Comments/Responses to AT/Archon Integration High-Level Requirements

I: **List of Respondents**

1. Archivists' Toolkit Roundtable

2. Columbia College, Chicago

3. Dahousie University

4. Georgia Tech

5. Georgia Tech

6. Harvard University

7. MIT

8. North Carolina State University

9. Smithsonian Institution

10. Stanford University

11. Syracuse University

12. Texas A&M University

13. University of California, Los Angeles

14. University of Miami

15. Yale University

16. Yeshiva University

II: Responses

1:   Archivists' Toolkit Roundtable Steering Committee (ATRTSC):

General comments/questions

The parameters of the feedback are somewhat confusing. It is stated that the features listed are based on current AT and Archon functionality with no intention to add functionality. However, it is likely that the new merged application will have to be created from the ground up, and as such, there might be an opportunity to make modest changes to the functionality. Some of the comments that follow are about missing elements, fields, etc. that could potentially be incorporated with some ease if the team desired and thus we have included them. There is also concern about larger issues, such as with plug-in development. For example, we weren't sure how much to add in terms of features/functions we'll need on users or reference info. Will there be an opportunity to provide feedback on development of a reference module (or is the AT/Archon team looking to its users to develop?)

Is the system that is being developed robust enough to manage really large collections? Will it be sustainable?

A real working through the wedding of the two different utilities isn't apparent. There is some muddying of where certain functions are controlled; e.g.:
O Rights – somewhat controlled within Work Order, Accessions, and again in Rights
O the Assessment Module and the AVSAP functions overlap

Unclear what support will be given to AT while the development is going on. Some of us are moving ahead with developing modules because we need functionality immediately, but we are placing faith in the hope that our work will not become obsolete/ will be compatible with new system.

Archives Functions

o   Repository information is not aligned with any particular standard; additional fields would be required to support either EAG or ISDIAH
o   Repository Info: URL should be repeatable, or add options for: Facebook Page, Twitter account, Blog address
o   Repository Stats: seem to be geared toward revenue-gathering functions. Add options for other services; e.g. public programs, outreach, instructional sessions, training, workshops, classes…with fill in.
o   Subareas of repositories and associations with materials
o   User Info: Grouping content providers and end users in same table could get sloppy. In AT currently, lowest access level (1) still gives write permission to resource records. Need to track end users but not assign them privileges if there is a public web interface. Would need to track addresses for end users, not for content providers. There should be a way to retire, but not delete, a user (content provider) account. Is that what "Account Locked?" is for?
o   Multiple users: More than one person, each entering data for different functions, should be able to work on a given collection at one time (so long as it is not for the same record); e.g. one person creating digitization work order while another is working on a collection-level MARC record.
o   Audit feature: keeping track of who's doing what. (Is data entry tracked by user ID and date?) This could be tied to a wiki-like history roll-back feature or undo feature.

- User levels / Permission Controls: Ability to more specifically customize individual user permissions and levels; ability to control the levels of access in terms of viewing/editing ability.
- Collection Management: Need check boxes for "processed" and "cataloged" so this info can be recorded without date specificity. Should be required to link a C.M. record to at least one accession, resource, or digital object; o/w record would be useless. Highly desirable to be able to add a C.M. record directly from an accession, resource, or digital object record rather than going to separate menu.
- Collections Management and Assessment tabs: Both can be set to link to 0 or more resources, accessions, or digital object records. What is meant by linking to 0 resources? Shouldn't it instead be required that they link to at least one of those records, be it a resource, digital object, or accession record? Because collection management and assessment records don't include fields for title, etc., how would they be tracked without this link?
- Assessment section currently duplicated (Assessments and AVSAP); ought to be combined somehow. The "Institutions" and "Storage Facilities" subsections would be more usefully located as part of the Repository records.
- Assessment: add fields for recording appraised value, insurance value, name of appraiser, date of appraisal, and option to link to digital copy of appraisal (such as ability to link to external files in accessions currently). Note: info about appraisal/monetary value might be more usefully associated with accessions tab, rather than assessment. As with C.M. above, should be required to link an Assessment record to at least one accession, resource, or digital object; w/o record would be useless. Highly desirable to be able to add an Assessment record directly from an accession, resource, or digital object record rather than going to separate menu.
- Work orders should provide record status/location of materials, advising patrons in Web interface that the materials are unavailable.
- Work orders: Is intention to allow repositories to manage R&R requests? If so, should have the options of: recording if a permission form was sent and received. Also, it would be useful to be able to link to a digital copy of a signed permission form. What is the relationship between this tab and the Rights tab? How to integrate these two better so that rights for reproduction requests can be administered more effectively.
- Accessions: Need fields from AT: Acquisition Type (means of acquisition) and General Accession Note. As noted above, should be able to add Collection Management and Assessment Records directly from this screen.
- Accessions: Why does Resources offer "attributes to control Web output" but not accessions?
- Extent and date information should be repeatable, perhaps with option to turn functionality on or off for repository (i.e.,closer integration of NWDA/UMA-based extension plugins in database or application core)
- Resources: "Related archival materials URL" should be part of "Related Archival Material" note, or this info should also be available through the latter. What happened to General Physical Description Note available in AT?
- Resources and Digital Objects: Search should be more robust, allowing searches within notes fields in particular.
- Deaccessions: Should be able to add deaccession record directly from resource, accession, or d.o. record. Will this module allow for management of materials awaiting deaccessioning in the future (such as records scheduled for future destruction or items that are part of an appraised, tax-deducted gift and therefore cannot be discarded for 3 years after their receipt by the repository)? Will there be a way to retire, without deleting, records for deaccessioned accessions, resources, or digital objects (or components thereof)?
- Rights: This module has a somewhat duplicative relationship/overlap with: accessions (rights info), resources (restriction notes), and work orders (where R&R requests might be managed). How to integrate in most meaningful way and avoid duplication?
- DACS minimal level requirements should be available in the primary data entry screen, where possible (e.g., moving accessrestrict and scopecontent to the first tab)
- Digital object record missing extent information (and other elements), while many of the current note types are less useful for that item type
- Names: How the various kinds of names will be managed, through one or multiple areas? (Names as Creator, donor, researcher, vendor)
- Names: add URL field (for website, blog, etc.) to contact info
- Name records should be aligned more closely with ISAAR/EAC, and perhaps also AACR2/RDA/MARC
  - Provision of multiple citation fields
  - Revision of relationship types
- What is the role of authority record number values in system; also, what is the expected Authority ID value, integer or URI?

- Is the <u>log entry in name records</u> the right spot for maintaining this information
- <u>Metadata:</u> preservation metadata/migration history. Would like to be able to manage materials well at the item-level, including reformatting A/V items and migration of computer files.
- <u>Metadata</u>: Repositories have identified need for PB Core, PREMIS. Is AT/Archon development team considering EAC mapping? Any other metadata standards that would be helpful to incorporate (e.g. VRA core?)
- <u>Outgoing loans management:</u> Would like to have ability to manage items for outgoing loan. This would include item-level tracking for conservation, digitization and again for an outgoing loan inventory, including unique ID's and item-level metadata, condition reports, valuation for insurance. – Might simply be a matter of adding data fields at the item-level to <u>work order functions</u> for things like valuation, "item requested for loan", etc. & then output in report form.
- Need a way to <u>retire records (not delete).</u> Or make record inactive or not display in list view (e.g. facilitate batch export of non-internal only resources).
- <u>More user-defined fields</u> needed for all modules.

Imports

- Additional import file formats need to be supported:Names: EAC/MADS/MARCXML
- Subjects: MARCXML
- Consideration should be given to offering OAI harvesting
- Digital objects: CSV?
- Names might be EAF.

Exports

- Additional metadata formats should be supported at export:Additional PREMIS metadata for digital objects beyond PREMISrights
- Accession data should be exportable somehow, not just through SQL queries
- Export of resource component records as MARCXML (with inheritance?)
- Names should include MARCXML
- Descriptive information in name records should be used in EAD export rather than using bioghist notes in Resource records
- EAG record export?

Reports
- Technologically, using iReports, Jasper reports, Crystal reports, etc., is beyond most archivists. Needs a wysiwyg-type editor. Shouldn't have to know programming to configure reports.
- Need ability to query/limit by particular date ranges (not just annual), and by fields, for statistical reports. Some of this can be done in AT already by filtering on the browse screen, or running a query, and then a report from the results set. However, it is not as intuitive or robust as we'd like.

Stylesheet

- Ability to alter/swap/add on

Application Functions

- Architecture permits scalability and quicker loading of large/complex resources and digital objects
- Customizable user access levels or views, including read-only access
- Interoperability with other content management systems (e.g. Fedora, Dspace, iRODS, Greenstone)
- Bug report integrated with main bug tracking log to permit searching, comparison of issues
- Other application interfaces needed, including OAI-PMH (with set configuration possibilities) and Web services for integration with other systems
- An "undo" button; ability to reverse drag-and drop or other changes made to records

2: Columbia College (Chicago):

<u>ARCHIVES FUNCTIONS</u>
Repository statistics: This is a handy addition for budget talks and annual reports! Since we are a non-profit, we might also wish to record here our success (or drops) in fundraising—private foundations, public foundations, individuals…. We have memberships too & would like to track stats for new members, member levels chanes and the like. Possible?

Collection Management: We need to have a place to at least record first name or initials for **who** has accomplished the various tasks, such as sending acknowledgements—we need accountability and historical checking.

Love the **processing priority** field! I had to create my own easy/high research value matrix using a spreadsheet, but it would be so much better to have this as a field for each collection. Will this also be available on lower levels, like series? That could be useful for larger accessions, with some really interesting record groups and some, well, not.

Assessments: Beautiful! Bravo! Wow! To have the AVSAP at our fingertips AND integrated into the database system. We have a great deal of various A/V materials to keep track of here. We also have music manuscripts, which is not listed in the special section—assuming we could assign our own title(s) to the generic fields (e.g. "Special format 1" and "Other conservation issue 1")?? This would aid data entry considerably—enhance usability on both front and back ends.

Question: will there be a date field associated with: RecentlyPlayedBack?
This value will constantly change over time of course: if I play it today (recent = yes), but don't in the next 3 years, the value in the field is still "Yes" but it's not recent….
How is this handled? Can a "Yes" answer be set to time out after a given duration?
Providing a linked date to use in a query would allow me to have records pop up for review after a time span has elapsed that I consider appropriate for each type of media described.

All of the links in the **Work Order** area are very well thought out. (to accession, resource, digital object, and vendor).

Accessions: "MaterialType (records, papers or publications)": this list seems a bit sparse. Does an audio cassette containing a non-commercial recording of a published musical work count as "Papers" or "Records" or "Publication"? How about a field recording of interviews? Pardon if this is due to my short span of experience… but it's a bit perplexing.
OR is this not the full list of types that can be used (customizable, extensible)?

I think we also need to look to the future for born-digital materials. "digital media" or something like it needs to be a selection for type of material. Soon we will have to add "Interactive Media" or some kind of multi-function, software-implemented "object" in our collections. Let's plan for it now with date or material type triggers to do evaluation of the need to perform long term preservation activities on this stuff.

I LOVE the Classifications function! We have many topical links between collections in our holdings, but no elegant way to allow the user to realize this independently; even for our reference staff, that knowledge often stays stuck in their heads—not too accessible online! This offers a richer way to connect collections than static subject guides and the like, allowing a "value-added" function to our reference work, enriching the user experience immeasurably over time. We may even want to allow vetted users to create these! Thanks!

Possibly super-dumb questions:

I don't see the **data element "Publisher"** for the finding aid. ? Assumed to be the repository?

I don't see where to enter the Title for the collection-level unit, and for sub-unit, a.k.a. **<unittitle>**, in the Resources section. Also, the ability to specify **<genreform>** is important to our holdings—is it provided for? I can't find where to indicate what's covered by the EAD tag **<origination>**. Perhaps these are all very obvious from within the user interface? (just not as visible in your functional spreadsheet)

I don't know how frequently this capability is used, but will it be possible to create a **chronological list** pairing dates with events/descriptions? (as allowed by EAD)

GENERAL REMARKS about **Archives Functions**:

In general, I love the features that incorporate workflow and project management into the database, including the rights management section. Great stuff. Way better than sifting through and managing multiple small software utilities or spreadsheets or forms and folders… Having this info right there in the collections database makes managing the stuff so much easier.

REPORTS: Could data about *value/interest of the collection*, i.e. priority ranking, incomplete *project management* flags (status of plan) be included in the **Collections Mgmt** report? This could be a guide to what's on the to-do list for staff/interns.

APP FUNCTIONS:

User settings for default view or available menus—excellent! I am continually amazed at how differently two people will use the same piece of software. More than one way to find a particular menu item or function facilitates this diversity. Also advanced users may wish to "turn off" or minimize the helpful aspects they no longer need.

I'm intrigued by the "language file" for the user interface—sounds like I can customize the UI somehow with this…? All the stuff in UI, and Repository that is marked "configurable" is brilliant. So is this, if I understand it correctly: "Relations: dual pane relation windows to associate different entity types to each other." Is this a kind of automated or visual way to link up the data elements together?

Absolutely thrilled to see the provision of ways for users to add value to the collections through **annotations.** I do believe this kind of integration of users into the process of description will be more common and more used in the near future; as a research center, this holds great potential for us. Also, allowing researchers to manage their use of the collections with virtual bookshelves, ability to order online, etc. is a valuable addition.

SEARCH: great to search by classification—will the user be able to see a drop down list of these? Also, after an initial search yielding materials *across* collections, can a user filter a set of search results and search *within* those results? (i.e. not repeating a general search, but refining it). Can search refinements also be applied across collections? Can the user have "similar" searches suggested to them? Or narrower/broader term refinements suggested? "More like this…" or "you might be interested in…"?

SUPPRESSED FIELDS SECURITY: There is some concern with EAD finding aids that are placed on the web that the public can view non-public material by looking at the source—is there any way someone could hack and look at suppressed material?

Linking accessions/resources/digital objects to subjects and names is wonderful! Overall, your rich linking and cross referencing between creators, names, subjects, resources, and more is exactly why we want to use computers in the first place—I commend you all!

3:   Dalhousie University:

Import
My first comment is more of a question. On the import tab, it lists SQL for importing AT db and Archon db. Did you mean MySQL?

2. Export
I was pleased to see EAC included as an export function for names. I imagine it would be nice to be able to import EAC as well. For me, importing and exporting are key features and it would be nice to have as much flexibility as possible. But the inclusion of EAC is great.

3. Web Access
This looks very comprehensive. I especially like the user/customer functionalities (add/drop items, email list of items, etc.). I like the staff user features as well.

I think what you have so far is great, but it's not exactly clear how this maps to description standards. I am impressed at the ICA's A-to-M and how it supports description using Dublin Core, MODS, ISAD(G), and Rules for Archival Description. A main reason cited for not implementing AT around here was that it wasn't exactly RAD compliant. We use the CCA's crosswalk from RAD to EAD during our EAD creation, and I believe this is also incorporated into A-to-M. Has there been any discussion about supporting different description standards?

Anyway, in general, the high-level requirements seem to incorporate the best features of Archon and AT and add features that are currently not available anywhere. Kudos!

4:   Georgia Tech:

I reviewed the requirements document, and I only have a few positive comments.

Archives functions:
I think having an assessment and work order functions will be very helpful.

Reports:
I look forward to have the ability to create work orders.

I've requested my staff submit comments as well. I'm certain you'll be hearing from them soon, especially in regards to imports, exports and stylesheets.

5:   Georgia Tech (additional response):

First, let me say that I'm so pleased that you are planning to work together on this integration project. I remember when I chaired the AT / Archon session at SGA in Columbus (Scott and Sibyl spoke) that we talked about the possibility of taking the strengths of both projects and integrating them. It's a really good idea for the archival world, I think, as it gets us closer to one single program for all.

I think that you've been incredibly thorough in your outlining of the requirements for the integration. I don't know a great deal about how easy it will be to accomplish this integration, nor do I pretend to understand its complexities, but it seems that you've covered most of what I would consider the community's needs. I do think that any integration project has to be able to import easily existing AT and Archon data -- I have heard some concerns about how this can be done. I see that both AT and Archon db importing are listed in imports. In terms of exports, I also see that EAC is listed as a required export, which I think is also essential.

I have two questions: In looking at the required reports, I wonder whether you will retain the capability for users to customize and create additional reports? If not, then I think it might be necessary to do a thorough survey of current AT and Archon users to suggest reports that are missing. If so, this will give users the opportunity to manipulate the data in ways that they don't now anticipate. Also, I notice that there are no immediate plans for a reference module. I can see the point of view that this would be outside your current scope, but I do think that this would be a nice addition to the product. Perhaps it could be a later addition -- I can see that there will be quite a lot of work involved in managing all of the current plans.

6:   Harvard University (pooled comments):

Background

Harvard is approaching the end of its first year of AT implementation. This first year has seen production use of AT for accessioning. We have also closely examined the challenges involved with implementing other AT modules. The most important of these is resources.

Ingest of legacy data is the biggest hurdle to implementing resources in AT. We need to move data into AT resources from our institutional discovery systems; the amount of legacy data for ingest to resource records is vast. Across all of Harvard's archival holdings, roughly 3000 EAD instances and 10,000 MARC records. In addition, if we wish to take full advantage of AT, we need to reliably export data to those systems and target specific records for overlay.

We expect to include in our final report a proposal for some enhancements. Among these are:
- A much expanded repository profile to support consortial uses such as integrated reporting of archival metrics and survey data (needs specification)
- Alternate, repeatable extent measurements (as opposed to free-text "additional extent statement") in both accessions and at the collection level for resources (See appendix for more.)
- Staff security level changes, at minimum, a new "view-all-edit-none" (i.e. a level 0) (needs specification)
- A logoff button (needs specification)
- Container records with links to locations (See appendix for more.)

Questions

1. **Next steps.** What are the next steps, after this comment period and the webinars?
2. **Plug-ins.** How will AT/Archon integration effect enhancements/plugins? Will investment in AT plugins be lost due to changes in the programming?
3. **Public access options.**
    o Would it be correct to assume that there will be some way to implement the integrated AT/Archon without allowing any public access? How would this be achieved?
    o In a single, shared implementation, could one repository opt out of the public interface entirely while others opt in?
4. **Users and registrations.**
    o What is the intended scope of registration? Does it include merely registering for online use of the public interface, or is it intended to cover registration for in-person use of archives and manuscripts? How does this work in practice for Archon implementers?
    o Is there functionality for recording the vetting of users? Since our users register in person before using our collections and are vetted (we examine a photo ID, for example), how do Archon sites with similar procedures differentiate between registration for use of the online system and vetted registration for use of materials?
5. **Collection management records.**
    o Why is there a collection management record? Will the interface to the existing Accession record be able to include seamless inclusion of fields from the "Collection Management" record? Is there a strict one-to-one relationship between an accession and a collection management record? It seems ripe for confusion to have the potential for more than one collection management record per accession. Also, it is a very generic name for these records.

- o What are the restrictions and permissions? Are these access and use restrictions? Are the permissions records of transactions in which permission has been granted? Surely, permissions for use is a kind of authorization. An authorization is a relationship, like collection use (i.e. circulation loan), between a researcher and a collection?
6. **Containers.** Why are locations linked from resources and accessions but not from containers? It seems that the data model is at odds with reality. Are not accessions are held in containers that are in turn kept in locations? Are not instances of resources held in containers that are in turn kept in locations? (See appendix for more.)
7. **Related Names.** What kinds of scenarios are supported by the name relationship, if not former and later name (analogous to MARC authorities 5XX fields)? What is the status of EAC support?
8. **Extents.** What is an "additional extent statement"? How does this differ from the "container summary"? Why are "dimensions" and "physical facet" part of a note type? Why are these not an additional extent? Is this the intended use of the "additional extent statement"? We would prefer to be able to calculate and report on alternative expressions of extent. (See appendix 1 for more.)
9. **Classification.** Why is the record-grouping or functional grouping term "Classification"? Some repositories use classification as a method of grouping; however, others do not.

Ingest/Export

One of the greatest challenges we face in implementing the AT at Harvard is the ingest of legacy data. While we have been largely successful with ingesting accessions, ingesting Resources has proved more challenging. Part of this is due to EAD's flexibility, which means even this supported ingest has been problematic. However, additional barriers include the following:

1. External database record identifiers
2. Description control information
3. MARC holdings data
4. Batch ingest of MARC records

1. External database record identifiers

Record type	Resource records
Data element/s	External database and record ID
Nature of comment	Missing data area / functionality
Analog	MARC 035
Scenario/s	To support targeted ingest/export, records management, and synchronization with discovery systems to which records or components are exported or from which records or components are ingested
Note	This is an element that is available in MARC, but not in EAD. The EAD working group should be informed of this need also.

2. Description control information

Record type	Resource record
Data element/s	Finding aid information
Nature of comment	Change to existing behavior
Analog	EAD <profiledescriptionand <revisiondescription>
Scenario/s	When EAD or MARC is ingested, the existing profile description seems to disappear. When a resource record that was ingested from EAD file is subsequently exported as EAD, AT appears as the source of the finding aid in the <profiledescription>, rather than the original <profiledescription>. The AT information should appear as <revisiondescription>, and the original <profiledescriptionshould be maintained.

3. MARC holdings data

Record type	Resource records
Data element/s	UnitIDs, Access Restrictions, Immediate Source of Acquisition
Nature of comment	Missing data area / functionality
Analog	MARC holdings 852, MARC holdings 506, MARC holdings 541

Scenario	Support for ingest of data from MARC holdings records in addition to MARC bibliographic records
Note	Harvard's MARC implementation does not permit inclusion of 541 or 506 fields in the bibliographic record because resources can be held in more than one repository and each repository may have different agreements covering access or different immediate sources for their holdings. These are therefore part of the holdings record. Similarly, because repositories do not use shared classification systems, but instead use a variety of unit identifiers, the kind of data associated with EAD <unitidis held in MARC holdings 852 subfields. Are other archival units who share integrated library systems facing a similar problem with ingesting data from MARC holdings records?

4.

Record type	Resource records
Data element/s	NA
Nature of comment	Missing functionality
Analog	NA
Scenario/s	It is impracticable to ingest large numbers of small resource records that originate in MARC without batch ingest of MARC records.

User records

1. Need for multiple current contact information; need to retain historical contact information
2. More user-defined fields needed

1. Need for multiple current contact information; need to retain historical contact information

Record type	User
Data element/s	Contact information: Addresses, phone numbers, email addresses
Nature of comment	Missing functionality, data model does not accommodate needed data
Scenario/s	Users often have multiple current addresses, email addresses, and phone numbers. For security purposes, we would want to retain all past contact information for any user who has had onsite use of resources. We also want to know both the permanent address and the contact address of users who have temporary local addresses during research visits.
Note	May depend on what scope of "registration" means. If online use only, this may be moot.

2. More user-defined fields needed

Record type	User

Element/s	Repository-defined strings, text, and fields controlled through lookup-lists
Nature of comment	Missing data elements/functionality
Scenario/s	Repositories record a variety of information about on-site users to support security and institutional reporting.
Note	May depend on what scope of "registration" means. If online use only, this may be moot. If we were to implement "registration" as registration for the purposes of in-person research, more specification would be needed, but would include: • At least 3 repository-defined flags • At least 3 repository-defined fields with data contents limited by lookup lists • Several more repository-defined string fields • At least 1 text field for a longer note

Work orders

1. Need to record vendors' own work-order numbers
2. Need to be able to record vendor without necessarily linking to vendor name record
3. Need note

1. Need to record vendors' own work-order numbers

Record type	Work orders
Data element/s	External database Name/ID
Nature of comment	Missing data/functionality
Analog	NA
Scenario/s	When work is outsourced, the vendor often has an order number or other control number that needs to be recorded locally

2. Need to be able to record vendor without necessarily linking to vendor name record

Record type	Work orders
Data element/s	Vendor name (or repository-defined string fields)
Nature of comment	Missing data/functionality
Analog	NA
Scenario/s	Name records are shared. For administrative uses such as work orders, it is important that they are not. Also, even if the vendor name changes, it is necessary for administrative uses to know the name under which the order was placed.
Note	The same functionality could be achieved merely by having repository-defined fields, one of which could be used for the name of the vendor. A few

	repository-defined fields would be advisable anyway.

3. Need to be able to record vendor without necessarily linking to vendor name record

Record type	Work orders
Data element/s	Note
Nature of comment	Missing data/functionality
	NA
Scenario/s	Infinite number of reasons why a note would be needed, especially on outsourced work orders.

Appendix : Outlines of possible specifications for alternate, repeatable extent expressions and container records

Alternate Extent

Functionality: Alternate extents would support measurement within and across collections in alternative ways.
Explanation: Archives do not have the resources to create AT instances for each physical part of their holdings. Alternate extents would be a place to store, per accession or per collection, measurement totals in units of measurement other than cubic or linear feet. For example, archivists could number items in media formats to assist in preservation planning. This functionality could answer questions such as, "How many VHS cassettes are there in this accession?" "How many reels of film are in this collection?" By extension, reporting from these fields could answer: "How many VHS video cassettes did the Schlesinger Library accession last fiscal year?" "How many reels of 35 mm film are there across the University?"
Links: For any one accession or resource, there are 0 to many possible alternate extent measurements.
Examples:
- A collection of photographs. The physical extent measurement is 8 cubic feet. A simple alternate total extent is 8000 photographs.
- A collection of audiovisual materials. The physical extent measurement is 10 cubic feet. An alternate way of indicating the total could be the enumeration of each media type:
    o 100 reel-to-reel audio tapes
    o 50 VHS video cassettes
    o 15 35 mm film reels
    o 100 16 mm film reels
- A mixed material collection. The physical extent measurement is 6 cubic feet, of which 5 feet are textual materials and 1 cubic foot is still and moving image materials. In addition to expressing the cubic footage of the total, a repository may want to record a measurable partial extents of the non-textual material only:
    o 2 photograph albums
    o 80 photographs
    o 1 VHS video cassette
    o 1 U-Matic video cassette

Draft Fields:

Field	Type	Note
Alternate extent number	Float	
Alternate unit of measurement	String	drop-down list, not limited to list
Alternate measurement type	String (lookup list)	drop-down list, limited to list
Alternate measurement total linkage	Integer	For alternate totals, which records should be added together to form the alternate total.

The potential values of the measurement types are: "Alternate" (meaning it is not intended to be calculated as an alternate total measurement in any way), "Alternate simple total" (meaning a different unit of measurement for the total), "Alternate total addend" (meaning that, when added with other alternate total addends the result is an alternate expression of the total collections extent).

Container records

Functionality: Container records would directly support inventory control.
Explanation: Many repositories at Harvard already have box inventory and location management databases. These record inventories, keep track of materials movement, assist in security, collection measurement, and planning. This model would lay the groundwork for enhancements including reading room circulation and loans. One repository at eady has a functioning MySQL system that does this.
Links: A container can be linked to 1 location. A container can be linked to 0 or 1 other container (this is for group boxing, the relationship is always "is inside"). Resource instances can be linked to containers. Accessions can be linked to containers.
Examples:

Box ID Part1	Box ID Part2	Box Num	Size	Measure-ment	Type	Restrict?	Date Begin	Date end
MsB1		1	.3	cubic foot	document box	false	1962	1984
2009-01		1	1	cubic foot	record carton	true	1990	1991
2009-01	PF	1	.1	cubic foot	portfolio folder	false	1880	1880
MsB1	MF	1	.25	cubic foot	microfiche box	false	1985	1990
MsB83		1	.1	cubic foot	pamphlet folder	false	1865	1865
Group Box		1	.35	cubic foot	document box			

In the examples above, MsB83, a pamphlet folder containing the entirety of a small collection, could be linked to Group Box 1, which would hold both MsB83 and other small collections. MsB83 has no location link, but Group Box 1 does have a location link. Moving Group Box 1 moves all the linked containers.

From very brief discussion at Harvard, we have identified the following minimum set of fields in use in existing box management systems:

Field	Type	Note

Barcode		
Container identifier Part1	String	Typically derives from a unit ID for the collection or from an accession number
Container identifer Part2	String	
Container number	Integer	Typically matches box number in a finding aid
Box size	Float	
Unit of measurement	String	Typically linear or cubic feet; limited by lookup list
Box type	String	Limited by a lookup list
Restriction flag	True/False	Used as fail-safe for access restrictions
Year contents begin	Integer	Used for security, access restriction sunset dates, and preservation
Year contents end	Integer	Used for security, access restriction sunset dates, and preservation
Note	Text	

7:   MIT:

Below is a list of suggested additions to the High Level Requirements for AT/Archon Integration.

Accessions
- Extent number and extent unit should be repeatable fields. This way reports could track not only cubic feet of material, but also the number of audio cassettes, videotapes, photographs, or the extent of other formats.

Resources
- Extent number and extent unit should be repeatable fields. This way reports could track not only cubic feet of material, but also the number of audio cassettes, videotapes, photographs, or the extent of other formats.
- Ability to set permissions at the collection level

Locations
From the list provided it is difficult to determine with the Locations functional area will fit our needs.
- We need to be able to enter barcodes easily – similar to the Yale plug-in. In order to call boxes from off-site storage we need to be able to view all of the containers with associated locations and barcodes for a given collection.

Digital Objects
- Add a file name field to the file versions section

Exports
- Repositories should have the ability to alter and create new digital object mappings to the various metadata schemas

Web Access
- Ability to set individual access levels for each collection. We have several collections that we don't want public and need to suppress from any lists being published on the web.

8:   North Carolina State Univ:

The following questions and comments come out of a meeting of Special Collections, IT and digital libraries staff at NCSU to discuss the High-Level Requirements for AT / Archon Integration Project.

Some of our response, of course, is based in our experience with AT. NCSU has been using AT since April 2009. We are currently using AT 1.5.9 and plan to upgrade soon to AT 2.0. We use AT for collection management and for finding aid creation.

Our most basic question is what do you really envision for the integration?

Throughout the requirements, we would like to see better provision for handling born-digital material as well as physical material. For example, processing time estimates should be able to be hours per megabyte (or other appropriate unit) as well as hours per foot. AVSAP allowed values for recording formats should include digital formats and more physical formats.

Other questions that arose during our review include:
   What is a collection management record? What is the relationship between collection management and accession and resource records? (Archives Functions)
   Can locations be imported? (Imports)
   Can batches of containers be imported into a resource record? (Imports)
   What is actually meant by clickable links from creator to resource/collection? Can relations go in opposite direction—accession to resource, child resource to parent? (Web Access. Relations)
   What would rights management look like?
There are a number of functions we would like to see included that either are not or may not be included:
   Web interface for staff for editing
   Ability to import locations
   Ability to import batches of containers
   Batch selection of containers to move them in the hierarchy
   Easier search within resource record
   Find and replace
   Temporary locations
   Hooks for automated export
   Ability to sort components within a series and preferably, ability to select a range of components to sort
   Display unitdates with unittitles in component list. This is often what distinguishes one title from another.
   EAD view within the application so user does not have to export and open in another application
   If no EAD view is provided, add indication of EAD equivalent value for fields (EAD tag name appears on mouseover of field name perhaps)
   Autosave

9:   Smithsonian Institution:

 Review of first draft of high-level requirements for integration of AT and Archon
ADMIN
o Repository Identification
 . Unique repository identifier (so it can talk to Artesia or Horizon)

ACCESSION RECORD
o Pre-acquisition information
o Collections Committee request, approval, etc.
o Deed of Gift effective date
o Restrictions [More restriction choices (possible drop down box?)
o Expiration/Destruction date
o Employ full-level date
o Processing priority—more levels (instead of only High/Med/Low
o Recommended level of processing
o Actual level processed at
o MLP processing level?

ASSESSMENT MODULE/SURVEY TOOL:
Need Assessment Record linked to both Resource and Accession record
o Special Formats—make customizable, add more checkboxes and dropdowns
o Option to add types of materials
o Specific notes for each box
o Pick List/Drop of suggested values
o Emergency Flag or Alert check box
Preservation Management/Activity (refer to SI's High Level Requirements doc)
o Date when preservation work occurs
o Treatment received

REPORTS:
Ability to add more reports (not the canned ones) and make them easily accessible through the drop down box
A means to load in report queries created by other AT users so that it is included in the drop down box.
Smithsonian Institution Page 2

IMPORT
Ability to import records other than collection-level records from MARC (ie. Series and item level record)
Batch import support.
Incoming data is easily accepted. For example, records in a standard format need to load in easily.
During importing, avoid duplicate authority records.
Should support multiple import profiles by unit/system user, location, matching point element
Matching points this needs to be configurable, with different match points and/or match point values by import profile.
Import should support option to overwrite existing record or not upon a matched record

AUTHORITY RECORDS (new heading)
A mechanism for handling shared subject and shared name content to avoid duplicate records.
Should include support for EAC and for shared subjects and names in a MARC-like manner as well as standards-based thesauri.
Support for identifying and de-duping duplicate headings.

COLLECTIONS USE (new heading) (potential future)
Should include the capability to track collections use, grouped by patrons and use
Should include reference requests, researchers, researcher geographic locale, volume or similar quantity digitized, exhibits, loans, etc.
Some of the existing AT users are building functionality that addresses, at least in part, these items. See plug-ins and efforts listed on AT website.

SPACE MANAGEMENT
Configure of total storage space and space by location
Identification of total used space and used by location
Identification of empty space by location

SYSTEM / SECURITY SECTION
Backend must be able to be separated so that it can be placed behind a firewall.
Data must be secure.
Data must be confidential.

If CMS is shared: data provided by various unit archives must not be viewable by other archives
Shall support multiple views of data (i.e. some, all, confidential data) based on assigned privilege sets
CMS must provide an audit trail of database changes to key fields (i.e. storage locations. Exact fields requiring audit to be determined)
Shall allow users to confirm edits and modifications to database before changes are saved by system.
System shall support passwords
Support for LDAP authentication

WORKFLOWS (new heading)
Support for digitization workflows
o Digitization Request
o Cataloging

o Tracking
o Accessing: Presentation play and display

TRACKING/PRESERVATION MANAGEMENT
Support for preservation tracking
o Preservation priority of item / collection
o Date when preservation work occurs
o Treatment received
o Date treatment was completed
o Name of responsible person
o Any problems, issues, or follow-up steps that are needed
o Environmental conditions recorded for each storage area on a regular basis
o Statistics on preservation activities
o Pre-preservation activities
o Technical evaluation of collections items (audio or video cassette, roll of film) such as format, length (footage or time), speed, color or b&w, sound or silent)
o Priority of collection as defined by unit's disaster preparedness plan
o Preservation cost
Configure business process, rules, and workflows
o Track progress of items along a process
Allow for close tie to digitization management and assessment/survey

10:   Stanford University:

What is not in the requirements:

- addressing the issue of including multiple extent statements ... necessary for tracking formats of material for both statistical and preservation purposes. This information is extremely valuable when planning processing projects or writing grants.
- more flexibility re login restrictions or views. Perhaps a login for Public Services or student/hourly workers that restricts views to specific modules (mostly the resource module) and does not allow view of Accn module where we need to track costs of collections... and perhaps ability to restrict view of Names module to allow linking to a name but not seeing address / contact information.

another issue that has created a lot of difficulties for our staff is the lack of ability to customize a view of the main listing for a module. We have different staff members using AT for different purposes. I use it primarily for statistical purposes or to print reports. One staff member only accessions in AT; another is responsible for overseeing creation of listings in the Resource module and clean up of our accession data (migrated in last year)

11:   Syracuse Univ:

With the caveat that I have not played with either Archon or AT in a year or so, I offer the following thoughts on the high-level functionality document. I hope there will be a nugget or two of useful data.

As a general question, I'm curious how you see the relationship between the new A/AT application and Aeon? Aeon has yet a third focus, geared more towards patron interactions, but I wonder if you see any overlap (perhaps in A/AT's work order section?) and/or potential for integration, either built in or via APIs or other coding magic.

1) User management --
　　　What about user categories, for both those who enter data into the system (e.g. student, volunteer, full-time staff, part-time staff) as well as for patrons (e.g. student, faculty, alumni)? What about donors, will they also be included here?
　　　Is there a way to link a user to the collection(s) they have used, with dates -- i.e. logging their visit and what they looked at [The "Reports" tab suggests this is possible so maybe I'm just not seeing it here.]
　　　Is there a way to link a user to work orders placed by them (e.g. photocopy requests) ?

2) Collection management --
　　　Is acknowledgement agreement the same as a legal Deed of Gift, or is this just a thank-you letter? What about a place to record the acq ack file name (in case electronic version is kept)?
　　　Should there be a way to manage links to, for example, collection-level MARC records (like the "manage links" section down in Accessions) ?
　　　What about a way to connect related collections (e.g. "John Smith Papers" and "Mary Jones' Collection Relating to John Smith") ? Perhaps the assumption is that these can be located by a name search? I only wonder because EAD offers the <relatedmaterials> element for this purpose.

3) Assessment management --
　　　Is it really useful to pick out a few issues like brittle paper and make them fixed, when there's such a huge range of potential problems? Wouldn't it be better to leave this all open to be defined by the institution?
　　　For monetary value (i.e. appraisal), there does not seem to be a place to store who did the appraisal, when it was done, a link to the document, any caveats or notes about it, etc etc etc. Is this important information that ought to be in the database or is it sufficient to just (presumably) have it in the files somewhere? Also, assessment is very different from appraisal, I wonder whether they ought to be two separate modules?

4) Work orders --
　　　Now here it seems like the opposite problem from the Assessment issues above: there are certain work orders that are universal and common, like photocopy request, scan requests, etc, that could easily be listed here as allowed values under "Task category." Or are the task categories to be defined by the institution? But if that's the case, why not the same reasoning for Assessment issues?
　　　This section doesn't seem to include a way to print (either to paper or to email/file) an invoice for invoicing the patron. Rather than "revenue generated" would it make sense to have an invoice option that automatically calculates the "Amount due" and then a "Date paid" to record payment received?

5) Accessions --
　　　Am a bit confused on why there are acquisition acknowledgment functions up in collection management but not down here in accessions. Isn't each accession an acquisition, and aren't they all acknowledged? Why two different things? We do a Deed of Gift for every accession, is that not standard?

What's the difference between "material type" and "accession type" ?

I don't see a way to connect an accession to a donor -- would that be done as a "linked name record" ?

6) Resources --

Am uncertain why "Languages" is here rather than in "Accessions."

Will A/AT allow the attachment of multiple languages to a single resource/accession/collection, since that happens frequently?

What if I want to see all the languages present in a collection in toto, will I need to view each resource individually?

Is a resource not linked to a collection? Or is it a two-step process: a resource is linked to an accession and the accession is linked to a collection?

What about accessions or resources that are not connected to a collection (e.g. someone donates a book, which ends up going to be cataloged as a Rare Book) -- is that accounted for?

7) Digital objects --

It's unclear to me whether this is intended for born-digital or digitized or both; if the latter two, is there a way to record the date of the original as well as the date it was digitized? That wasn't clear to me from the spreadsheet.

Is this module meant to in effect replace a digital object management system like ContentDM or to supplement it? If the latter, is there a place to record the unique ID of the associated ContentDM (or whatever) record to enable cross-application connections?

8) Rights management --

This is nice, I like that you can link to a resource, an accession, or a collection and the ability to store the rights information in a single place is good.

9) Names --

Does this section conform to EAC, such that an authority record can be mapped accurately and easily to EAC elements and perhaps exported as an EAC record? [Oh yes -- just saw that in the Export section]

Do we really need a "salutation" stored in the database? Like "Dear..." ? That seems far too much micromanagement. And recording interactions? Again, maybe it's just me, but this seems serious overkill.

10) Exports -- no Dublin Core export for anything other than digital objects? Why?

11) Reports --

Possible to list collections based on particular qualities, such as collections with a given person's name associated, or a list of collections with a particular subject, or...? Looks like you can do it for accessions but from a researcher perspective they won't want to see a list of dozens of individual accessions, they'll want to know what collections they should be looking at, won't they? Ah -- or maybe this is not meant to be a search tool for end users (maybe they'll do that kind of search via the OPAC or some finding aids search interface). Never mind :)

Possible to list digital objects by type (audio, video, etc) ?

12:   Texas A & M Univ:

One of my staff compiled a "Wish list" of suggested improvements:

Archon Wish-list

● Auto-saving function: currently, when I'm entering a
collection, I have to first update Archon with the base information about the collection, update it, and then go into content manager to enter the finding
guide information about the contents of the collection. Should I forget to update the first page, when I return to it after updating the content, all my typed
entries for the Collection manager page are gone. Livejournal, Blogspot, and other sites on-line all have a feature where the site automatically saves your
entry before you officially update your blog. This would make entering collections faster (not having to update every aspect individually rather than all at
once), and safer (if it crashes, there's a fail-safe in place to keep your entry intact).
● Redundancy: There are multiple places (Subject, Genre,
Materials Type) where you enter the exact same information about a collection. In the case of Subject and Genre, the two seem to intersect or mesh with
each other; every time I try enter something into the "Subject" portion, it also shows up in "Genre". The manager for both is even the same. If they're
supposed to be used separately, why do they intersect?
● Browse by Subject: I think a good way to streamline this form of
browsing would be to automatically list all the collections that abide by certain filters after you've clicked one. Clicking on the filter "Genre/form of
material" and then being greeted with the exact same screen as before does not indicate to me whatsoever that the collections have in fact, been sorted out
for me at all.
● Sorting: Newer sites and web-browsers these days allow a new
level of customization and organization through grab-and-move sorting.
Google Chrome, for instance, lets you grab thumbnails of your favorite sites on your homepage, and then organize them how you want to. A similar
feature like this also exists in their blog site, Blogspot, which users can use to move things around on their personal journals as they wise (profile, link list,
archive of previous entries, etc.). This would be helpful in Archon because currently, in Content Manager, the only way to enter in data about a collection
is through copy/paste.
This method relies on the original word document detailing the collection to be in the final order of the materials for the collection.
 Should the collection be redone, this would mean redoing the entries'
orders. If you could just grab and sort, this would save a lot of time and effort on the curator's part.
● Click for drop-down menu: Currently, the Administration and
Packages tabs have automatic drop down whenever you run your mouse over them. This is irritating, because it means any time the mouse even runs over
the the tabs for a second, the menu appears. An easy fix for this is just an old fashioned 'click to view' approach to these tabs.
● Name Unification: When you enter the title the collections are
sorted by, it is called the "Sort Title" in the Collections Manager.
 In the mainscreen, it's called "Record Groups".
● Descriptions: In the Content Manager, all the different levels
allow for in-depth descriptions of a collection except one: Box. Why not let them f a collection except one: Box. Why not let them all have room for a
description?
● EADs: Would it be possible to create them from the data
entered?
● Autonumbering: Classification Manager does not automatically

assign a number to new entries currently. It would be easier to have it automatically capable of keeping track of the numbers, so then the only thing a person has to enter is the title of the Classification.

- Clunky interface: The current interface breaks portions of a
collection off into different managers, with no real clear explanation from any of the help tips as to what they're for. Is it possible to stream line everything onto one interface? This doesn't necessarily mean everything for the database together, but I think a good simple addition would be to put the content manager on the same page as the other 95% of the collection's information, rather than having a little button at the top.

- Speed: Right now, everything loads very slowly. Is there a
reason for this?

- Formatting: There is no way to format text, should it need to
be in order to make a proper citation. No bolding, no italics, no underlining. Neither ctrl+b/i/u works, nor does html formatting (and so on). These are necessary in order to properly cite certain materials.

- Page Limit: I became aware of the fact today there is a size
limit to how much info can be contained within one series. However, Archon always told me I had 'updated the record successfully'. If I've reached the limit, it should probably notify me of this, so I can break large series/groups up into multiple entries. Rather than dumping it all into one and then wonder where half of my information has gone.

- Extent in number and type of boxes - For example, the ability
to input 3 cubic foot boxes, 1, 5" box and 2 custom.   Finding guides
are detail oriented, they need to be as specific as possible.

- Error Message: A basic error I thought I'd bring to attention.
 This is what happens whenever I try to go from one large data entry to another one. In order to bring up my information, I have to back out into the Collections Manager, then go back in. The first time it happened, I hit refresh, and none of my typed data showed up at all. I thought it had been erased.

- Formatting: Lacks ability to put things in Italics or at least
underline them.

- Printer Friendly View: Fix the printer friendly view on the
public search side. Words appear over the top of other words.

- - Printer Friendly View - is not printer friendly or screen
friendly - words appear over other words - probably a Stewart type person fix

13: UCLA (14 contrib)**:**

General comments/questions
- Would like to have ability to manage monographs and manuscript materials at item-level. We appreciate the multiple functions that are being built into the system, but from the viewpoint of some staff; e.g., Conservation, the system appears to be geared toward handling only a portion of the items they are working with daily (manuscript materials, but not monographs).

- In general, looking at current AT, many more user defined fields are needed.

- Would like ability to link, and readily open up documents outside of the system, such as digitization, conservation work orders, appraisals, deeds of gift, etc.

Archives Functions
Applies to all areas:
Would like to have ability to query any given date span and all fields
Type of records – add family papers, photographic collections, art works, ephemera

Repository Information

User Information
What is the purpose of the User Information?
Does this relate to patrons as well as staff?

If this is meant to be used as a reference module, the data fields seem insufficient. Provided below are the fields UCLA currently uses for patron registration:
Last Name
First Name
Sign up date
Institution
Email
Permanent address (repeatable – 4 fields)
    Zip
    Telephone
Local or Mailing Address (repeatable – 4 fields)
    Zip
    Telephone
Local address good until: [date]
FAX number
UCLA affiliate
UCLA Library card number

Status category (undergrad, grad, faculty, non-UC)
Purpose of Research [options; e.g. publication, personal research, class assignment, etc.]
Other (text field)
College-University
Professor
Course number
Publication production information
Registered by [staff name]
Patron notes
Print Perm or Local
Location code [this is for tax purposes – L.A., Calif., U.S. or other]

All of this information is meant to work in concert with our invoicing and licensing workflows. Will AT/Archon have the capacity to manage these functions? If possible, we would like to avoid having to duplicate data entry in more than one system. (Our current system is a MSAccess-based system)

The fields above are just the basic record for user registration. Other records/functions are linked to this basic record – licensing, invoicing, duplication, reformatting requests. If the AT/Archon team is interested in seeing the associated fields, we will provide them.

Collection Management
Acquisition acknowledgement sent – not necessary if using "Acquisition acknowledgement sent date". If the field is not null, acknowledgement was sent.

Acquisition agreement sent – For UCLA needs to be repeatable to accommodate several types of deeds: rights retained; rights transferred to UC Regents; rights not held; mixed materials.
Also need to document the Statement of Value associated with one of the above types of deeds, and to document the valuation.
If an appraisal was done, fields needed to document the appraiser, (or is this done in the Names area?)

Navigate through collection management records: first, previous, next, last - Please add keyword (and string) search function

Link to 0 or more…accession records, resource, records, digital object records - Please add links to work orders or reports; e.g., items out for conservation, digitization or loan.

Assessments
For indicating the value of or issues associated with an item or collection - *Is this collection AND item-level? Could this be used to document valuation of an item (insurance value) that is being sent out on loan? Could a report be generated from these fields with Sum function?

Estimate time needed to process the materials – or enter flat estimated hours + note field to describe in narrative form.

Special formats – additional user defined fields needed; e.g., still negatives can be differentiated by format – 4x5, panorama, 2x3, nitrate, glass, safety, 35mm

From UCLA Conservation:
I tend to look at things for the following reasons condition treatment, exhibition and digitization. The first category probably is too detailed for AT, but the second two I think could definitely be considered part of assessments that are also of concern to archivists:

** conservation treatment needs
   Many different concerns here – I note that AT focuses mainly on formats & condition (and what condition they do have is pretty skimpy), but as an archivists tool, probably many of my issues aren't necessarily relevant or are too detailed.

** pres concerns/treatment needs prior to exhibit (which may include):
   Items that are particularly light sensitive
   Items that may need special mounts or other prep work
   Treatment/stabilization needed prior to exhibit
   Packing/transport concerns
   (other docs to link to in this category):
   Condition reports for item
   Loan forms/agreements
   Borrowing institution's AAM facilities report
   Insurance
   Packing/transport paperwork

** pres concerns/treatment needs prior to digitization (similar to exhibits in many ways:
   Conservator approval/sign off required?
   ID items that may need special handling
   Treatment/stabilization needed prior to exhibit
   Packing/transport concerns

AVSAP

Work orders
Staff responsible – make repeatable. More than one staff often work on a project.

The steps seem to be related to photo duplication, but not other workflows (conservation, outgoing loans, reformatting—xerox, microfilm, digitization, etc.

From UCLA Conservation:

Thoughts about how a conservation workflow could be handled:

1) have the capacity to include non-archival collections into the system - so if someone sent me a cataloged rare book they could import a voyager record or other bib info and begin the process through AT (so as not to create separate workflows for me).

2) be able to link to outside AT/Archon info or added documents such as treatment proposals, treatment reports, and digital photodocumentation

3) somehow track the following (some of these could be combined esp. if certain actions or notes are automatically date stamped or date identified):

a. item logisitics to the lab (delivery, pick-up, etc) b. date of arrival (sign-in) c. who's sending it and bibliographic info d. deadlines (for exhibit, loan, digitization, etc) and possible links to those workflows e. sending of treatment proposal (including time estimate) f. approval/curatorial sign off on treatment proposal g. treatment report + photodoc + date complete back + time treatment took h. item logisitics back to the originating unit or location

4) at some point it would be really interesting if there were a way to incorporate other prioritization information that may be developed in AT/Archon (?) to helping set priorities for conservation treatment as well, but I suspect this would be very distant in the future.

Accessions

Classifications
What kind of classifying is meant to be done? Is this the assignment of series and subseries types? Broad classifications/subjects? Digital archives?

Resources
- General comment: We are looking for an instinctive, user-friendly means of creating finding aids.
- We would like to be able to "open the hood" and see multiple entries on the screen, as is available through the Table view in MS Access.
- The AT interface does not allow one to see what they've entered in the descriptive field before, for example.
- You can't sort the fields (sometimes necessary when you want to quickly see what the highest box number entered is, for instance).
- We would like to be able to generate box and folder labels from the resource record, and to configure the labels as we wish (possibly a Report function, but we would like this to be easily configurable)
- We considered whether it would be desirable to have a function that would export data to MS Access for creating box and folder labels and reports, but that seems like a workaround, and necessitates working in two systems.
- We would like a search and replace function for editing finding aids. KB

Finding aid author – make repeatable

Digital objects
From UCLA Digital Library:
Because the structure of EAD documents is so different from a traditional MARC/MODS/Dublin Core record the data is often in other places—usually notes—but it is there (e.g. dimensions, format, etc.). I think the trick will be to be sure that we enter this data in the same format in different systems so complicated data transformations won't be necessary.

Deaccessions

Names
Personal Name
Primary name   Please add: subordinate name 1, 2; meeting names; place name (conferences)
Qualifier   What is the definition of qualifier?
                Is this "role"?
                How is a person's role in relation to a collection defined?

Corporate Name
>*Subordinate Name 1, 2* – Please add 3,4,5

Non-Preferred Name – What is the functional use of this? Will it redirect the user to the authority name? If so, please make this repeatable.

Non-Preferred Family Name
Prefix – How is prefix defined? Is it "van" in Van Beethoven? Mr.? Mrs.?

Related Names (see also references)
All of the data elements in this section; e.g. Personal Relationship, personal Relationship dates, Family Relationship, etc., - need to be very repeatable.

Subjects
- Please rename to "Subjects/Genres"
- Is the system capable of using names as subjects?
- Does it have the ability to filter, query, separate names; i.e., by donor, creator, etc.?
- Would like to have "pick lists" for the sources
- Can thesauri be input and used as pick lists?
- Can we input links out to sources, such as Library of Congress?

Indicate the authoritative source of the subject heading, e.g., AAT – Is one of these e "local"?

Provide an identifier for the external authority record for the subject heading – **Identifier:**
>Is "identifier" a record number?
>Does this link out to an authority file?

Locations
Suggest – the system automatically tracks the date a location is entered or edited so that one can know what the most recent location is and when an item is relocated.

Imports

Exports
Ability to export to MS Excel and Access.

Reports
We would like to have a means of outputting annual ARL stats. This would apply to all UC's – need to translate extent information from standard archival units to "manuscripts units" as described by ARL.

We would like the reports function to be easier to use. In the current version of AT you need to know a separate report software, which is expensive and has a big learning curve. If the new system had the capability to export to MS Access, the reports function could be used. However, this may not be a great long term solution. Ideally the reports function would be built into the system.

Stylesheet

Application Functions

Web access

14:   University of Miami:

I just had a look at the AT/Archon fusion spreadsheet, which I know you are soliciting feedback on. I think it covers most bases in terms of preserving the basic functionality of both platforms.

 I'm not sure if it is too early in the process to volunteer the feedback I'd like to give you, but I have a suggestion that could affect your overall architecture if you decide to take it into mind moving forward. Namely, it would be great if this new tool you are developing could support hosting union catalogs of finding aids from multiple repositories. The need for this has popped up several times in Florida, and is occurring right now here at UM…[….] I also believe that FCLA has considered various options of providing this sort of
service to smaller state institutions that lack the technical infrastructure to run their own server. Having a web-based tool like Archon is ideal for providing centralized technical infrastructure to needy institutions, and building this more explicitly into the hierarchy of Archon/AT records/system architecture could be a big help. In addition, the ability to support multiple institutions in one instance, with institutional branding, is one of the nicer features of
ICA-Atom, which I think is gaining steam in the international community. I don't know if my suggestion would complicate your plans beyond what you'd like to tackle right now, or if you are already considering it, but just wanted to place it on your radar as a feature of potential benefit to people thinking on a regional cooperative/consortial level about providing technical infrastructure to archives.

15:   Yale University:

Attached is Manuscripts and Archives' comments (in red) [Excel spreadsheet—i've copied comments below]*. We welcome all of the added functionality and improvements to the AT/Archon package. Most of our comments concern Application Functions, Imports and Exports, and Reports. The main point or requirement we would like to stress is an extensible, sustainable architecture that permits quicker loading/deletion/export of large or complex resources and digital objects. As a respository with an enormous amount of data, speed is of critical importance to us. Currently, the AT strains under even limited use. This performance issue will only grow in an exponential fashion as we begin to use the AT to manage our digital ojbects whose number will surely dwarf our existing (physical) components. Thus, rethinking the architecture employed to build resources/digital objects will permit not just us but other large repositories and growing numbers of consortia with large or growing collections to continue to use AT/Archon well into the future.

Some general questions of clarification or additional functionality desired include:

 1.whether the product will have both web access and a client? what are the peformance issues for web access?
 2.Abiity to export additional PREMIS metadata aside from PREMISrights 3.
Customizable user access levels. We've found that that although we don't want users to be able to edit certain fields, they do need to be able to see them. Therefore, perhaps having the ability to assign what can be viewed/edited would be helpful. Alternatively, it would be nice to grey out certain fields that cannot be edited. Read-only access would be another option.

Thanks again for soliciting our imput and good luck on the next phase of the project.

> *[Copied from Excel spreadsheet]:
> Import tab:

Names	XML	what supporting?
	EAC/MADS	

> Export tab:

Archival description	EAD
	MARCXML
	PDF
	Container labels (txt) [box/folder]
Digital obects	METS (MODS; PREMISrights)
	METS (DC; PREMISrights)
	DC
	MODS
	MARCXML
	PREMIS

Reports tab:
      Collection Mgt: add: Extent of holdings
      Accessions: add: Accession(s) per fiscal year
      Digital Objects: add: Digital object record(s) restricted
      Resources: add: Resources added in fiscal year
                         Barcodes

Stylesheets tab:
      For all: ability to alter/swap/add on

Application Functions tab:

Common Behaviors/Properties	Components have most of the data elements available to the top-level resource record, and an unlimited number of children or siblings can occur.
	architecture permits quicker load of large resources and digital objects
	quicker delete/export of resources (esp. batches)
	Drag and Drop (multiple items) to Reorder items w/in hierarchies; scrolling permits easy movement within full hierarchy

Yeshiva University:

I am an AT user, so my comments are probably skewed to AT functionality and terminology. Also, I don't use/foresee using Imports, Digital Objects, Work Orders or Assessments much in the short run, so I didn't review these. I tried to refrain from having my comments become a wish list for new functionality, since you indicated this is not what these requirements are, but some might have inadvertently slipped in, or be too enmeshed with remarks on the requirements to be separated. But I did my best.

Collection Mgmt (CM): I'm both intrigued and puzzled by this new functional area. It looks like the attempt was to enable much of what's in the fifth tab of the current AT accessions module to now be associated with either accessions, resources, or digital objects (A/R/DO), as well as to apply to a group of them. But I'm not sure this is exactly the case, since the feature description doesn't seem to require a link to any A/R/DO (but maybe it should be understood as requiring a link to one of the three, without mandating a particular one? I'm assuming that's the case). Was there an AT specification released for this functionality that I missed? I would like to understand it better. Much of my comments below are based on assumptions I've made which may be incorrect.

1. Overall, I like and can envision being able to track at least the processing portion of what's being called CM not just at the Accession level, since, especially with efforts to expose hidden collections and reduce backlogs, it's very possible to have semi-processed or even largely unprocessed Resources (although the features description for Resources states these are fully processed, implying I'm truly offbase about what this functional area is). Still, I can envision creating a CM record for an Accession before it becomes a Resource that's processed to the series level, for example, and then, at some future point, a new CM for the Resource to get the series fleshed out and create a container listing.

2. Managing collection processing across multiple A/R/DOs also makes a lot of sense. But I hope all the underlying A/R/DOs linked to a CM record will be viewable when browsing the CM module, since I believe this is how users identify their data, versus via a separate CM ID or even a CM title that applies to the group. I know this is not presently the case in AT modules, and was something I commented on in both the Assessment and Work Order specs, but got the impression it would be hard to do.

3. I should have made this #1, since it applies to the overall structure of the CM unit, as I understand it. I question whether combining what's being called 'acquisitions' together with collection processing data/functionality in a single module support users' workflow or is optimal database design. A guiding principle I recall from working in this field years ago was that data should be grouped together when it changes together. But it seems like fairly unrelated data is being mixed together – data that relates to 'acquisitions' (driven by the donor), and data that relates to processing (driven by the repository). Furthermore, it seems that every CM record that relates to more than one A/R/DO will have a significant portion of the data blank since, for example, acknowledging several acquisitions together has no impact on how they're processed (even less so on how they're cataloged, but I'll come back to this). And handling these groupings seems to be the main reason for creating this data structure, right, since otherwise you could just keep the data at each of the individual A/R/DO levels? So now users have to work with a whole new concept that, due to efforts to be so generic and maybe minimize the number of modules, is somewhat ambiguous and may actually create unnecessary complexity.

4. Regarding the data in this module that relates to 'acquisitions', I understand that archival tasks can cover many of these at the same time, but is there even a need to create a new data structure for this? Is it necessary to explicitly record, by creating a new entity, that several A/R/DOs were on the same acknowledgment letter or deed agreement, or could this be inferred if they have the same dates for these items? Maybe there's a way to just redesign the interface to be able record this information for multiple A/R/DOs at the same time to support this workflow without involving new data or separate modules.

5. Along the same lines, how does the cataloging of collections belong in the CM module? I believe cataloging has nothing to do with how groups of collections are acknowledged or even processed, and so will require a new CM just to record the cataloging. Furthermore, even if various collections are cataloged at the same time, they're not done as part of a single project that needs to be tracked (In fact, unlike collection processing, where the CM module records specific project-level processing fields, there are no specific fields provided for a cataloging project – just a single

date – which would not be enough to track a "project" that most likely would span a range of dates). It seems the data belongs at the A/R/DO level. I'm not even sure an interface redesign to handle these multiples is warranted by the workflow, but I guess it could be handled this way if needed.

Accessions:
1. *Material Type* - I assume this relates to the current "resource type" in AT. We use "Collection" very frequently, but as long as the list is customizable I guess it doesn't matter.
2. *Accession Type* - Assuming this is the current "acquisition type" in AT, I wonder why this field remained at the Accessions level and related 'acquisition' fields moved to the CM module, since it seems that this relates to the donation as a whole (but of course I've just argued against recording acquisition data at all…)
3. *Unprocessed Extent* – I wonder if this data is more correctly stored in the link record between CM and Accessions created to track collection processing. And since CM records apply to Resources and Digital Objects, is it needed on these links as well? As I mentioned above, I could definitely see tracking processing at any of these stages.

Resources:
1. Is there a way to be able to record locations separate from creating individual instances? Perhaps as ranges? I believe Archon does something like this.

Names:
1. Will non-preferred and related names be included in the browse list?
2. Is there a way to relate names as added entries to a collection (i.e. 700s)?

Locations: Is there a way to batch delete?

Marc Export:
1. Is there a way to explicitly set up the 852 field? There are different local practices for what's done, yet the export uses predefined fields, requiring every record to be edited.

Reports: Overall, don't add across extent units.

Web Access:
1. Advanced searching: provides lookup lists for some fields – subjects, genres, etc.
2. Flexible to allow institutions to decide what modules to implement and what data to include in public interface - may choose not to implement registrations or give public access to accessions data, for example.