I put in this document the brief evaluations of all the ontologies seen for the description. I think it could be a good base with these criteria, but I can change or extend them.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ONTOLOGY | HIERARCHICAL LEVELS | CLASSES | OBJECT PROPERTIES | DATA  PROPERTIES | IN USE/ DIFFUSION | MAINTAINED | STANDARD IN USE/CONCEPTUAL MODEL |
| ARCHIVAL | Only two simple levels: Collection and Manuscript | 8 | 15 | 0 | ? | Probably not. | None |
| ReLoad EAC-CPF | None (ontology for Record Creators) | 37 | 32 | 44 | In use only in IBC  (and in the SAN’s derived ontologies) | See below | Semantic translation of EAC-CPF [ISAAR(CPF)] |
| ReLoad OAD | None: there is only a “level of description” property, but it’s not that useful for hierarchical structures | 41 | 42 | 31 | In use only in IBC  (and in the SAN’s derived ontologies) | I don’t know (Probably now they’re more focused on XDAMS, and maybe they could think that the domain is described according to standards, but we can’t know in advance if they’re going to update the ontology - according to a future update or a change of the standard - or what) | ISAD(G), EAC-CPF |
| ReLoad OCSA | None (Ontology for Archival Holdings and their services) | 8 | 7 | 3 | In use only in IBC  (and in the SAN’s derived ontologies) | See above |  |
| SAN | Almost one: “hasUpperLevel” property make a connection between one “UOD”(unity of description) and another, but apparently it’s not intended to give a real hierarchical structure | 40 | 34 | 50 | In use only for SAN’s LOD (last updated in december 2014 [→ Stefano Vitali is no more the director?]) | It’s hard to decide. Maybe not: LOD’s last update date back to two years ago, and maybe the project it’s hold to be ended. But, anyway , it doesn’t seem to be very common or popular. | All the above from ReLoad project |
| LOCAH | None: it has only one property “Level”, that makes a connection between “Archival Resource” and its Level class. | 24 | 17 | 43 | In use only in LOCAH and Linking Lives (its “sequel”) | It seems to been not maintained anymore: “*The Linking Lives project (2011-12) is a follow on from the Locah project (2010-11)*” | Mix of semantic well known ontologies and vocabularies modelled on the needs of the project: not standard compliant |
| SNAC | SNAC’s aim is to describe properly the archival context, not the archive itself, anyway they are waiting for RiC-O to better the archival description part of the project | ? | ? | ? | Used and supported by many institutions in the U.S. | Maintained and funded | EAC-CPF compliant, waiting RiC-O to be also compliant with the other standards |
| APEx | Using EAD, they have the hierarchical possibilities of EAD, but it isn’t a semantic use of EAD. (I think they have not made yet the “ontological translation”) | ? | ? | ? | In use inside the project , because of the adaptions to have more consistent data. | Maintained by the working group. | Compliant with all the standards (EAD, ISAD(G), ISAAR,...), but not yet “semantic” |
| RiC-CM (O?) | For a “multi-dimensional description” → multi-level and multi-relation. No explicit hierarchical structure, but the RecordSet can have as members of the Set one or many other RecordSet, creating the hierarchical structure. | 14 | (792) [it’s the number of possible relations, but I’m not sure: I think it’s less] | 68 | If it will maintain the expectations it will be use by many institutions and project, also because it would be the first semantic standard by ICA, and so very authoritative. | It will probably be maintained by ICA (EGAD). | Compliant with all the standards, and “semantic native” |