16.1	<p>Modelling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why treat Date and Place as entities rather than shared properties of all entities?</li> <li>• Are these entities, properties or both? (E12/P68 Date; E13/P69 Place). Being both is problematic.</li> <li>• 'Scope and content' property (P9) includes time periods and geography as examples - so are they really entities, or structured sub-properties within a Record's scope? Need clarity</li> <li>• Leave modelling of Date and Place to external models that focus on time and place?</li> <li>• Both seem to be generic and textual - no attempt to normalize the data. Deliberate? These should be handled by reference to normalized Date/Place entities.</li> <li>• What is the rationale/logic for having Place and Concept/Thing as entities? These are subject-based attributes that can be added to anything. Having them as separate entities could be a nice add-on, but not central to, archival descriptive practice.</li> <li>• What is the rationale to have Date, Place and Concept/Thing as entities? To allow reasoning on them?</li> </ul>

<p>2.17 Place (E13): modelling issues; jurisdiction, geographic area, and administrative area are not equivalent (definition); distinction between Place and Agent</p>	
2.17.1	<p>Modelling</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently doesn't allow for nesting of several instances of Place (one Place containing another) as does schema:Place. Need to allow for hierarchical relations between Places (currently only 'associated with').</li> <li>What is the rationale for having Place as an entity? Confusing: it seems to be both location (e.g. holding location) and physical positioning (geographic coordinates)</li> <li>Jurisdiction and geographic place are not the same: a jurisdiction can have a geographic place/region which it exerts control over but it is its own entity; can be accompanied by other agents/agencies that administer the functions of that jurisdiction</li> </ul>
2.17.2	<p>Definition/scope; label</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Jurisdiction is not the same as Geographic area, nor are either of these necessarily equivalent to an administrative point or area</li> <li>Impression that only populated places or jurisdictions are considered places in RiC, yet Amazon River is given as an example (a geographic feature).</li> <li>When does Place turn into an Agent (re: jurisdiction/administrative area)? Or are some Places also Agents?</li> <li>Geographic area, jurisdiction and administrative area are not the same: better described as separate entities</li> <li>Archival repositories are a type of Agent</li> <li>Why use term Place and not Location (like in PREMIS, PROV-O)? Explain.</li> </ul>

<p><b>2.18 Concept/Thing (E14):</b> needs new label; scope (does it include subjects); modelling (do not include other RiC entities; top-level entity?); implementation concerns (could be a catch-all; supposed to be controlled vocabulary)?</p>	
2.18.1	<p>Definition; label; scope; examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could we use a different title for this? Like subject or keyword tag? Needs authority control.</li> <li>Needs a better label.</li> <li>Would it incorporate events?</li> <li>Where do subjects fit in - in E14 or outside of RiC?</li> <li>Re: "any idea or notion": but must exclude Function (Abstract) -- would not want to confuse the two</li> <li>Remove 'all RiC entities' from scope note: because suggests that any of them could be prescribed in two ways.</li> <li>Add 'Event' to the entity name (more accurate).</li> <li>Need more clarity in the scope notes to explain what this entity is.</li> <li>Add keywords to examples, which are currently mainly re: historical areas.</li> </ul>
2.18.2	<p>Modelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Model it as a top-level entity above all others? (Would align with FRBR-LRM).</li> <li>What is the advantage to having Concept/Thing at the same level as other RiC entities versus as a super-class? The latter option seems conceptually less conflicted and having a hierarchical super-class relation might enable economies of description (more properties being assigned in a generic fashion to a super-class rather than repeated at the class level).</li> <li>More clearly express that this is the 'top' entity that includes all other entities.</li> <li>Not clear if a super-class of other RiC entities or a super-class of vocabulary encoding schemes based on knowledge organization systems.</li> </ul>
2.18.3	<p>Implementation concerns</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This could become a catch-all entity being heavily used/mis-used. Will an archivist have the time to decide if 'slavery' is a Function, Abstract Function, Activity, or would it be easier to just call it a Concept/Thing?</li> <li>• Understand the motivation for this, but fear sloppy implementation</li> <li>• Too general - might be better to have specific entities in place of what this covers.</li> <li>• Is the intention that this vocabulary would be controlled (LoC subject headings)?</li> </ul>
--	---

### 3. Issues regarding Properties

3.1 General Issues	
3.1.1	Ordering of properties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doesn't always flow properly - e.g. P12 should follow P10.</li> </ul>
3.1.2	Grouping of properties / shared properties <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest having one History property that applies to many entities (instead of P20, P28, P35, P44, P47, P50, P54, P57, P60)</li> <li>• E5 Occupation, E6 Position, E7 Function, E9 Activity, E10 Mandate, E11 Documentary Form: Suggest having Type, Description and History properties that are defined once and can be applied to these six entities (vs. P43, P46, P49 Description, for example), since they are of datatype 'text' and not 'controlled term'</li> <li>• E1 Record, E3 Record Set: suggest having the following properties defined once and applicable to these two entities - Authenticity &amp; Integrity Note; Content Extent; Scope &amp; Content; Physical and Logical Extent; Classification; History</li> <li>• Record properties (pp. 22-26) are categorized into four categories (Content, Representation, Carrier, Management and Use): these categories are not defined or presented, and can safely be omitted</li> <li>• Define 'Type' as a shared property</li> <li>• Have one list of properties that state to which entity they could apply (avoids repetition)</li> <li>• Record/Record Set: have almost the same properties - could define them just once instead?</li> <li>• Multiple instances of description properties (P56, P49, P51, P53, P56, P59, P67): why not use P4 General Note instead?</li> <li>• Define Authenticity and Integrity Note once and use for more than one entity</li> </ul>
3.1.3	Unevenness of properties; irrelevant properties; lack of scope notes/examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some are very specific, others very broad</li> <li>• Some don't seem relevant or are out of scope (e.g. gender, opening times, language of agent)</li> <li>• Lack of scope notes/examples: difficult to understand how to implement a property. Having a working example of each entity type with data for each property would be helpful.</li> </ul>
3.1.4	Implementation considerations/tools <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will specific controlled vocabularies be provided or identified (or guidance given) for properties with controlled terms?</li> <li>• Provide cross-reference to equivalent elements in existing standards for comparison and improving understandability.</li> </ul>
3.1.5	Multiplicity is not clearly expressed (creating one or many instances for the same property)



3.1.6	<p>Data types</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Beyond the role of RiC-CM to go to this level of specifics; belongs in instructions/guidance re: implementing RiC, not in the model. AND/OR leave for RiC-O</li> <li>Potentially an implementation barrier to include entities that require a URI representation: leave data types for supporting documentation for RiC implementation considerations</li> <li>Omit them: not appropriate for the model to include</li> <li>Data type: too vague - specify them more fully (e.g. preferred/expected number, text, date formats, plus strategies for resolving ambiguities such as with dates)</li> <li>Date data type and normalization: include this(akin to EAD's @normal) - do not leave for implementation layer</li> <li>Extent data type: type as an actionable number (float) with a unit property, do not leave for implementation layer</li> </ul>
-------	--

3.2 Suggestions for new properties	
3.2.1	<p>Suggestions for new properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Digital file format</li> <li>Ethnicity</li> <li>Type (of relation) - e.g. contextual relation, associative relation, structural relation, relation between records, etc.</li> <li>Need more properties for Dates (for complexities around analogue and digital dates)</li> <li>Legal status (i.e. of a record)</li> <li>Quality of Metadata (certainty of description)</li> <li>Other facets of identity (e.g. religious affiliation, race, ethnicity, cultural context, sexual orientation) - i.e. why only gender?</li> <li>Level of description (equivalent to P23 Type property, and shouldn't be restricted to Record Set)</li> <li>Representation (to differentiate physical/technical properties)</li> <li>Management (place registration, maintenance activities needed)</li> <li>Place ('bounding box')</li> <li>Life cycle management (closed period, appraisal, disposal)</li> <li>Physical condition for Record Set</li> <li>Sequential ordering of entities could be handled by a 'key order' property, instead of via relations (s.4.1, note c)</li> </ul>

3.3 Shared properties	
3.3.1	<p>Additions/deficiencies (see also 3.1.2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add date as a shared property (to satisfy basic requirements for all recordkeeping entities - that they have identity, dates, and relationships)</li> <li>P1/P2 identifiers: insufficient - distinguish between identifier for the entity (e.g. Record Set); for a given description for an entity (e.g. finding aid identifier); global identifier for the entity or identity (e.g. ISNI, ISBN). Option to have a single Identifier property, and have RiC-O detail types.</li> </ul>
3.3.2	Modelling

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have common properties belong to a super-type object like 'Universal Recordkeeping Object'</li> <li>Option to have Identifier as an entity with properties like local, global, etc.</li> </ul>
3.3.3	<p>P1 Global Persistent Identifier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would require change in practice</li> <li>Which would this be? URI from transferring body, from online catalogue, or individual asset ID?</li> <li>ISNI example problematic because Identity is not an entity in RiC</li> <li>Delete 'persistent': no identifier is truly persistent (bound to an organization that maintains them)</li> </ul>
3.3.4	<p>P2 Local Identifier</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What about legacy identifiers?</li> <li>Is this property necessary?</li> <li>More than one local identifier is needed</li> <li>Are creator-generated classifications/codes and those assigned by the archives included in the same property?</li> </ul>
3.3.5	<p>P3 Name</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does this relate to name authority files, where there were parallel bilingual names, for example? Is the property simply repeated?</li> <li>Call this property 'label' (to represent title or name)?</li> <li>Wording: "designating an individual instance of a given entity" - more accurate?</li> <li>To accommodate multiple names for an agent, is the multiplicity 1 to n?</li> </ul>
3.3.6	<p>P4 General Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how P4 General Note is intended to be used</li> <li>Necessary?</li> <li>Call it local note instead?</li> <li>Scope of this property unclear: could it include information other than that regarding the relation of the entity to another RiC entity?</li> <li>Shouldn't need extra information on relations: indicates RiC is missing fields and method for describing relations has not yet been developed</li> </ul>

3.4 Properties of Record	
3.4.1	'Content information': inaccurate title for 3.2.1; evaluate the record as a whole, not its content
3.4.2	<p>Missing properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear how to apply dates to records because no date property (creation, modification date, temporal extent of content, etc.)</li> </ul>
3.4.3	<p>P5 Authenticity and Integrity Note, P8 Quality of Information, P16 Physical Characteristics Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P5 overlap with P8 Quality of Information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear in scope notes - difficult to distinguish</li> <li>Partial overlap between P5 and P8</li> <li>P5/P8 overlap as described in terms of whether the record is "whole and complete" and whether the record has "legibility and completeness", and the examples both mention lost text due to damage</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ P5 and P8 could be placed next to each other, as they both pertain to diplomatics</li> <li>• P5: Do we need this? Should there be separate notes for authenticity and integrity?</li> <li>• Not sensible for checksum - free-text field</li> <li>• Checksum for presentation copy, or publishing checksums for closed records?</li> <li>• Expand further for digital - separate field for checksum (for validation)</li> <li>• Sufficient for dealing with such an important aspect of the record (authenticity &amp; integrity)?</li> <li>• Needs more detailed modeling (e.g. fixity) - look to PREMIS</li> <li>• P8, P15 and P16: overlap</li> </ul>
3.4.4	<p>P6 Content Type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlap with P10, P12, P15?</li> <li>• Assumption that record can be perceived by a human sense - but what about data or code?</li> <li>• Will the terminology match with RDA?</li> <li>• Purpose of this property is unclear.</li> <li>• Overlap between media format, production technique, encoding: why so granular here, while no place for checksum/hashing algorithm?</li> <li>• 'Content forms' better for multimedia content.</li> <li>• Similar to Genre, Communication/Transmission form</li> <li>• Fully describe content types (controlled vocabulary)</li> <li>• What if a record consists of multiple record components with different content types?</li> <li>• Difference between P6 Content Type and P7 Content Extent?</li> </ul>
3.4.5	<p>P7/P29 Content Extent, P15 Physical or Logical Extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time is measurable not countable. Is duration the same as content?</li> <li>• Need clearer definitions.</li> <li>• Helpful to distinguish between content extent and physical/logical extent?</li> <li>• Odd to classify time duration as P7 (content extent) and physical dimensions as P15 (carrier extent) - technically accurate but a headache to implement</li> <li>• Re-label P15 'Dimensions'</li> <li>• Encoding extent as plain text seems regressive (not actionable data)</li> <li>• Not practical to distinguish content extent and physical extent - use extent and medium like in ISAD(G)</li> </ul>
3.4.6	<p>P8 Quality of Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Re-purpose to indicate quality of metadata (confidence rating about certainty of descriptive information)</li> <li>• Make more granular: 8a Legibility; 8b Completeness; 8c Accuracy; 8d Fidelity</li> <li>• Isn't this just the Condition of the record? Otherwise, when thinking of quality of the record, think of content/substance of the record and its capacity to serve as evidence.</li> <li>• Good term name? Subjective assessment of quality</li> </ul>
3.4.7	<p>P9 Scope and content</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the same information being captured through relations (with agent, place, date)?</li> <li>• Justification for this field? Repetition or summary of other entities and relations.</li> </ul>
3.4.8	<p>P10 Encoding Format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shouldn't be restricted to digital (MIME type) - just have controlled term? Need to apply to analogue and A/V (film, video, tape)</li> <li>• Purpose is unclear: to aid management, preservation or use?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Label is odd: why not file format? MIME type is inadequate - needs to be further broken down</li> <li>• Encoding has different meanings: character encoding (UTF-8), A/V codec (e.g. FFV1)</li> <li>• Unclear general approach in RiC for properties specific to digital vs. analogue</li> <li>• Scope notes should state that the encoding format must be a specific representation (e.g. image/tiff) not a generic representation (e.g. image)</li> <li>• Property too widely scoped: three concepts - encoding (UTF-8), file format (pdf, doc) and MIME type - create three properties for each of these</li> </ul>
3.4.9	<p>P11 Language Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why a textual version of a controlled term? Use URIs not textual code.</li> <li>• Why combine ISO language codes, free text (including language and script)</li> <li>• What about computer programming languages?</li> <li>• Change label to 'Language' ('information' is superfluous)</li> <li>• Do not specify 'represented in Records' - English includes some French words, but wouldn't want to claim French as a language in that case</li> <li>• Should also be applicable to Record Set</li> </ul>
3.4.10	<p>P12 Media Type, P13 Production Technique, P14 Medium, P15 Physical or Logical Extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Record properties describing physical characteristics seem too precise or granular and might not be universally translatable or applicable within other cultural interpretations</li> </ul>
3.4.11	<p>P12 Media Type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Narrow use of 'mediation' (whether or not a device is needed to render an information object); all information objects are mediated by technology and culture</li> <li>• Pointless property - overlaps with P6 Content Type</li> <li>• If corresponding to RDA, media type can be inferred from Carrier Type, but this is absent in RiC</li> <li>• Potential overlap with P6 Content Type, P10 Encoding Type, P14 Medium</li> <li>• Purpose of property is unclear: if to capture technical dependency, need more detail. If dependency is more general, add 'Characterisation information'?</li> <li>• Unclear: controlled term, but no preferred list</li> <li>• Unclear: 'media' has multiple meanings - i.e. a carrier. Would mediation device be more accurate?</li> <li>• Examples should indicate a general type of mediation device (e.g. DVD player instead of 'video').</li> </ul>
3.4.12	<p>P13 Production Technique: scope note should indicate that it is not for use with digital records. Stating magnetic recording for digital records has little value, and carriers may change.</p>
3.4.13	<p>P14 Medium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P12 Media Type/P14 Medium: overlap - improve definition wording for clarity</li> <li>• Difficult to distinguish from P16 Physical Characteristics Note</li> <li>• Examples imply medium is a mixture of carrier types and material types (e.g. vinyl disk is a carrier type while paper is a type of base material).</li> <li>• Scope states inclusion of physical carriers not needing an intermediation device, while some examples contradict this.</li> <li>• Needs better coordination with library community on these aspects because of shared requirements for storage and conservation.</li> <li>• What is the source for the controlled list of media provided?</li> <li>• Need explicit example for describing digital records held 'on-line' - underlying physical medium would be unknown.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If property is supposed to help with conservation/storage of the media, needs more details.</li> </ul>
3.4.14	<p>P15 Physical or Logical Extent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distinction from P7 Content Extent?</li> <li>• Re-label as Carrier Extent to make distinction with P7 Content Extent clearer.</li> <li>• For digital records - needs reference to archival and presentation copies (different sizes due to compression for online presentation copies). Need more extent types for digital extent.</li> </ul>
3.4.15	<p>P16 Physical Characteristics Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlap with P14 Medium?</li> <li>• Overlap with P8 Quality of Information?</li> <li>• Equates to condition status?</li> <li>• OK for display purposes, but for conservation management, need explicit property for recording condition.</li> <li>• Does it include preservation status?</li> <li>• Reserve this element for when conservation intervention has taken place?</li> </ul>
3.4.16	<p>P17 Classification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to understand. Too vague.</li> <li>• Definition seems inconsistent with scope and examples.</li> <li>• Multiple classification terms allowed (Records occurring in more than one set)?</li> <li>• Need examples in the context of other Record properties in order to understand. Does it refer to corporate file plans or administrative schemes? If so, re-name it accordingly.</li> <li>• Falls under arrangement? Criteria to identify membership of an archival document in an archival unit.</li> <li>• Which classification code is being referred to: location of records in relation to each other in an archive block ('volume description number') OR location of a record in relation to its place in a series ('collective description') OR both?</li> <li>• If allowing multiple classification codes, what about ISAD(G) limitation that higher level decisions apply to subordinate levels?</li> <li>• Reserved for creator-generated classification? Or also repository-contributed classification codes.</li> </ul>
3.4.17	<p>P18 Conditions for Access / P19 Conditions of Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presumed as sequential activities. Seems intuitive, but spell out explicitly.</li> <li>• Needs more detail</li> <li>• Access control frameworks need more nuancing in digital environments. Constraining access on Records will not control other forms of access enabled through activities, agent groups, mandates, or through relationships to access events.</li> <li>• UK legal status of public record: does this fit here? Under Mandate? Separate property?</li> </ul>
3.4.18	<p>P18 Conditions for Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For digital records, system dependencies among applications software, operating systems, firmware and hardware are part of the content that must be preserved and described - they are too lightly treated here and mixed with intellectual property rights management</li> <li>• Too much for one property - one option is to have sub-properties for more granular detail (e.g. closure status, closure code, record opening date, etc.)</li> <li>• Combines access conditions relating to intellectual and physical access: responsibility of national standard to break down into distinct elements, or should this separation be reflected in RiC?</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mix of two types of access conditions - one re: the condition, and the other as imposed under access and privacy legislation (or other agreements/terms)</li> </ul>
3.4.19	<p>P19 Conditions of Use</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Example: wording could be better</li> <li>Change name to avoid confusion with P18 Conditions of Access - e.g. 'Restrictions on Use'</li> <li>This property could also be used to identify freely available digital records one can download or access at the archives</li> <li>Definition: overlap with P8 Quality of Information.</li> <li>Definition: should include legislation like intellectual property</li> <li>Example: referring to the copyright owner of the record, not the owner of the physical record (the repository)?</li> </ul>
3.4.20	<p>P20 History</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Needs examples</li> <li>Define once and use for multiple entities</li> <li>Prefer to see history modelled as a series of events.</li> <li>Surprised that no independent property for appraisal - included as part of History - shouldn't be catch-all field. Plans to subdivide this field?</li> <li>Needs to capture actions performed on records by information professionals - still 'active' in the archive (continuum).</li> <li>Rationale for using a narrative history entity rather than defined events or actions (with associated dates and agents)?</li> <li>Re-label as 'archival history'?</li> <li>Separate history of record's custody from actions taken by repository to migrate and reformat?</li> </ul>
3.4.21	<p>P21 Record State</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confusing name - wouldn't apply to multiple manifestations e.g. different versions of born-digital, multiple copies in a film archive (i.e. not always original vs. copy)</li> <li>Where would digital surrogate, digitized record, and born-digital fit? Is this a model for information about conceptual records, or about objects? The inclusion of checksums suggests the latter.</li> <li>Example: 'sample' copy not 'simple' copy?</li> </ul>

### 3.5 Properties of Record Component

3.5.1	Need to separately define properties for Record Component, with examples specific to this entity
-------	--

### 3.6 Properties of Record Set

3.6.1	<p>Section 3.6 Properties shared by all members of a Record Set</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there business rules driving these? Would need to capture these.</li> <li>Why limit the use of the listed properties only when they are shared by all member Records of a Record Set? E.g. P11 Language Information could only be used if all members shared the same language value. What if some Records had English or Welsh at the Record level? Could not record that information in the Record Set description?</li> </ul>
-------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The basis of forming a Record Set could be something other than a shared property - e.g. all records by the same creator, all records accessioned in a particular year: this is not reflected in RiC's text.</li> <li>• No guidance given re: how to handle cases in which properties are not shared by all members. Where should this information be put, if the values are not shared at the Record level?</li> <li>• Why are P8 Quality of Information and P16 Physical Characteristics excluded here? Why couldn't they be shared by all members of a Record Set?</li> <li>• Stating that a Record Set must share at least one property contradicts the option previously stated in RiC to have a miscellaneous set.</li> <li>• Could the shared property be as general as being part of the holdings of a single repository (this is the 'set')?</li> <li>• Should also include properties P7 Content Extent, P8 Quality of Information, P9 Scope and Content, P15 Physical or Logical Extent, P16 Physical Characteristics Note, P19 Conditions of Use, P20 History: these being absent makes conversion of all descriptive levels to RiC from ISAD(G) difficult</li> <li>• Description seems more limited in RiC at aggregate level than at Record level, which is contrary to tradition</li> </ul>
3.6.2	<p>Section 3.4 Properties of Record Set, Section 3.5 Properties summarizing the members of a Record Set, Section 3.6 Properties shared by all members of a Record Set</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Properties in s.3.4 seem to belong in s.3.5 (all properties summarizing the members of a Record Set). What is the distinction?</li> <li>• Properties in s.3.5 have the same value as those defined for Record (which is the same as what is stated for properties in 3.6). Distinction is unclear.</li> <li>• Why differentiate between shared and summary properties? Why not just list all properties? No rationale provided.</li> <li>• Was it to identify properties whose value is inherited from lower levels? If so, the better approach is to create one property (Px Shared) whose value applies to Record Set and Record.</li> <li>• Some properties needed to summarize a Record Set are missing.</li> <li>• Some of the shared properties do not refer to the Record Set, but rather to the members: therefore, illogical. Also, why only be applicable to a Record Set if shared by members (e.g. P11 Language)? Would like to summarize multiple languages held by different members of a Set in the Record Set description (e.g. Italian and Latin).</li> </ul>
3.6.3	<p>P22 Authenticity and Integrity Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need examples</li> <li>• Same as in Record?</li> <li>• Missing Quality of Information.</li> <li>• Relation to P20 History: chain of custody (if reformatting and migrating)</li> </ul>
3.6.4	<p>P23 Type</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'Piece' is an example - incorrect word for intended meaning? How is it a Record Set?</li> <li>• Analogous to 'level' in ISAD(G) - please clarify that 'item' is equivalent to RiC's Record not Record Component (?). Some other terms unclear (e.g. 'file' as level vs. file as digital material; how are 'piece' and 'project' sets?)</li> <li>• Re: non-archival sets: intention to include records retention schedules, or some other business classification of records?</li> <li>• Add examples that are different than those in ISAD(G), to explicitly acknowledge that Types can be inherited/used to support other descriptive traditions</li> </ul>
3.6.5	<p>P24 Accrual Note, P25 Accrual Status</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Give accruals further thought: they are part of a process (accessioning) and some may wish to document these as Record Sets (or sub-sets for incorporation into sets). Allow for treatment of accruals as sub-sets with relationships to Record Sets as part of the history of forming the set, and not just a property forecasting future possibilities. Also, may need to manage Transfers or Deposits separately from Accessions because of 1:n relation to Accessions.</li> <li>Merge these into one property (this would be adequate).</li> </ul>
3.6.6	P26 Arrangement, P27 Classification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Classification is one means to arrange Record Sets. Definitions provided need clarification to distinguish between them better.</li> <li>Should these be one property instead of two?</li> </ul>
3.6.7	P26 Arrangement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Physical arrangement should be within scope. It may be the only remnant remaining of the creator's original practices.</li> <li>In some cases intellectual arrangement is reflected in physical arrangement (e.g. chronological order, alphabetical order).</li> <li>Examples seem to be of original (supplied) physical order rather than arrangement. Examples might be 'emerge from a particular function, activity or class' instead.</li> </ul>
3.6.8	P27 Classification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Classification scheme reference' would be more accurate.</li> <li>Some examples seem to be the name of the Record Set.</li> </ul>
3.6.9	P28 History <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove repeated sentence between definition and scope.</li> <li>Don't capitalize Event (no event entity in RiC).</li> </ul>
3.6.10	P31 Scope and Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope is null. Use scope of P9 (Scope and Content of Record entity).</li> <li>Provide examples.</li> </ul>

3.7 Agent Properties	
3.7.1	Section 3.7 Properties shared by all Agents: should also include P39 Contact Information
3.7.2	Agent properties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Juridical status could appear as a separate property (it's currently in the scope notes of P32 Type)</li> <li>ISAAR(CPF) 5.2.7 Internal structures and ISDIAH 5.3.4 Administrative Structure are missing: could represent this through related agents, but a textual field could be useful to summarize</li> </ul>
3.7.3	P32 Type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Typo: "If type is unknown then..."</li> <li>Clarification of "Not all properties under Agent apply to all types" - meaning, not all properties under agent apply to any agent, whatever the property of P32 Type is?</li> <li>The examples show group and corporate body while in ISAAR, the notion of corporate body encompasses group.</li> </ul>
3.7.4	P33 Identity Type <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scope and application of 'assumed' identities - e.g. changes for reasons of marriage, politics, religion?</li> <li>Not a useful distinction: given name and assumed one.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tacit value judgement involved - motivations of the agent in using a particular identity. Not the place of the archivist to determine if an identity is 'real'.</li> <li>• If keep this distinction, flesh out: e.g. include identity type authority and explanation of circumstances of the identity.</li> <li>• Danger in establishing a singular 'true' identity vs. 'assumed or fictitious' identities</li> <li>• This property is unclear</li> <li>• How does RiC manage different names used by/for an Agent?</li> </ul>
3.7.5	<p>P34 Language Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agent may also be a machine, e.g. a script that performed acts on objects. Separate element for machine language?</li> <li>• Why is this property important? Why not include in history of the Agent?</li> <li>• RDA only treats the language of an Agent as relevant when it is expressed in an information resource - better approach for RiC?</li> <li>• Change term name to 'Language' ('information' adds no value, all properties contain information)</li> <li>• Is language used by an Agent a property of a relationships rather than a property of Agent? E.g. used to write a document, conduct business, etc. Attach to relationship to contextualize how the language was used.</li> </ul>
3.7.6	<p>P35 History: 'Concise' because presumed that information about functions, occupations, position, activities of the Agent was separately described (as entities)?</p>
3.7.7	<p>P36 Gender</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not be binary or time-based (it can change)</li> <li>• Better as an entity with relationship Agent identifies as?</li> <li>• Usefulness for users' requirements? Why is it needed?</li> <li>• Cannot know this information in historical records, only how they are described.</li> <li>• Why only gender? Marital status, ethnicity and other related terms could be provided if they appear in historical records.</li> <li>• As administrators/users of historical records, cannot make objective statement regarding the truth of a person's self-identity. Beware the archivist's power to name. Consider implications of asking archivists to record this information. If retain, need guidance so that archivists could do this thoughtfully without causing harm.</li> <li>• If retain, make a non-controlled element - no consensus on terms in use to describe gender and they may change over time.</li> <li>• Current examples given are about sex, not gender.</li> <li>• Beware of dangers of fixing and oversimplifying this category.</li> <li>• If retain, consider citing the source of information regarding a person's gender.</li> <li>• If retain, allow gender to be a repeatable element.</li> <li>• Not enough care has been put into this property; consider other existing models like FOAF.</li> <li>• Alternatives to document demographic grouping mechanisms other than by gender? E.g. woman's literature, African American studies.</li> <li>• Which gender is an individual's legal gender?</li> <li>• Could allow Agent to self-describe (if possible) (ONIX approach)</li> <li>• On whose authority to assign gender designation? Archivist not a good choice.</li> <li>• Leave out gender entirely - practical and ethical considerations.</li> <li>• Could include important information about gender in agent history, don't have separate property. Although this would limit statistical possibilities you could have with a distinct field.</li> <li>• Include 'other' or 'not specified' (better than 'unknown').</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimal use cases demonstrating value of retaining (e.g. disambiguation between Romanized forms of names) - creates more problems than it solves.</li> </ul>
3.7.8	<p>P37 Technical Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Unclear - no scope or examples or explanation</li> <li>In RDA, part of 'capture' information to describe Expression (resource); not part of an Agent</li> </ul>
3.7.9	<p>P38 Services to the Public, P39 Contact Information, P40 Operating Hours, P41 Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lopsided: corporate body has certain properties but not others; some others may be useful and could be added</li> <li>Not the right place for contact info and opening hours</li> <li>ISDIAH was an unnecessary standard from a theoretical point of view because it documents the custody of records that is a relationships.</li> <li>Adopting ISDIAH properties that are associated with an archival repository but in RiC are available for all corporate bodies: misleading.</li> <li>Also, contact information applicable to other types of agents (e.g. donors).</li> <li>Disproportionately address corporate and government records over those from individuals, families, etc. Bias.</li> <li>Add more complex examples to accommodate decentralized corporate bodies like social movements.</li> <li>Properties seem out of place in RiC: omit?</li> <li>ISDIAH origins: apply to a narrow set of corporate bodies. Place these properties among those that apply to any agent.</li> <li>Does 'service to the public' pertain to the original context of creation, or after transfer to an archives? Unclear.</li> <li>ISDIAH origins and liable to change - constant updating? Alternative - offer space somewhere to link to an agent's website.</li> <li>Others could apply to corporate bodies here - P18 Conditions of access and P19 Conditions of Use</li> <li>Missing scope and examples</li> <li>Website and address is not contact information</li> </ul>

### 3.8 Properties of business entities - Occupation, Position, Function, Function (Abstract), Activity, Mandate

3.8.1	These entities and properties (P42-P60) should be reconsidered as vocabulary encoding schemes associated with specific properties of an Agent and other specific entities. This is the approach used in RDA.
-------	--

### 3.9 Properties of Occupation

3.9.1	<p>P42 Type, P43 Description, P44 History</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P42: missing scope</li> <li>P43: missing scope &amp; examples</li> <li>P44: necessary to provide history of occupation?</li> </ul>
-------	---

### 3.10 Properties of Position

3.10.1	P45 Type, P46 Description, P47 History <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• P45: missing scope</li><li>• P46/P47: missing scope &amp; examples</li></ul>
--------	---

### 3.11 Properties of Function

3.11.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Consider ISO 23081-1 which defined four types of functions.</li><li>• P48 Type / P49 Description: missing scope</li><li>• P50 History: missing examples</li></ul>
--------	---

### 3.12 Properties of Function (Abstract)

3.12.1	P51 Description <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why is there no history property? Is it too abstract to have a history?</li><li>• Missing scope.</li></ul>
--------	--

### 3.13 Properties of Activity

3.13.1	Properties of Activity: P52 Type, P53 Description, P54 History <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Needs to be set up like Function / Function (Abstract): to choose between a general and a specific agent</li><li>• P52: categorization of type of activity seems unnecessary</li><li>• P52: Missing scope</li><li>• P53: Definition was confusing - was framed in terms of another entity (Function or Occupation). Re-define as 'Description of the nature, scope and meaning of the Activity.'</li><li>• P53: Clear that Activity can be linked to Function, but also to Function (Abstract)?</li><li>• P53: Example unclear re: what activity is being described. Unclear demarcation between activity and tasks.</li><li>• P54: Missing examples.</li></ul>
--------	--

### 3.14 Properties of Mandate

3.14.1	P55 Type, P56 Description, P57 History <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• P55: missing scope; two examples are also records (decree and letter of appointment)</li><li>• P55: description differs from common archival perspective of mandate - what is the relation to 'general life or work events', for which there is also no example?</li><li>• P56: Missing scope and examples</li><li>• P57: Missing examples. How important is it to provide a history of a Mandate?</li></ul>
--------	---

### 3.15 Properties of Documentary Form

3.15.1	P58 Type, P59 Description, P60 History <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• P58: Missing scope</li><li>• P59: Missing scope and examples</li><li>• P60: Missing scope and examples. How necessary is it to record History of a Documentary Form?</li></ul>
--------	---

### 3.16 Properties of Date

3.16.1	P61 Type, P62 Calendar <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No clear way of indicating that a Date might be approximate or uncertain</li><li>• P61: Missing scope; type 'range' is unnecessary - whether or not a date is a range can be derived from the data</li><li>• P62: Missing scope</li></ul>
--------	--

### 3.17 Properties of Place

3.17.1	P63 Type, P64 Geographic Coordinates, P65 Address <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why is History not available as a property for Place, while it is included for most other entities?</li><li>• P63: Missing scope</li><li>• P63 raises possibility that places are areas, but P64 only has geographical point data (latitude and longitude) - needs points that define an area or polygon too</li><li>• P64: missing scope and examples</li><li>• P65: redundant - Place is already a physical location</li></ul>
--------	--

### 3.18 Properties of Concept/Thing

3.18.1	P66 Type, P67 Description <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Why is History not available as a property for Concept/Thing, while it is included for most other entities?</li><li>• P66/P67: Needs scope and examples. Otherwise meaningless.</li></ul>
--------	---

### 3.19 Shared Properties of a Relation

3.19.1	P68 Date, P69 Place <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Rename 'Properties of Relations' with shared properties being a subsection. Each relation can have properties of its own.</li></ul>
--------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other shared properties: certainty of the assertion - binary yes/no or nuanced exact/approximate; timestamp (for more precise dates); precedence or order (chronological sequence is known though other order is unknown); type or genre (to distinguish between separate assertions with the same form - e.g. temporary or permanent state); identifier (ID); name.</li> <li>• Why is Date a shared property of a relation while elsewhere it is an entity in its own right (E12)?</li> <li>• P69 should not be a shared property, always keep as a separate entity (E13) for better graph design -- e.g. Agent occupies (1985-1990) Position + Agent is associated with (2015-) Place (France).</li> <li>• Specification of dates needs more work - use ISO 8601 for machine processing, but what about archival dates? Other limitations to ISO 8601 (Gregorian calendar; too many options, would need to choose a subset).</li> <li>• How to accommodate archival dates if using ISO 8601: they are approximate, they are often qualified (e.g. circa), they are unknown; archival time periods are often continuing.</li> <li>• Because of these issues, suggest that dates are either explicitly represented in Gregorian calendar; are in the form 'from' date and 'to' date; have two parts (flag and numeric date); flags are 'in', 'by', 'after', 'circa' etc.; numeric date expressed in W3C format</li> <li>• How to cover decades or centuries? Point date and an error?</li> <li>• Date and Place as shared properties doesn't conform with OWL language - which would require reification (the relations would become entities). Suggest having an Event class (agent performs a specific action toward a given entity on a certain date, in a certain place).</li> </ul>
--	---

## 4. Issues Regarding Relations

4.1 General Issues	
4.1.1	<p>Relation as attribute; relation as entity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As attribute: record description would include its relational link to the creating/controlling agency, related records, etc.</li> <li>• As entity: provides more focus on the relation; relations with their own identifiers, dates, and persistent links to related entities (problems at conceptual level in expressing reciprocal relationships and ensuring persistence of relationships)</li> </ul>
4.1.2	<p>Comprehensiveness: too much?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very comprehensive - too much so? Will people actually look at it?</li> <li>• Too detailed - needs to be simpler - difficult to grasp with so many of them</li> <li>• Suggesting not to enumerate all possible combinations of subject, relationship and object: provide relationships as predicates and allow users to determine what kinds of connections to make with them (e.g. with application profiles)</li> <li>• Extensive list but not comprehensive and needs more work</li> <li>• Too long a list - should be moved to annexes; focus on describing concept and possible properties of relations. E.g. say that a relation can be expressed in present or past tense, but don't enumerate all possibilities.</li> <li>• Should the relations be elaborated in RiC-O instead of RiC-CM?</li> <li>• 792 single direction/396 bi-direction over 51 pages: essentially unusable. Such a long list (noted as incomplete) will not be easy to maintain or use effectively.</li> </ul>

	More likely to have inconsistent use which will inhibit machine processing on the model.
4.1.3	<p>Re-use of existing ontologies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In addition to defining a set of RiC relations, allow the use of relations types defined in other ontologies/vocabularies</li> <li>• Why not re-use existing relations with the same definition?</li> <li>• For interoperability, consider adopting an existing set of relations rather than creating a new one</li> </ul>
4.1.4	<p>Binary relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only binary relations are included, while tri- and quad- relations would be needed</li> <li>• Must all relations be binary? Could a relationship among three entities ever be a possibility, or would this be represented as a set of two distinct but related/linked binary relations?</li> <li>• If Date is only implementable as an entity, would this require allowing relations between three entities simultaneously? Or would inference solve the problem (e.g. X is related to Y at date Z; Agent is creator of Record, Record has creation date Date -- infer that Agent created Record on that Date).</li> <li>• Agent + Position + Occupation: Agent held Position, which was related to (fell within the domain of) Occupation. Can one understand 'Agent held Position' without also needing to know about the relation between Position and Occupation? Is there a dependence here that binds the three together?</li> <li>• Ambiguous relations, particularly when using Date. Relating three entities together such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Date:1911 was start date of Position:Teacher</li> <li>○ Date:1911 was associated with Person:Ellen</li> <li>○ Person:Ellen occupied Position:Teacher</li> <li>○ Unclear if this means that Ellen occupied that position starting in 1911, or if 1911 was the start of that position in general, with some other association with Ellen.</li> <li>○ Suggest establishing Date as a property of entities instead, giving start/end dates for each entity plus contextualizing the relationship:</li> <li>○ Position:Teacher (1900-2016) was occupied from 1911-1930 by Person:Ellen (1890-1955)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
4.1.5	<p>Inverse properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need guidance on using/inferring them. E.g. hasPart / isPartOf - only need to assign one of them and should be able to infer the other (OWL processing). State this clearly, as end users might not know this.</li> <li>• Including inverse properties: both CRM and FRBR-LRM declare relations in both directions, too. FRBR-LRM has a more economical presentation.</li> <li>• Explicit inclusion of inverse relations in some instances is not very useful: provide instructions, instead, re: how to infer inverse relations</li> <li>• Not clear if existence of one relation requires the existence of the inverse. May be problematic to require the inverse if, for example, Record Sets are constructed outside the archives holding the records</li> <li>• Defining inverse relations as pairs of standalone relationships is very redundant</li> </ul>
4.1.6	<p>Alignment with records management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add relationships supporting management of records (recordkeeping business) as part of aligning recordkeeping practices across domains and timeframes. Consider existing sets such as AS/NZS 5478:2015 Table A3.3, Recordkeeping metadata property reference set, which conforms with ISO 23081.</li> <li>• Regarding documentation of past recordkeeping events (e.g. in 'History'): Australian practice identifies recordkeeping events to document these actions;</li> </ul>

	<p>could help strengthen the inadequate authenticity/integrity properties (P5/P22); important to consider when inheriting metadata from recordkeeping systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need more detail in the model on the processes that records undergo in all contexts, e.g., migration, application/changing of disposal/access rules, addition of classification in new contexts; process-based metadata helps support assertions of authenticity and integrity, particular in digital world</li> <li>• Some actions performed on a Record could be expressed by relations - conditions of accession (transfer, deposit, donation, acquisition, bequest), actions of consulting, destroying or converting formats</li> </ul>
4.1.7	Persistence: need more detail on how relationships between entities can be sustained over time
4.1.8	<p>How will relationships be assigned?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Between specific entities (e.g. an assertion of a relation between two entities' P1 URIs) or between 'packages' of descriptions of specific entities (which would have their own URI assigned)? Or is this the same thing: the 'package' (description) is collated by each assertion being related to the entity's P1 URI? Or would these P1 URIs represent the entities themselves, but not the descriptions about the entities, particularly since modelling descriptions (control information) was left out of this draft of RiC?</li> </ul>

<b>4.2 Presentation of relations</b>	
4.2.1	<p>Need definitions/explanations and examples.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not necessarily simplistic or one way to interpret/implement - for example, 'creates' could be modelled as 1) Actor_A creates Record_X, OR, 2) Actor_A performs Function_M toProduce Record_X. In 1), Date and Place could be properties of the relation, OR as entities in their own right. In 2), Date and Place could be described as entities, and could contextualize Function_M. Option 2), although more complex, might better suit a context with thousands of create transactions per day.</li> <li>• Relations need descriptions and rationale for their selection. Priorities for including certain relations in archival description over others - are some RiC relations more peripheral (e.g. Position and Occupation R356/R394 – R358/R393)</li> <li>• Some relations have similar names - e.g. Agent authored (R204) or wrote (R218) a Record; Record Sets can be accumulated (R232) or collected (R235) by Agents.</li> </ul>
4.2.2	<p>Presentation creates bloat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Repetition of relation names among relation domains: difficult to identify the basic set of relation names, to see if it's comprehensive or if anything is missing</li> <li>• Duplicative: inverse; past/present expression</li> <li>• Bi-directional: expressing both creates duplication - minimize this</li> <li>• Would like less redundant presentation, consolidating by relation types.</li> <li>• True number of semantically distinct relations in the model is obscured by the presentation: there seems to only be a few dozen semantically distinct relations among the nearly 800 listed. Due to not taking advantage of RiC-E14 Concept/Thing as super-class, as well as treating inverse relations separately, and present/past tense naming. Just declare the building blocks in the conceptual model, and allow implementers to record compound relations directly and derive variants.</li> <li>• Use bi-directional relations rather than single directional relations: to reduce the relationship count by 50%</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have one central list of relations, not spelled out (repeated) entity per entity</li> </ul>
4.2.3	<p>Past/present tense expression</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid this and replace with date information</li> <li>Things that are current won't always be current - a sort of built-in obsolescence as relations change over time</li> <li>Would require continuous reviewing of relations - feasible?</li> <li>What if only some are monitored and updated, while others are not - potentially intellectually incoherent descriptions? How to ensure data reliability?</li> <li>Wasteful and requires high level of maintenance: would have to deprecate an instance of a relationship to replace it with another having the same meaning but in past tense.</li> <li>Use Dates or 'extant'/'former' as a property of the relationship instead - would also help reduce the number of distinct relation types</li> <li>Is this necessary? With Date as a shared property of a relation, would not be necessary to include temporal differences (past/present) in the list of relations</li> <li>Alternatives: eliminate all past tense; use future tense instead, particularly for Record-entities subject to records management practices</li> <li>Since all present tense relationships will become past in the future, no need to duplicate past and present - use Date property (P68) instead</li> <li>When date of a relation is unknown, use a qualifier like 'unknown date' or 'without date' -- these could be new properties of Date entity.</li> <li>Concern for scalability of the implementation of the past/present mechanism in archival description</li> <li>Could avoid by rephrasing - for example "associated with".</li> <li>What is the default value (present or past)?</li> <li>If it is most meaningful for an archives to make statements about the past, what is the use of the distinction?</li> <li>Potential solution: use qualifiers to indicate start time and end time, or express that the statement was valid at a given point in time, or no statement at all</li> <li>What if one's language doesn't have grammatical tense?</li> <li>What is the semantic distinction?</li> <li>Event-based models like CIDOC-CRM are more effective when the chronology of properties is important.</li> <li>RDA uses date attributes of entities to allow human users to infer the currency of the data.</li> <li>There may be specific relations where past/present distinction is useful (needs more clarity): e.g. Record was member of Record Set (where membership had changed). Could have an indicator to signify a past relationship, or predicates (relation name) could be listed independently of the entity names (reducing the number of combinations listed) and could be used with any or specified entities.</li> <li>Assumes the perspective of the present that runs counter to the intention of contextual networks: using entities, relations and properties to show change through time. Use date information rather than relation tenses.</li> <li>Present tense could be understood as generally true - e.g. X is child of Y means that X is always a child of Y.</li> </ul>
4.2.4	<p>Needs more dynamic presentation of relationships</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E.g. on a website</li> <li>Needs more multi-dimensionality: have categories of relationships (e.g. creation) that link to more expansive lists, perhaps referencing other standards</li> <li>Difficult to follow interconnections in this table format - could have dynamic digital diagram in the form of a wheel with a hub and spokes; a user could choose</li> </ul>



	any entity to be the hub and can see all bidirectional relationships it may have as spokes; ideally could choose 2-3 hubs and see all relations, or just mutual relations
--	---

4.3 Classification or categorization of relations	
4.3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider a broader classification of relations, which would be more flexible for local use</li> <li>Welcome the grouping/merging of relations as suggested in RiC 4.1, note 4 (e.g. 'is member of', 'is part of', etc. which are applicable to different entities)</li> <li>Might have multiple relations of the same type between a pair of entities: need to accommodate this</li> <li>Need to identify underlying relation types and clarify terms to ensure consistent interpretation. This will help refine/expand contested concepts (e.g. create) and identify overlap or redundancies.</li> <li>Which relations would be grouped under relationship-type 'Formation' and which would be acceptable statements of provenance? Would other non-Formation relations reflect provenance (e.g. Agent 'establish' as ambient provenance)?</li> <li>Would typing relations help/hinder clarifying provenance?</li> <li>Entity/Relationship type: would it contain all instances that operate according to the same recordkeeping requirements, allowing for extensions by sub-types? This may allow for management at the level of each type rather than each instance.</li> <li>Consider that ownership is a succession relation in disguise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AGENCY B--&lt;succeeds&gt;--AGENCY A in 1925 in exercise of FUNCTION G</li> <li>AGENCY A--&lt;succeeded by&gt;--AGENCY B in 1925 in exercise of FUNCTION G</li> <li>AGENCY A--&lt;exercised/owns&gt;--FUNCTION G from 1901 to 1925</li> <li>AGENCY B--&lt;exercised/owns&gt;--FUNCTION G from 1925 to 1980</li> <li>FUNCTION G--&lt;was exercised/owned by&gt;--AGENCY A from 1901 to 1925</li> <li>FUNCTION G--&lt;was exercised/owned by&gt;--AGENCY B from 1925 to 1980</li> </ul> </li> <li>Could conceptualisation and implementation be separate, so that the number of instances would be inconsequential - the same standardised practice would govern them all. Implementers could select those instance of use to them, ignore the rest, and apply the rules (or not) as appropriate). Identify general policies/procedures/roles that could apply in any descriptive programme, jurisdiction or practice?</li> <li>Types of relationships: provenance, succession, containment, associative. Also, Events/Actions - allowed description of things done to or on records.</li> <li>Grouping. Where relationships are applicable to all entities, define them once in a generic 'entity' section, not duplicate them in each entity specific section.</li> <li>With such an extensive list, and working with allied professionals, suggest having meta-categories of relations: temporal, associative, familial, hierarchical, and whether something is part of a larger whole, or a separate but related entity.</li> </ul>
4.3.2	<p>Based on RiC (vs. starting from scratch): an attempt at a categorisation into relationship-types (without the benefit of certainty as to what any of the terms mean):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship-Type : Formation (63 instances) viz. "create/created by"; "authored"; "collect(ed)"; "wrote/written"; results from/in"; "accumulate"; "assemble"; "arrange"; "establish".</li> <li>Relationship-Type : Governance (42 instances) viz. "owns/owned by"; "rights held"; "controls"; "directs"; "manages"; "superior/subordinate".</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relationship-Type : Succession (22 instances) viz. “successor/predecessor”; “parent/child”.</li> <li>Relationship-Type : Belonging (30 instances) viz. “part/part of”; “member of”; “is/has example”.</li> <li>Relationship-Type : Possession (12 instances) viz. “held/holder”.</li> <li>Relationship-Type : Transmission (4 instances) viz. “sent by”.</li> <li>Relationship-Type : Documentary Features (73 instances) viz. “copy of”; “draft/original of”; “subject of”; “addressee”; “documentary form”; “evidence of”.</li> <li>Relationship-Type : Existential Features (57 instances) viz. “has/had functional relation”; “assumed identity”; “sibling/spouse”; “uses [agent-delegate]”; “pursues/occupies [position or occupation]”; “fulfils [function]”; “performs [activity]”; “authorize(d)”; “required competency”; “defined/revised [by mandate]”.</li> </ul>
4.3.3	<p>Consider refining this by adopting the basic relations defined for UML Class Diagrams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Instance-level relationships <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dependency</li> <li>Association</li> <li>Aggregation</li> <li>Composition</li> </ul> </li> <li>Class-level relationships <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generalization</li> <li>Realization</li> </ul> </li> <li>General relationship <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dependency</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

#### 4.4 Digital copies, renditions, manifestations

4.4.1	<p>Digital records</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to think of digital manifestations, not just copies: unclear how one would handle a relation between multiple manifestations of the same text</li> <li>What about digitization copies (e.g. scanned paper records) and rendition copies (e.g. versions of born digital records made for preservation and access purposes)? Could have more explicit relationships like 'isCopyOf', 'isRenditionOf'</li> <li>Could be helpful to introduce the concept of the work and its relation to multiple manifestations (from library cataloguing)</li> </ul>
-------	--

#### 4.5 Comments about specific kinds of relations

4.5.1	<p>"Is associated with"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too basic to be meaningful</li> <li>Define once and apply it to many entities (vs. the current 180 occurrences)</li> <li>If all relations are a sub-relation or specialization of 'isAssociatedWith' state this specifically</li> <li>Reflect hierarchical relationships between generic relations such as this and more specialized relations.</li> </ul>
-------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarify if the association relationship can exist between instances of the same entity. The only RDA/LRM entity generally excluded from the same-entity association is Nomen</li> </ul>
4.5.2	<p>"has subject"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RDA/LRM limits the "has subject" relationship to the Work entity - only Works can have subjects. All others, and the Work itself, can be the "subject of" a Work.</li> </ul>
4.5.3	<p>authorship relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Addressed in two areas - Record and Agent relations (authored by / created by / collected by / written by); incomplete -- need also edited by, annotated by, abridged by, etc. Suggest looking to RDA relators (MARC Code list for relators).</li> </ul>
4.5.4	<p>Has member / has part</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Could be conflated to one generic parts relation - but would this work for how Record Sets are described?</li> </ul>

4.6 Comments about Record-entity relations	
4.6.1	<p>Record-based entities (general)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distinction made in EAD between 'related document' and 'separated document' is missing for Record/Record Set/Record component</li> <li>For Record/Record Set/Record Component and Agent relations: add 'built by' (e.g. 3D models), edited by, modified by, approved/controlled by, received by</li> <li>For Record/Record Set/Record Component and Position relations: add 'is evidence of'</li> <li>For Record/Record Set/Record Component and Date relations: add 'was destruction date of' and 'was modification date of'</li> <li>Comparing Record/Record Set/Record Component relations, potentially missing: Record has coverage date; Record Component is evidence of Mandate</li> </ul>
4.6.2	<p>Record relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R21/22: intellectual property rights, or rights to grant access to the material? How does this mesh with P18/P19 for access and use?</li> <li>R31 vs R35: creator vs. writer?</li> <li>R38 Record resulted from Occupation: Occupation requires a description of Function - so why the direct relation between Record and Occupation here?</li> <li>R42 same as above (R38), except with Record and Position</li> <li>R57: provide use case or explanation how the Record is evidence of a Mandate</li> <li>R64: Provide use case/explanation when or how Record is associated with a Date, especially if the date cannot be used as a RiC-P68 property</li> <li>R71/R72: what is the difference between 'is associated with' and 'has subject' between Record and Concept/Thing</li> <li>How would indicating the location of originals/reproductions of a Record be accomplished using RiC-CM? With 'is original of'/'is copy of' alongside P21 Record State = copy/original? Plus a relation to a Place (+P65 Address)? Or would 'location' actually be a corporate body (Agent) in some cases (archive repository)?</li> </ul>
4.6.3	<p>Record Component relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R89/R95: is owner of/was owner of - should be is owned by/was owned by</li> <li>R82 Record Component is associated with Record Set: provide example of when a Record Component would be associated with a Record Set and not a Record (not that the definition of Record Component is that it is part of a Record)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R89/R95: Record Component is owner of Agent/was owner of Agent -- please explain</li> <li>• R155/R158/R160: explain difference between 'accumulated by', 'assembled by', 'collected by'</li> </ul>
4.6.4	<p>Record Set relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why can't Record Set have as subject another Record Set?</li> <li>• Relations between Record Sets - R142 (associated with), R144 (predecessor of), R145 (successor of) and R146 (was associated with): don't seem to allow for more specific explanation of the relation between two record sets (e.g. two series within an 'archival bond') - would that be done as a property of the relation, or just within the properties of the two entities?</li> <li>• 4.1.3: Welcome making explicit that the Date of a Record Set is extrapolated from below (dates of the various individual Records in the set)</li> </ul>

4.7 Comments about Agent relations	
4.7.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could there be more relations between Agent and Record? Consider other options identified in RDA.</li> <li>• Could have a family relationship instead of specifying all permutations within a family.</li> <li>• What about other types of Agents that don't involve creator/contributor responsibilities - e.g. a dealer who facilitated a sales transaction of private records?</li> <li>• Need more relations concerning use of Records to reflect the intricate issues?</li> <li>• R234/R235: difference between assembled/collected?</li> <li>• R245/R213: what would an example of Agent sent Record Set/Record? A transfer to an archives repository?</li> <li>• R250/R251: between Agents, controls/controlled - how is this different from a hierarchical relation? If there is a difference, should it be done somehow with Mandate?</li> <li>• R253/R257 (agent-functional relation-agent) How this should be used?</li> <li>• R255/251 (agent(group)-"part of"-agent (group)) maybe some other name for relation</li> <li>• R264/265: why 'director' relation between agents?</li> <li>• R298/R299: Is Position only used for persons (occupying it), or could it also relate to groups? Same comment for R293/R294 Agent pursues Occupation.</li> <li>• R314/R315: provide use case or explanation where Agent is/was associated with Documentary Form</li> <li>• R262/R265/R267/R270/R271: better to just have R260 Agent is associated with Agent with an additional property like Type (child, parent, sibling, spouse)? Current approach too stiff compared to real world.</li> </ul>

4.8 Comments about Business-entity relations	
4.8.1	<p>Business entities (generally)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding the inheritance of relations from Record Sets by their members (p. 11, s.1.8.2): could a conflict be created if also relating them to activities? Inheriting a</li> </ul>

	<p>relation to a Function while being individually related to activities? Confusing for the user?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indirect relation (i.e. Agents perform Activities, in which transactions (a subset of Activities) are carried out, producing Records): need clarification on causal relations between business entities and other entities</li> <li>• Limit application of some relations to Agent -- specifically for Occupation, Position, Function, Activity, Mandate. Alternatively could model these as properties of Agent rather than as entities.</li> <li>• R400/R401, R404/R405: Position in associative relations to Function and Activity: while Position and Agent also have direct relations to Record. How does this configuration highlight the role of the Agent in the context of the Record (creation/accumulation)?</li> </ul>
4.8.2	<p>Function relations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• R442/R443: is there a need for Function-Position relations?</li> <li>• R463 Function was revised by Mandate: what would be the use case?</li> <li>• R359/R360: Occupation is/was associated with Function -- if Occupation is needed with Function, why only associative relations?</li> </ul>

<b>4.9 Documentary Form relations</b>	
4.9.1	R622/R623 Documentary Form is/was associated with Agent: provide use case/explanation

<b>4.10 Concept/Thing relations</b>	
4.10.1	Concept/Thing needs to be related to other Concept/Things in a more nuanced way

## 5. Appendices

<b>5.1 Comments on Appendices I and III</b>	
5.1.1	<p>Appendix I - Diagram</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Modify to include functions in consideration of 'chain processes' as described on p. 10 ("The model enables..."). This would show how Function descriptions illustrate context, reaching over multiple corporate bodies (Agents).</li> <li>• Consider need to show inverse relations. Need a more developed diagram - note that archivists' linking decisions will rely on authority records as well as content</li> <li>• Does this diagram depict the only form of presentation? What are alternatives? The presentation must be related to users' needs and search strategies</li> </ul>
5.1.2	<p>Appendix III - Bibliography</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider reviewing/adding Lemieux's project on data visualizations and archival description</li> <li>• Consider adding DPLA's recent paper on content aggregations</li> <li>• Minor editorial corrections ("Bautier Robert-Henry"; "Eastwood")</li> <li>• Consider adding Nougaret, Christine... Les instruments de recherche dans les archives (1999)</li> </ul>