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Introduction

This is a summary of each section of the meeting’s discussion, each of which corresponded to one of the six topical groupings in the national consultation survey administrated by CCAD in the fall of 2015.¹ This document (and its French translation) is intended to supplement the full-length audio-video recordings of the event.

Group 1 Questions – Purpose and Scope of the Standard: Discussion Summary

The discussion began by referencing the survey results, which demonstrated that while most respondents desired change, there was a heavy split between replacing RAD with General International Standard Archival Description (ISAD(G)) and maintaining a distinctly Canadian standard.

Regarding the wholesale adoption of ISAD(G) (abandoning a Canadian national standard), it was stated that this was never the intent of ISAD(G), which is supposed to be used in conjunction with national standards. Further, a national implementation of ISAD(G) could include additions to rectify current deficits in ISAD(G), such as additional custodial history elements and description control area elements (to underline more strongly the accountability of the archivist through documenting their interventions on the records). It was also noted that adequate rules for electronic records are also generally lacking in existing archival descriptive standards.

Regarding adopting Describing Archives: A Content Standard (DACS) (abandoning a Canadian national standard), DACS was noted as an example of a national standard that aligns with ISAD(G). What specifically has DACS changed or added that represent its distinct national approach using the ISAD(G) framework? Could DACS be re-used or adapted to the Canadian context?

One participant who had been involved with the Canada-US Task Force on Archival Description (CUSTARD) mentioned that, at the time, Canadians felt it wasn’t sufficiently detailed, although this sentiment may have since changed.

Maintaining a Canadian national standard could reflect aspects unique to the Canadian context (e.g. bilingualism and potentially First Nations concerns). It would allow us to retain control over our own

¹ The questions in the survey were the same as those provided in the backgrounder document located here: http://www.cdncouncilarchives.ca/survey/CCADMtgExperts_FR.pdf (en français); http://www.cdncouncilarchives.ca/survey/CCADMtgExperts_EN.pdf (in English).
descriptive standard, rather than relinquishing control to the International Council on Archives (ICA) (for ISAD(G)) or the Society of American Archivists (SAA) (for DACS).

Regarding the one-stop-shop aspect, this approach is useful for small shops, as it’s not always convenient or practical to continually have to consult other standards. It’s convenient if one standard can apply to all media. Note that one reason RAD2 was not supported was because of differences of opinion on the inclusion of media instructions.

Survey results demonstrated that there was a split between those that wanted a very detailed standard and those that wanted a simple standard. The survey results also revealed that Canadians are not as conversant in other standards as Americans are (which is also related to the fact that DACS points out to external standards for specific media or other needs).

One participant noted that it would be helpful to have more information about how having a networked approach to standards (have RAD reference other standards) would work in practice, and what the result would be in particular for something like describing electronic records. Since there may be overlap between standards (e.g. both MODS and PREMIS contain rights information), there would have to be coordination between the standards and an explanation of how they were intended to be used together.

Regarding keeping RAD focused solely on archival description, generally the group agreed on this. RAD could point out to other standards that pertained to other types of description (e.g. indexing guidance) or archival activities (e.g. accessioning, preservation). Keeping the focus on archival description included archival authority records. The work of the National Archival Accession Standard Working Group (CCA-NAASA WG) was also mentioned.

Other considerations:

1. One participant questioned the role of vendors in the standards discussion. There are only a small number of vendors in play in the Canadian market. Are standards less important with digital finding aid creation? Other participants noted that vendors will adjust to archivists’ requirements, and that it is the responsibility of the profession to articulate their requirements and standards.

2. One participant noted that archival descriptive standards like RAD have dual roles: supporting archival custodial activities and supporting discovery/access. Is this the best approach and what should the balance be between the two?

3. Promoting interoperability doesn't necessarily mean leveling the differences between standards originating in different domains (e.g. GLAM: galleries, archives, libraries and museums). Entities and elements need to be defined within their distinctive domains before semantic relationships between domains can be identified. While crosswalks between standards are useful reference tools, data migration is always more complicated than anticipated.

4. Most users don’t care about hierarchical relationships between levels of description, they just want access. Would it be a problem to level out differences between descriptive traditions in different domains (e.g. libraries and archives)? What are the needs of the users? Do we even know these? What choices could we make that best serve them?
There was discussion around the apparent opacity of the operations of the ICA Experts Group on Archival Description (EGAD), including a lack of clarity regarding how to get involved with the group. While some information has been shared on the EGAD website and via conferences (in the United States and Europe, primarily), generally little is known regarding the status of the work. However, this could be due, in part, to the fact that initial drafts of the conceptual model and ontology haven't yet been completed (and thus haven’t been shared with the archival community for comment). These drafts are anticipated in 2016.

Although the group wished to recommend retaining a distinct Canadian standard, desires to influence international work (e.g. ICA) were also expressed. However, it was acknowledged that ICA would not be able to represent all Canadian concerns or requirements within its standards.

Another thread of the discussion concerned the currently dormant CCA Standards Committee, which had been responsible for tracking standards relevant to archives and had created a database of this information. The database still exists but would have to be refreshed. There is also potential to re-launch the work of this committee.

Summary comments at the end of this section of the discussion highlighted that:

1. DACS should be considered as an example of a national implementation of ISAD(G).
2. A distinctive Canadian standard (RAD) should be maintained, as it would leave control with Canadians. It should align with ISAD(G) and it would have to be articulated how this was so (specify national differences or variations). Caution should be taken given that the current work of ICA EGAD on its conceptual model could impact on ISAD(G).
3. The issue around the level of granularity for media description was not completely resolved, though the proposal for having a general core standard with accompanying implementation guides containing detailed guidance seemed like the best way to go. The media instructions would be moved to these guides, which could also be more responsive to change and frequent updating if maintained in a wiki or other online forum, for example. By contrast, the core rules would be general and slow to change. They would have to be robust enough to support daily use and include sufficient contextual information for the records. Implementation guidance could also clarify how different standards, which may have areas of overlap, were intended to be used together.
4. It’s important to track and account for work produced by ICA, but one cannot expect that it would correspond to all Canadian needs.
5. RAD should be focused mainly on description with possibilities to link to other systems or standards focused on other functions.
6. How to balance the dual roles of descriptive standards supporting archival custody and user discovery must be determined.
7. It would be useful to revive the CCA Standards Committee.
8. It is important to ensure that the archival community is continually consulted with efforts made to achieve consensus on the issues/options.
Group 2 Questions – Structure of the Standard: Discussion Summary

This portion of the discussion consisted of several related threads.

Regarding having an underlying conceptual or data model, it was felt that it would help to enforce content elements and issues around inheritance as well as providing hooks to additional standards. A conceptual model could underlie the elements of the standard without being made explicit (people could use the standard without knowing it existed). Further, a conceptual model could help support interoperability with standards for other archival functions (or more broadly – e.g. with other domains).

Regarding the current structure of RAD, the concern was expressed that many archives rely on the existing structure, and that the ISAD(G) structure was not intuitive. So, it would be problematic to change the structure for that reason. This might particularly be applicable to small shops with volunteers producing archival descriptions, some of which would not even be working in a database (archival management system) environment.

Countering this, the point was made that structure could be manipulated to be presented differently for different users – for example, currently Atom\(^2\) permits flipping between RAD and ISAD(G) descriptions. Similarly, one participant flagged the difference between structure of the standard and structure of archival description, and how these don’t need to be equivalent. Core elements and those identified in implementation guides could be organized and displayed differently for different users. For example, perhaps RAD’s current structure could be mimicked as a display option of a new revised RAD. There are technical tools available to produce variant displays or outputs of core elements.

Some discussion concerned how RAD should be published or mounted, for example, in a digital environment, and whether having a digital-only version of the standard would be feasible or advisable. LAC’s Concise RAD was named as an effort to produce a stream-lined hyperlinked version of RAD for the community. Many felt that an online version of RAD would be more easily accessed and maintained, but that there should still be capacity to produce a print version of it. A wiki was suggested as a potential online environment where collaborative development, maintenance and community consultation could occur. One participant noted the importance of having a version of the standard that would be accessible for those with disabilities.

Many participants commented on the cumbersome nature of RAD’s current structure which necessitates flipping back and forth between chapters, particularly between the general and media chapters. Also, its structure was based on now-defunct library standards (e.g. Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2\(^{nd}\) ed. (AACR2)).

Many agreed with the point that both digital and analogue records will continue to be created and, as such, descriptive standards will have to apply to both types of records.

The issue of aligning with ISAD(G) re-surfaced in this discussion, with the acknowledgement that committing to align to ISAD(G) may also require a parallel commitment to the International Standard Archival Authority Record for Corporate Bodies, Persons and Families (ISAAR(CPF)) even though the scope of ISAAR(CPF) is beyond that of RAD Part II, in that the former includes both context control as well as name headings while the latter only concerns heading control. While RAD Part II was not directly

\(^2\) https://www.artefactual.com/services/atom-2/
addressed in the survey, some comments were received about it. Further, participants at the meeting noted the importance of managing name headings as well as potentially maintaining distinct archival authority records, and how name heading management was a critical component of this. While descriptions of records are typically unique to individual repositories, descriptions of creators could be shared across repositories. Current systems infrastructure likely requires more than just name heading control (e.g. distinct identifiers and/or URIs being assigned to unique identities).

The group discussed whether multiple variants of archival authority descriptions should be maintained after having been collated (e.g. in a national authority file, if one existed), and there were differences of opinions regarding the pros and cons of both. For instance, a repository that held most of a creator's records may have a more fulsome description of that creator than a repository with a smaller amount of material. Some felt that one creator description should be maintained, while others felt that many descriptions could be collated together under the same name heading. Any details relating the individual to the scope and content of their records should not form part of an authority record, however, and this would have to be made clear in a new RAD that aligned with both ISAD(G) and ISAAR(CPF). Much work has already been doing in the area of archival authorities with the American Social Networks and Archival Context (SNAC) project, Encoded Archival Context (EAC) and the Virtual International Authority File (VIAF).

Some issues regarding other headings (e.g. geographic headings) were also raised. One participant voiced the question of whether or not that level of granularity has been of interest to users (e.g. searching by geographic name headings).

Regarding punctuation, generally the group felt that punctuation rules were not necessary, with some exceptional circumstances in which it could be useful.

The main summary points expressed at the end of this segment of the meeting included that:

1. An electronic-only version of RAD would not suffice; there would have to be a way to produce paper copies.
2. Training would be required to support implementation of the new standard, including training on implementation guidance.
3. The new standard would have to account for both digital and analogue records and include information regarding their context(s) of creation.
4. Both ISAAR(CPF) and ISAD(G) should be accounted for, supporting a distinction between describing records from describing creators.

Group 3 Questions – Description of Digital Archival Materials: Discussion Summary

One point raised was that there should not be a separate chapter for electronic records; rather RAD rules should address both analogue and electronic records throughout. This should include addressing hybrid collections.

One distinction that is being made more explicit these days is content from carrier, while in the past the concern was mostly with documenting and managing physical carriers, not making this distinction. There are several examples in which the distinction between content and carrier is relevant, such as digitized
surrogates of archival records. This introduces another nuance to the discussion, as there is an intellectual entity (e.g. the content) that may be expressed in more than one manifestation (e.g. access copies, preservation copies, digitized surrogates, copy negatives, etc.). The intellectual content could be characterized in one description, with links out to various manifestations or iterations of it in different formats, or on different carriers.

Another issue discussed was PREMIS, and how much information a user would need or want to know about archival administrative actions on digital records. While most presented the point of view that users would not be interested in full administrative details, some noted that there are exceptional cases (certain researchers may wish to know) and that this may change over time (both with the trend toward greater transparency and accountability for publicly documenting archival interventions on the records as well as potential future researcher interest in long-term archival management of records).

If content is removed from the carrier, is there an obligation to (or interest in) documenting the fate of the carrier? Could the carrier itself be an object of interest (e.g. logs of all of the content it had ever carried; as a technology artifact), or is it only ever just the content that it temporarily carries that is of interest to be documented? What about situations in which the carrier is unknown (e.g. cloud service providers)? One participant felt that the focus should be on describing the content, and that describing carriers separately would be complicated and possibly not of interest to users.

Could describing carrier or format migration be a part of describing the custodial history of the records, the rules for which generally this group was advocating to improve and expand?

Another point raised regarding describing and providing access to electronic records was the fact that the plethora of original (inherent, associated) metadata that can be mined to locate and manipulate digital records mitigates the need to create descriptions of them using an archival descriptive standard. The argument was that we should take advantage of indexing functions. Is a non-MPLP (More Product, Less Process) approach feasible in a situation in which there are millions of individual digital records to be processed?

The question was raised about what we are trying to represent in our descriptions of digital records. What about alternative or expanded views of provenance or other types of relationships that touch records? Whose responsibility is it to make these relationships explicit – the archivist’s, or the user’s?

The utility of a conceptual model was noted again, as entities and their relationships would be separately described and codified. Situations in which there were multiple copies of an intellectual entity could be better accommodated this way.

Some of these points had implications on the structure of RAD, if description of intellectual entities was to be distinguished from description of physical aspects.

Whatever the resulting standard is, it should be flexible to account for variance in the level of access and control that archives may have at a given point of time with respect to their digital holdings. Levels of access may vary depending on the stage they are at in the process (e.g. pre- and post-accessioning), and RAD rules should only pertain to the descriptive product being created, versus regulating how that product is achieved (individual institutional processes). Flexibility is also necessary to accommodate the wide variety of digital formats and media currently in existence, as well as future ones, for which levels of native metadata (for example) may vary widely in detail.
Another aspect that is important to record for electronic records is information about the systems in which they were created and managed throughout the lifespan. This corresponds to the International Research on Permanent Authentic Records in Electronic Systems (InterPARES) point of view that authenticity is derived from a broader systems context.

One suggestion was to create a core set of elements just for electronic records, distinct from the generic core set of RAD descriptive elements.

The final comment of this section was that more thinking and exploration of what could or should be done to define descriptive rules for electronic records needed to be undertaken before making any commitments.

**Group 4 Questions – Governance of the Standard: Discussion Summary**

In this segment, a clear preference was stated for maintaining responsibility for RAD with CCAD, which would have representation from archival professional associations (ACA and AAQ). Still, it was noted that other development and maintenance models for existing standards such as for DACS or METS/MODS/PREMIS would be useful to examine. DACS is maintained through a volunteer SAA committee and METS/MODS/PREMIS are maintained by the Library of Congress. An overview of the governance structures for MARC21 and Resource Description and Access (RDA) were provided by one participant, the latter of which may be worth considering in the context of RAD (distributing the responsibilities for content development, publishing, and secretariat functions).

Even if CCAD kept responsibility for RAD, the importance of maintaining strong relationships with provincial and territorial councils was emphasized, as these councils often have the best direct link to how things are going on the ground, and it would be important for CCAD to have this type of feedback.

Regarding costs, it was noted that upfront development costs for a revised RAD would be different (and possibly substantially more) than costs for ongoing maintenance. There would be costs associated with communication (teleconferences and face-to-face meetings), for example. Further, there is no revenue stream associated with a standard.

One participant explained that RAD had originally been publicly funded and its development and maintenance had cost several millions of dollars. While revisions now would likely be much less, any costs are generally prohibitive for the archival community. While a cost in the range of $30k/a might be manageable, there would need to be ongoing funding to support maintenance.

Other aspects affecting costs:
- requiring a bilingual standard
- inequity created if some had to pay for the standard while others did not
- RAD-compliance used to be a requirement to receive grant funding, but this incentive no longer exists

Options mentioned to manage expenses included:
- having different tiers of costs (e.g. individuals versus institutions)
- institutional funding for RAD could be managed as part of training budgets (this might receive more support than other types of operational funding)
- fundraising (e.g. grass roots like Kickstarter)
- grant funding programs
- increasing costs of association membership fees
- offering some parts of RAD (and related tools) for free, while charging for others
- charging archival management software vendors (though these costs may just be transferred onto clients)
- donating time (instead of money), particularly if RAD were being developed/maintained in a wiki environment or some other option that was readily available and open for community contributions
- other non-cash donation options mentioned were web hosting and systems support
- if RAD were licensed (e.g. annual subscriptions), then a free version in pdf could still be made available for those users that could not afford subscriptions
- following an open-source approach (e.g. free standard; for-fee training; community contributions to ongoing development or maintenance)

Generally the feeling was that RAD should be free of charge, as any costs imposed would be a deterrent to its uptake and implementation, and in many contexts (e.g. small, volunteer-run organizations) it would simply not be feasible to pay.

While there wasn't a clear consensus on how RAD should be funded in its entirety, many felt that public funding should comprise a part of it (e.g. LAC support). It was mentioned that LAC could potentially also act as a secretariat or institutional home for the standard, similar to how the Library of Congress manages METS, MODS and PREMIS. Still, caution was advised given that LAC may not be stable enough to rely upon for long-term support (e.g. it is subject to the effects of shifting political environments over time).

**Group 5 Questions – Consultation: Discussion Summary**

Ideas for supporting ongoing consultation and engagement of the archival community around RAD revision or development were discussed.

For example, the Archives Association of British Columbia's Round Table to discuss the RAD consultation questions (Fall 2015) was given as an example of a successful consultation exercise.

Options for consulting users, one of the primary audiences for RAD descriptive records (in addition to archivists themselves), were also discussed. Gaps in current usability testing and literature on user studies were noted. It was suggested to devise means of consulting users without asking them directly what they thought of the standard, as that would not be the most useful approach (users want effective discovery tools but may not have opinions on the specific descriptive/metadata components of those tools, which would be regulated by RAD). There are also different types or profiles of users with varying needs, interests and approaches, which would have to be considered. Further, many online users are unknown. Generally the feeling was that archivists still did not understand users' needs well enough when it came to finding aids and that more research was required.
The need to consult Canadian indigenous communities, who employ different knowledge paradigms, was also mentioned, particularly if RAD is intended to be truly suitable for the multicultural Canadian context. This related to another comment about the importance and rise of participatory archiving, the idea of which is to acknowledge, engage and include the voices and knowledge of others with expertise in the records, beyond the voice of the archives itself. A revised RAD could include (a) principle(s) attesting to this inclusive approach.

Different opinions and ideas were discussed regarding consulting sibling professions (e.g. librarians) who are also involved with describing resources to provide access to clients. From one point of view, caution was presented against consulting non-archivists too closely, as this had previously coloured the style and content of RAD (e.g. having been adapted from the *International Standard Bibliographic Description* (ISBD) and AACR2). Archivists need to devise something distinctly archival that meets archival requirements. While consulting sibling professionals could still be helpful, it should be a secondary activity.

In addition to the potential communities to be consulted that were listed in the survey question, others mentioned at the meeting included:

- creators and donors, who would be the experts on their own records and how they were created
- media specialists
- undergraduate students

Some background on consultation activities around RAD was provided, for information and as a point of comparison. The process at that time was to circulate a newly drafted RAD chapter to the community, allowing feedback to be sent for a period of three months. A compendium of comments was created, per each rule. The planning committee for RAD met with the Working Group drafting the chapter and discussed the comments made. Some were accepted, while others were rejected as dissonant with the rest of the standard. The Working Group then incorporated the accepted revisions. A new version of the chapter was afterwards released back to the community for further feedback. During this process it became clear that there was a need for a general descriptive chapter separate from media-specific chapters. Gradually less and less feedback was received from the community through this style of consultation process, although consultation activities continued through conference presentations and the like.

This type of consultative process may not be feasible during a RAD revision process at the current time, given that resources will likely not be available to the same extent. Some alternative ideas that were mentioned include:

- to better involve users in RAD development or maintenance, a user advisory group could be formed as part of RAD’s governance structure
- better involving students in RAD development
- incorporating a RAD input session at each ACA conference
- using a Town Hall model for stakeholder consultation
- incorporating RAD discussions as part of provincial/territorial associations’ meetings
- following consultation models employed by those developing Internet standards (e.g. using requests for communications that allow people to check in as they want)
There was some concern that the archivist volunteer base (those that would be interested and able to make regular contributions) varies in different regions, and that often the same people volunteer, which can cause burnout over time. Also it was noted that interest may be lesser now (at the theoretical and strategic stage of planning for RAD’s revision) versus down the road, during implementation. However, there was a high response rate to the CCAD survey, which was encouraging.

It was suggested to produce a Notes and Communications piece about the Meeting on the Future of RAD for *Archivaria*.

**Group 6 Questions – Revision Roadmap and Transitional Strategies: Discussion Summary**

The discussion started by considering the role of crosswalks as a tool to enable backwards compatibility as well as whether or not to allow legacy RAD descriptions to co-exist with descriptions devised according to a revised RAD.

One suggestion was that descriptive records could be flagged to indicate compliance with RAD1 or the future revised RAD, to help differentiate between them. While it could work to allow legacy records to co-exist for a time, there may be a point in time when it would be difficult to maintain both of them (e.g. in Atom, having both RAD and RAD2 templates). This would have to be considered.

There was definitely some community concern voiced in the survey results over having to get a new database or commit resources to re-description if RAD were revised, particularly at smaller institutions. This said, not all institutions are RAD-compliant now. Communicating that this is understood might help allay fears when moving forward.

One participant cautioned that data loss during conversion is common or difficult to avoid. Institutions could share information on their own data migration/conversion experiences with the community as use cases. A similar idea mentioned was to have case studies linked directly to the rules, to provide direct roadmaps for institutions. Vendors could also provide tools to assist in data migration exercises, although working with vendors before has had problems (e.g. RAD licensing efforts).

For crosswalks, it was pointed out that a RAD-ISAD(G) crosswalk already exists. Further, what had been discussed at this meeting pointed to a revision process for RAD rather than a wholesale reinvention of the rules, so the efforts to update descriptions and infrastructure to comply with a revised RAD may be less onerous than feared.

Another useful crosswalk tool (e.g. stylesheet) to develop would be from RAD to EAD3, the data exchange standard. This would aid in supporting consistent implementation and data migration activities. RAD note fields tend to be particularly problematic as they contain a lot of unstructured data. One participant suggested that reviewing Encoded Archival Description (EAD) might help illuminate what should be included in a revised RAD (as a type of gap analysis or illustration of what hadn't worked well between the original RAD and EAD).

As part of gaining community understanding, support, and buy-in for the RAD revision process, including eventual implementation, one participant suggested clearly communicating the rationale for revision. This, alongside regular communication and training, would help to assuage worries in the community as well as to ensure support and buy-in for RAD revision and implementation.
Some additional comments on various issues were offered at the end of this portion of the meeting discussion (e.g. questions and comments from meeting observers):

- provide more examples, as they make the rules clearer
- provide guidance on what not to do, not just what should be done
- follow the Atom template structure – e.g. identifying which descriptive elements must be provided
- more clearly explain the rules for describing physical extent of electronic records
- archival educators should adapt their teaching on arrangement and description to situate RAD in a period of transition, identifying strengths and weaknesses of the current standard
- clarify the relationship of RAD to metrics and institutional reporting (the CCA working group on archives statistics has been dormant)

End of Day Wrap-up Discussion: Summary

The day concluded with a wrap-up discussion of what had been previously been covered, with the intent of trying to confirm some decisions, direction, and areas of consensus or divergence. Some of the main points made were that:

1. Generally there seemed to be consensus that a Canadian descriptive standard should be retained, and that it should align with international standards.
2. DACS could stand as an example of a national standard aligning with international standards.
3. The proposed approach was that core elements would be articulated separately from more detailed 'implementation guidelines' (where media rules would go). Links out to other standards, or guidance about them and how they would work with a revised RAD, could also be provided.
4. Punctuation rules should be discontinued with exception to multi-part elements that require punctuation between the parts.
5. RAD2 could be used as a starting point.
6. A revised RAD should just focus on description and not on other archival functions or activities.
7. Part of the revisions to RAD should rectify existing gaps, such as providing richer information around custodial history, arrangement and archival accountability.
8. A conceptual model should be considered and/or developed or adapted (e.g. from ICA EGAD’s work, from Atom).
9. Rules for electronic records need to be treated throughout a revised RAD with sufficient examples.
10. Differentiation should be made between born-digital and digitized records.
11. Differentiation should be made between physical carriers and intellectual content.
12. There should be rules for recording information about original systems' environments.
13. Numbering conventions and writing style should mirror ISAD(G).
14. Generally the governance of RAD should be kept with CCAD, with the potential to consider a division of responsibilities or roles for content, publisher and secretariat. Other models should be investigated to help clarify options, keeping in mind that governance models are very much tied to resources available. One observer cautioned that the complexity of issues around governance should not be misestimated.
15. Prior to approaching LAC with any requests (e.g. to act as secretariat), CCAD should be able to clearly articulate wants and needs (clarify the scope and plan for a revised RAD).

16. Issues around sustainability and costing need to be fleshed out further. While there was consensus that some version of a revised RAD should be free, there is still potential for other revenue streams, and no consensus on this issue was achieved during this meeting.

17. There is a need for open and constant communication with the archival community throughout the process of revising RAD.

18. Consultation efforts must continue.

In addition to these points, the group discussed drafting a statement of principles to preface and accompany RAD. Alignment to international standards (ISAD(G), ISAAR(CPF)) could be stated there.

While at several points in the meeting the suggestion to re-do portions of the survey to allow for more statistically viable results was made, generally it was felt that sufficient information had been collected from the previous survey exercise, that it had been successful in achieving its aim, and that efforts would be better spent on moving forward. The fact that people want change was clearly articulated through the existing survey results.

Next steps to be done (or initial steps when revising RAD) included:

- drafting formal proceedings from the Meeting on the Future of RAD
- developing a statement of principles
- determining appropriate timelines as possible

To start, CCAD will develop a report with recommendations from the Meeting on the Future of RAD. It will be reviewed by the CCA Board prior to being submitted to LAC. CCAD may share a version of it with this meeting's participants prior to submission (if the timeline allows). The report must be submitted to LAC by March 31st, 2016.

**Meeting adjourned.**