

TS EAS Annual Meeting Notes

Location: Zoom (virtual)
Dates: August 11-14, 2025
Time: 9 a.m.-2 p.m. EST daily

Monday, August 11, 2025 Summary

- **Meeting kickoff/Introductions** to new TS-EAS members (Yogita Sharma, Carmella Furio) and early career member (Rebecca Hamburgess). Co-chairs reviewed meeting agenda, meeting norms, and the TS-EAS timeline. Also outlined goals for Day 1.
- **Outstanding Standards Decisions discussion**
 - EAC-F: Karin confirmed that there are no outstanding issues
 - EAC-CPF: Marie led the discussion of the remaining issues for EAC-CPF
 - GitHub issue #238 - Rename <provenanceEvent> and adapt its content model to eliminate confusion and/or misunderstanding.
 - **Resolutions:**
 - Rename <provenanceEvent> to <narrativeEvent>
 - All sub-elements are repeatable
 - GitHub issue # 267 - Attributes for <multipleIdentities>
 - **Resolutions:**
 - Parent and wrapper elements should have the same attributes as child elements (for language attribution and assertion description).
 - Detailed examples are needed in the Best Practices Guide to clearly explain the multiple identities element.
 - <function(s)> in EAC-CPF records
 - Issues:
 - Retaining an element <function(s)> and a standard (EAC-F) which share a name but are defined differently might be considered a conflict with TS-EAS design principles.
 - The current use of the term <function> in an EAC-CPF record is descriptive and/or provides an access point from a controlled vocabulary rather than expressing a function as defined by ISO.
 - **Resolutions:**
 - Rename <function(s)> to <function(s)Performed>. This element will provide information about a function, activity, role or purpose performed by the CPF entity

- being described.
 - <function(s)Performed> will act as a simpler version of EAC-F for those users who want to create minimal description for EAC-CPF entities.
 - Detailed examples are needed in the Best Practices Guide to clearly explain the <function> element.
- Outstanding issue for EAD:
 - Issue: <function> in EAD
 - Kerstin provided background information for <function> in EAD including comparison to EAC-CPF 2.0.1 and EAF 1.0. Made the distinction that the <function> element in EAD is to document the relationship between a function and the described materials it generated.
 - Provided several different options for discussion:
 - Option 1: Keep <function> as is for EAD 4.0
 - Option 2: Replace <function> with more generic <subject>, i.e. remove element entirely from EAD 4.0
 - Option 3: Follow EAC-CPF in renaming the element (e.g., <functionDocumented>)
 - **Resolutions:**
 - Retain <function> as it currently is for EAD 4.0
 - Detailed examples are needed in the Best Practices Guide to clearly explain the <function> element.
- Overall conclusions from the outstanding standard decisions discussion:
 - Would be helpful to find some examples of <function> that are recorded from institutions using AtoM and from the larger community.
 - Monitor reactions to <functionPerformed>/<function> and update BPG as needed.
 - There needs to be some education about why someone would use EAC-F. Consider specific activities to promote EAF and arrange some webinars/discussions.
 - Some simple diagrams in the BPG might be very helpful (example: https://www.accesstomemory.org/en/docs/2.9/_images/core-entity-types.jpg)
- **Best Practices Guide (BPG)**
 - Iris provided background and rationale for BPG, how the BPG is generated online (GitHub pages, Markdown), guidelines for formatting the content, and recommendations for restructuring the BPG to better accommodate all EAS. She concluded her presentation by emphasizing collaboration and a timeline for iterations, releases and archives.

- The floor opened for questions and comments. Questions were raised about clarity, accessibility, cross-referencing, and distinguishing the BPG from existing resources like the tag library and EADiva.
- **Suggestions:**
 - Include both basic and advanced examples to cater to different user needs.
 - Provide multiple access points to topics (e.g., through EAD, functions, or shared elements). Ensure users can easily jump between related schema and section content.
 - Emphasis should be on holistic use cases and encoding scenarios, not element-by-element explanations. Examples should reflect “real world” encoding practices, not creative deviations.
 - Community contributions should be reviewed and vetted and there should be a balance between committee examples and user-submitted examples.
 - Ruth Kitchen Tillman expressed interest in developing something like EADiva for EAD4—possible opportunity for collaboration. The co-chairs will reach out to Ruth.
 - For version crosswalks, provide human-readable mappings (e.g., EAD2002 → EAD4). This could be included in the BPG or possibly separate.
 - There should be clear labeling of sections (e.g., "About EAD", not just "EAD") to manage user expectations.
 - Highlight attribute best practices and common pitfalls; explain why and when to use certain attributes through contextual examples.
 - Use GitHub issue template and community review -- clarify who has final approval.
 - In the end, we need to be collaborative, thoughtful, and cautious about scope creep.

Tuesday, August 12, 2025 Summary

- Mary & Karin provided a summary of the presentations, discussions, and resolutions from Day 1. TS-EAS members provided feedback and raised additional questions.
 - GitHub issue #267 - Attributes for <multipleIdentities>
 - A recap was made due to some participants not being on the call at the time for the discussion yesterday to explain the resolution from Day 1.
 - Best Practices Guide
 - Two additional questions were asked:
 - *Would it be helpful to have a crosswalk from the EAS standards to Records in Context (RiC)?* Overall the TS-EAS members agreed this would be very helpful, but hold off until next year after the revised standards have been approved by SAA Council and after TS-EAS members are better versed in RiC.
 - *Would it be helpful to maintain a list of projects or institutions using EAD, EAC-CPF, EAC-F for community members to contact if they have questions?* This would be very difficult to maintain. We should also think about this as more outreach and communication. This includes how we're going to engage with the EAS Section leadership in outreach efforts.
- Karin provided an overview of the concept of shared elements and decisions made. She explained the reasons for shared elements, provided links to both the shared elements in the Tag Libraries and to the TS-EAS Design Principles, emphasizing Principle 1, "each element will be defined once." She pointed out that we have not made a formal decision regarding the sharing of elements and attributes across all standards.
 - **Resolution:** the entire TS-EAS membership formally agreed that the aligned EAS should include shared elements and attributes. Members also suggested that the TL/BPG should highlight where elements/attributes are shared and why they are shared.
- Karin also initiated the final discussion about decisions made regarding examples. While there was agreement in Chicago that examples should be moved out of the Tag Libraries and into the BPG, no formal decision was made by TS-EAS.
 - Specifically, the question was where to put encoding examples? **Several options/suggestions**, including the pros and cons of each, were discussed:
 - Move examples entirely out of the TL and into BPG.
 - Keep very simple "snippets" of encoding in TL and move lengthier encoding examples/explanations into the BPG.
 - Provide a fully encoded example (with annotations) and a "core" encoded example. For a "core" encoded example, we still need to decide what this

looks like.

- Create a BPG/TL main landing page that includes crosswalks, links to both. This could be a work-around for both the submission package and the need for minor revisions.
- Connect with Ruth Kitchin Tillman (EADiva) to figure out how to collaborate.
- Alex provided an update on the Tag Libraries providing an introduction, explaining how the tag libraries have changed over time (for the better), explaining shared pages, shared elements and attributes, and what was next for the tag libraries. The presentation prompted the continuing discussion of:
 - Where to put encoding examples (TL, BPG, or both)
 - What encoding examples represent (e.g., definitional, illustration)
 - Who are the encoding examples for/how are they being used
 - The difference between a simple encoding (“snippet”) sample and a more enhanced example
 - Whether coding examples should stand alone, be grouped, or both
 - The repetition of encoding examples should be minimized
 - Whether to include encoding for all elements or just those “where we care” e.g. with regard to interoperability
 - Other groups that we should be reaching out to?
 - **Resolution:** It was recommended and agreed by TS-EAS members that a small working group looks into this in more detail instead of at the subcommittee level.
 - Group will include Mary (will coordinate meeting), Elizabeth, Alex, Ailie, and Kerstin
 - The timeline for this working group is tight - work needs to be completed before October 1
 - Next step: Mary will set up meetings for the working group.
- Karin presented recommendations regarding transparency in descriptive practices. She reminded TS-EAS members of decisions made including not to add a new control element for describing AI/DEI/Harmful language, but using the elements we already have. She also pointed out other concerns raised in GitHub issue #163 which asked about including statements with regard to accessibility in archival description, and encoding content warnings.
 - **Resolutions:**
 - Agreed that the statements with regard to accessibility should be in <accessConditions>. One of the examples included in the issue should be included in the BPG.
 - Agreed that the encoding examples for artificial intelligence (AI) were valid and

should remain as is.

- Agreed that the encoding examples for DEI/harmful language were valid and should remain as is, but that a note regarding content warnings should be added. Users should follow the content descriptive rules outlined by their institution for such warning; it is not something for the EAS.
- Agreed that the topic paper (with minor revisions) should be included in the BPG

Wednesday, August 13, 2025 Summary

- Mary & Karin provided a summary of the presentations, discussions, and resolutions from Day 2.
- We then moved straight into the breakout discussions. As a reminder the discussions were:
 - Breakout #1: Relations – how do we want the user community to use relations? Explanatory text and examples. (Led by Elizabeth)
 - **Summary:**
 - The group explored multiple scenarios (e.g., manuscript collections, oral histories) to compare encoding with and without the use of "relations" in EAD and EAC-CPF.
 - Relations enable more precise, structured, and machine-readable connections between different entities—beyond what can be captured through plain text.
 - As existing TS-EAS vocabularies remain on a more general level and didn't offer enough granularity or detail for some use cases, the group explored alternatives like RiC to express nuanced relationships.
 - The team plans to clean up and share XML code snippets that show side-by-side comparisons of metadata examples with and without relations, highlighting when their use adds meaningful value. Examples will be reused in the BPG.
 - Breakout #2: Alignment of standards – EAS “one pager” that will serve as an executive summary of this work. (Led by Andrew)
 - **Summary:**
 - The group emphasized a strategic shift from "misalignment by design" (where EAD and EAC-CPF developed on separate paths) to a unified suite of three aligned standards—sharing elements, attributes, and revision cycles (“alignment by design”).
 - While outlining the goals of alignment, the group noted the overlap between purpose and benefits, ultimately organizing the one-pager around stakeholder-specific advantages.
 - Stakeholders identified included archivists, archival institutions, aggregators, educators, software developers, and standards maintainers. The document aims to clarify how each group benefits from the aligned standards.
 - The team plans to refine the wording and visuals of the one-pager, with Mary volunteering to turn the draft into an infographic—pending broader access and collaborative editing of the document.

- Breakout #3: Tag library and shared elements “one pager” (Led by Alex)

- **Summary:**

- The group concentrated on the practical aspects of shared elements—how and why they’re implemented across standards—tracing their evolution over the last two years and emphasizing their role in unifying the tag libraries.
 - Key advantages discussed included easier maintenance, standardized definitions, improved interoperability across standards (e.g., EAD, EAC-CPF), and will be easier to pick up since elements behave similarly across contexts.
 - The group clarified that technical and structural differences between standards may prevent perfect alignment, but these are not conceptual mismatches—core elements remain consistent and reusable.
 - With shared elements now affecting all standards, the team stressed the need for long-term, collective oversight of the tag libraries through coordinated governance and documentation.

Thursday, August 14, 2025 Summary

- Mary & Karin provided a summary of the presentations, discussions, and resolutions from Day 3.
- Karin provided an overview of the next steps for the standards revision, including the timeline for the submission packet (which was revised from October 1, 2025 to October 31, 2025) and the various components and companions (e.g., outreach and communication) to the submission packet. She stressed that it's going to be a busy couple of months and that we (co-chairs) will likely be reaching out to teams for information.
- As part of the standards revision, Karin also mentioned that there currently is no "home" for the publication of EAC-F and investigations will be made in where it will be placed.
- Karin also provided an overview of the preparations for the next EAS phase where we will be looking into how other content models like RiC, DadoCM and others can be expressed with the EAS standards. The goal would be to by latest having created a draft of the next phase to be approved by Standards Committee and SAA Council by the 2026 SAA annual meeting.
- The TS-EAS annual meeting wrapped up with an open meeting which provided an update from TS-EAS. The presentation began with a short introduction to TS-EAS and the goals of the TS-EAS annual meeting. A majority of the meeting focused on a recap of the four meeting days, including a presentation about the Best Practices Guide (Iris Lee) and the Tag Libraries.(Alex Duryee). Information about the submission packet and the results from the final comments for EAD were also provided. There were 23 participants, with about half from outside the TS-EAS membership. The presentation is found on the microsite and in the GitHub repository for notes.
- After the open meeting ended, the TS-EAS annual meeting was formally adjourned.