To:	ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

From:	Jennifer Bowen, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee

Subject:	Report on the JSC meeting, Chicago, April 24–28, 2005

The JSC has posted a fairly extensive report on Outcomes of the April JSC meetings to the JSC public website. In order to ensure that my comments do not conflict with the text of that report and thus cause undue confusion, I have decided to make this report to ALA in the form of a gloss on that document. The original text of the Outcomes document appears in a larger font (Verdana), with my comments and additions in a slightly smaller font, indented, interspersed. I have also added some internal captions and numbering to this document to make it easier to navigate, and include additional comments on topics not covered in the Outcomes document at the end of this report.

Outcomes of the Meeting of the Joint Steering Committee Held in Chicago, U.S.A, 24-28 April 2005

1   General

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of *AACR* (JSC) met in Chicago, U.S.A. from April 24-28, 2005. The Committee of Principals for *AACR* (CoP) also met that week in Chicago, and two joint meetings were held to discuss work on the new edition of *AACR*, and the best ways to support the project.

1.1	The following observers (mostly from ALA) also attended all or part of the JSC meeting:

John Attig, Penn State (CC:DA voting member)
Betsy Mangan, retired, LC (CC:DA voting member)
Kevin Randall, Northwestern University (CC:DA rep.)
Renette Davis, University of Chicago, and other U/Chicago staff
Judy Kuhagen, Library of Congress
Matthew Beacom,Yale University (Chair, JSC Outreach Group)
Helen Schmierer, University of Illinois/Chicago
Joan Schuitema, University of Illinois/Chicago
Qiang Jin, University of Illinois
Ebe Kartus, Deakin University (ACOC Chair)

This is a summary of the JSC meeting; a complete list of topics discussed is contained in the agenda.

2   JSC Constituency feedback on Draft of Part 1 of *AACR3*

Feedback from the constituency review

At the meeting, the JSC reviewed the responses to the draft of part I of the new edition in the context of the goals in the strategic plan, and the wider environment:

➢ The feedback from the responses indicated that the goals in the strategic plan for *AACR* are still seen as valid. The rules should be based on principles; they should cover all types of materials; they should be applicable to, and operate in an online Web-based environment; they should be compatible with other standards for resource description and retrieval; and, they should be easy to use and interpret. There is an expectation that the rules will be used world-wide, and will be used as a resource beyond the library community to facilitate metadata interoperability and reduce overall costs.

➢ The feedback in the responses, however, indicated dissatisfaction with the arrangement of the draft of part I, particularly with respect to the separation between general rules and supplementary rules, and the scope of the supplementary chapters for specific types of content and specific types of media.

➢ There was also a call by some constituencies for the code to be modeled on metadata standards used by other communities.

➢ There was feedback that the language needs to be clearer and more direct, and that library jargon should be avoided.

2.1   ALA's comments on the draft were similar to those submitted by the other constituencies, although on the whole ALA expressed more dissatisfaction with the arrangement of Part 1 than did the other constituencies, to the point where ALA proposed an alternative arrangement based on ISBD areas that eliminated the separate chapters for supplementary rules. While some members of ALA strongly supported modeling the arrangement of the code on other metadata standards, CC:DA itself was less supportive of that approach, and the ALA response did not specifically call for modeling the rules on metadata standards (although it did call for making the rules more usable by other metadata communities).

3   Moving from *AACR3* to *RDA* (*Resource Description and Access*)

Change in direction for new edition of *AACR*

➢ The JSC and CoP affirmed that a new edition is still the best way to achieve the goals in the strategic plan, but agreed that a new approach was required.

3.1   Some commenters on the Draft of Part 1 specifically recommended that the JSC cease work on a new edition of *AACR*, or at least delay the process until additional consultation could be done with other stakeholders. The JSC and the CoP discussed these two options, and rejected both. Moving ahead on the initiative is considered essential, given the pressing need to address the challenges of describing digital resources and to provide a code that is more readily adaptable to newly emerging, more efficient, database structures. Not pursuing a new edition at all was also seen as a missed opportunity to:

1) improve the level of compatibility between traditional library cataloging records and those produced using newer metadata schemas, and
2) fill an emerging need by offering a possible content standard to metadata communities.

The JSC and CoP felt that delaying a new edition until additional consultation could be done with stakeholders would delay the timeline unacceptably (although the timeline has been extended somewhat, as described below). The new timeline (outlined below) allows for consultation with stakeholders concurrently with the development of the new code.

➢ The current environment is very different from that in which *AACR2* was developed: digital resources pose new challenges, and the records produced by the rules are used in a digital environment.

➢ Although the content of the new edition will be built on *AACR2*, and records resulting from use of the new edition will be compatible with those created in the past, what is being developed is in effect a new standard for resource description and access, designed for the digital world.

3.2   The statement in the Outcomes above includes a key phrase that will be used in reports and publicity about a new edition:

"A new standard for resource description and access, designed for the digital world."

This phrase accurately and concisely explains what the new code will be. The JSC is also starting to move away from using the term "rules" in describing *RDA*, and to instead refer to *RDA* as a set of guidelines, following the lead of Cataloging Cultural Objects and other metadata standards. This is also in keeping with the general movement toward simplification and an emphasis on principle-based cataloger's judgment. The process of simplification will move us away from having a "rule" to handle every specific situation that a cataloger encounters, and we need to keep this in mind as we move forward to develop *RDA*.

3.3   One of the focuses of the JSC/CoP meetings was on the need to provide adequate communication and public relations regarding work on the new code. In the recent past, we have assumed that most stakeholders are familiar with the existing rule revision process and with previous work toward developing a new edition of *AACR*, and in fact many are not. Our communication hasn't been pitched to the right audience, and thus has been less effective than it could be. As a beginning response

to this, I have written an "Executive Summary" of the April JSC meetings that is pitched at library administrators (attached, as Appendix A). I have distributed this document (or an earlier iteration of it) to the leadership of both the ALCTS Executive Committee and the ALCTS "Big Heads" Discussion Group, and encourage members of CC:DA to distribute it to other administrators as you see the need.

➢ With the change in direction there will be an emphasis on the new edition as an online product, although a print edition will also be published.

3.4 ALA's response to the draft of Part 1 mentioned several concerns about the new code as a digital product: Will the digital product be affordable? Will it be available in a timely manner? Will it have the functionality that catalogers need? Other concerns have been expressed about whether adequate market research has been done to justify the decision to focus on a web product. ALA will want to engage fully in discussions about plans for the web product to ensure that these concerns are fully addressed. An open discussion on this topic will be scheduled for the Monday morning CC:DA meeting at ALA Annual in Chicago so that CC:DA members and observers can express their concerns and opinions about the functionality of a web-accessible version of *RDA*. Representatives from ALA Publishing will attend and participate in the discussion.

4   Specifics of *RDA*

➢ The new approach will have the following features:

✓ the structure will be aligned more directly with the *FRBR* (*Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*) and *FRAR* (*Functional Requirements for Authority Records*) models;

4.1 There were many calls in the constituency responses for a closer connection between Part 1 of the new code and *FRBR*. The new structure for Part I will reflect a regrouping of descriptive data elements to correspond to subsets of attributes and relationships associated with the four primary entities in the *FRBR* model (work expression, manifestation, and item) and their association with specific user tasks (see also description under Section 6.1)

✓ instructions for recording data will be presented independently of guidelines for data presentation;

4.2 During the Constituency Review of Part 1, CC:DA discussed separating instructions for data recording from data display. Specifically, we discussed the possibility of moving the discussion of ISBD punctuation to a less prominent place in the code (perhaps to an Appendix). After a rather rushed discussion (because of the looming deadline for comments), CC:DA voted NOT to endorse the approach that the JSC has now decided to pursue. This is something that CC:DA will need to discuss at ALA Annual.

The decisions made at the JSC meeting actually take the separation of data recording a step further by not only moving the instructions on data display to an appendix, but also moving away from arranging Part 1 in terms of the ISBD areas. Instead, the new approach to Part 1 will move all discussion of ISBD display (punctuation and order of elements) to an Appendix. This Appendix will describe ISBD as one possible display standard that can be used in catalogs, and is intended to also include examples of full records using an ISBD display. Another section of an Appendix will address OPAC displays, perhaps belatedly acknowledging the reality that OPACs usually don't follow ISBD display standards anyway. [More discussion of how the JSC came to these decisions about the arrangement of Part 1 follows under Section 6]

✓ the layout and formatting of instructions will be more "user-friendly."

4.3 An effort will be made to make the formatting of the rules less densely compacted, with more use of bullets, captions, and other formatting devices so that they are easier to navigate.

➢ The rules will be divided into three parts: the first will cover resource description; the second will cover the provision of access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies, and citations for related works, expressions, manifestations, and items; and the third will cover the formulation of name and title access points and other data used for authority control.

➢ Guidelines on levels of description, access, and authority control will be linked to functionality.

4.4 Taking the "levels of description" currently described within *AACR* as a starting point, the new code will include more flexibility in providing levels of cataloging that will make the code usable in a wider variety of situations. The JSC discussed having each of the three sections of the code include guidelines on cataloging levels (description, access, authority control) that will be tied more directly to the *FRBR* and FRAR user tasks. This increased emphasis on levels will aid in the process of rule simplification, as the rules themselves won't have to address the level of data to be included (*5JSC/LC/2* – LC's proposal for simplifying rules for publication data – is an example of this approach).

As discussed at the JSC meeting, ACOC agreed to prepare a document (will be numbered *5JSC/ACOC rep/1*) addressing levels of description, access, and authority control that will be available for constituency review on June 20th, and can be discussed at the CC:DA meeting in Chicago. Reponses to this document will be due on September 12th.

➢ Guidelines for the presentation of both descriptive data (e.g. ISBD (International Standard Bibliographic Description)) and authority data (e.g. GARR (Guidelines for Authority Records and References)) will be covered in appendices.

> To signify the change in direction, the JSC has decided on a new working title: *Resource Description and Access* (*RDA*).

  4.5   The JSC (in consultation with the CoP) has decided to stop referring to the new code as "*AACR3*". In light of the more substantive changes now planned, the new working title, *Resource Description and Access* or *RDA*, signifies that the new code will be more than just a "repackaging"of the existing rules, and will actually include much more substantive changes. Along with this change, the JSC is also starting to refer to *RDA* a "new code" rather than a "new edition."

5 Moving Forward with *RDA*

Consultation with stakeholders

> In deciding to follow the new approach, JSC and CoP agreed that there needs to be increased consultation with stakeholders, in parallel with the revision process. Major stakeholders for the new edition include not only the JSC constituencies who have traditionally had a role in defining the content of *AACR*, but also library administrators, system developers, metadata communities, MARC format developers, and international programs such as the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, the ISSN International Centre, and IFLA. Plans are underway within the JSC and the CoP to consult more directly with these stakeholders as work on the new edition moves forward.

  5.1   There is a parallel effort going on within CCS with the report of the Task Force on CC:DA Representation and its recommendations to try to bring more of these other stakeholders into the CC:DA process. An update on this process may be available at the Monday CC:DA meeting at ALA Annual, after the ALCTS Board has had an opportunity to act on the report of the CCS Task Force.

> A prospectus outlining the new approach will be prepared to facilitate consultation with stakeholders and to provide context for constituency review of the individual parts of *RDA* as they become available. The prospectus will be accompanied by tables of contents for the General Introduction and all three parts as well as sample presentations of guidelines and instructions.

  5.2   The Prospectus for *RDA* will be available in mid-July, so we will not be able to refer to it during ALA in Chicago. The best indication of what the new structure will look like that will be available to us at upcoming CC:DA meetings is *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1*. We can use this document as an aid to discussing the new structure of *RDA*. As the Outcomes report states above, the Prospectus is designed to provide context for the review of the drafts of the parts of *RDA* as they are issued. While the JSC discussed the desirability of releasing a draft of the entire code for review all at once, this was determined to not be feasible even under the revised production schedule (listed below).

Change in timeline — Publication in 2008

➢ The change in direction will result in an extension to the overall timeline, including allowing time for a new draft of part I to be made available for constituency review.

➢ The following timeline presents a "best-case" scenario and is subject to change:

   ✓ May 2005-July 2005: Development of prospectus
   ✓ Oct. 2005-April. 2006: Completion of draft of part I, and constituency review
   ✓ May 2006-Sept. 2006: Completion of draft of part II, and constituency review
   ✓ Oct. 2006-Apr. 2007: Completion of draft of part III, and constituency review
   ✓ May 2007-Sept. 2007: Completion of General Introduction, Appendices, and Glossary
   ✓ 2008: Publication

6   Responses to Specific Feedback on Part 1

Review of responses to the draft of part I

At the meeting, the JSC discussed the constituency responses to the draft of part I at a general level, in the context of the change in direction.

> As stated in the Outcomes, the JSC did not discuss the detailed recommendations in the constituency responses to the draft of Part 1 during the Chicago meetings. The JSC does, however, plan to address these recommendations, using the process described below under Section 6.12.

➢ *Organization of part I*

   ✓ Dissatisfaction with the organization of the draft of part I was one of the factors that led to the change in approach for the new edition.

   ✓ Part I of *RDA* will be more directly aligned with the *FRBR* model and will focus on the attributes of the work, expression, manifestation, and item that are used to identify the resource and to describe the technical characteristics and content of the resource.

   ✓ General instructions as well as supplementary and special instructions applying to specific types of content, media, or mode of issuance will be grouped together under the relevant element of the description.

   6.1   As a result of the dissatisfaction expressed by ALA and others with the arrangement of Part 1, the Editor mocked up an Alternative Structure based upon

the elements of the description and eliminating the separate chapters for general and supplemental rules, as ALA recommended. (Note that this initial "Alternative Structure" document is a restricted JSC document and not available to CC:DA. However, the essential elements of it are also included in *5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1*). In the Alternative Structure (and as shown in the follow-up document listed above), each element of the description is treated as a discrete entity. For example, all instructions dealing with "title" are dealt with in one chapter, rather than considering "title" in Area 1, again in Area 7 (Notes) and again in Part 2 when considering variant forms of title.

6.2   The JSC observed that once the code's organization was no longer tied to ISBD areas, many other current problems with *AACR2* could also be addressed more easily. In addition to responding to ALA's concerns about the need to consult multiple chapters within the Draft, and the concern of several constituencies to bring the code closer into alignment with *FRBR*, another benefit of the Alternative Structure is that it may make the rules easier to understand and apply for those communities who are not familiar with the ISBD structure. The JSC noted that this arrangement also presents additional possibilities for simplification of the rules, such as how to approach the GMD (see below). The new structure also helps to address ACOC's suggestion that digital materials should actually be the primary focus of the new code (to replace the book focus of *AACR2*). While the new structure does not necessarily make digital materials the primary focus, the more flexible structure allows for the inclusion of new elements for digital identifiers such as URIs, which do not have a clear place in the ISBD structure.

➢ *Focus of the description / Sources of information*

✓ The draft of part I included instructions on determining the focus of the description and related this to the choice of the chief source of information. The constituency responses to the draft indicated that the instructions on focus for the description and the relationship of those instructions to instructions on sources of information need to be made clearer.

✓ There were also a number of reservations expressed about the generalization of instructions for choosing the chief source of information.

✓ The Library of Congress has submitted a proposal for revising the draft rules which covers what is being described, sources of information, and related rules.

✓ The Editor has also prepared a follow-up document, reworking those sections of the draft rules to respond both to the proposal made by LC and to other issues raised in the constituency responses.

✓ Constituencies will be asked to comment quickly on the LC proposal and the Editor's follow-up document so that the chosen approach can be included in the prospectus.

6.3   LC submitted the first version of *LC/1* before the JSC meeting along with their response to the draft of Part 1. This document was LC's attempt to improve the deficiencies that they saw in the preliminary rules in the Draft regarding: what is being described, number of records, basis of description, and sources of information. Key elements of LC's proposals include:

> Using the resource as a whole as the prescribed source
> A prescribed priority order of sources for the title proper, as an alternative to defining a "chief source"
> reserving the use of square brackets for information that is not taken from the resource itself

Preliminary CC:DA feedback on the original LC document indicated some ALA concerns about these recommendations: for example, about the adequacy of the "Other resources" category in LC's version of A1 1B2. The revised version of the document has a new first paragraph under A0.1B regarding resources that change over time, but otherwise the document has not been revised significantly.

6.4   In response to *LC/1* and to the general dissatisfaction expressed during the constituency review period regarding the preliminary rules, the Editor prepared *5JSC/AACR3/1/Editor follow-up/1*. This document attempts to fit the LC proposals into the Alternative Structure for Part 1. The Editor's document thus reflects more of the "latest thinking" about how these rules might be situated in the new code than does *LC/1/rev*, which is based on the Draft of Part 1. The Editor's document includes discussion of sources of information for each data element immediately prior to the rules for that element, thus addressing the concern of respondents to the Draft of Part 1 who did not like the placement of all instructions on Sources of Information within the preliminary rule.

Despite the possible difficulty for CC:DA in commenting on the Sources of Information rules before discussing the new approach to *RDA* in general, it is hoped that our providing some quick feedback to the Editor on these documents will allow him to incorporate comments from constituencies on these issues into the Prospectus before that document is issued in mid-July.

6.5   When commenting on these two documents, CC:DA is asked to consider the following:

1) Read the introductory section to the Editor document carefully, and please respond specifically to the five bullets on Page 7 of the *Editor follow-up*.
2) Does the *Editor follow-up* document adequately address the concerns expressed by ALA on the rules for sources of information in the Draft of Part 1?
3) Do *LC/1/rev* and/or the *Editor follow-up* address concerns that were expressed concerning *LC/1*?
4) Are there aspects of *LC/1/rev* that are preferable to the *Editor follow-up*?
5) Is there enough guidance for preferred sources of information for non-book materials? (this was one concern expressed about *LC/1*)
6) Are there other changes that ALA could propose that would further simplify and/or generalize the rules for Sources of Information?

While ALA's response to these two documents must be submitted by June 13, it may still be useful to include these documents and the other constituency responses to them on the CC:DA agenda at ALA in case anyone has additional concerns about them that they would like discuss.

➢ *Generalization*

✓ Constituency responses to the draft of part I were, on the whole, positive towards the work done to generalize the rules and reduce redundancy, but there were reservations expressed.

6.6 One reservation to generalization expressed by ALA was regarding the application of the numbering area to all materials (discussed below under 6.9. Resources issued in successive parts). Other concerns about generalization expressed during CC:DA discussions of the Draft involved efforts to generalize rules related to transcription. The comments revealed a clear dichotomy between some types of materials (e.g., printed materials, rare materials) where transcription is of vital importance for identification of the resource, and other materials (e.g. digital resources, some AV materials, assembled collections) where transcription is of more limited (or no) importance. The JSC is investigating an approach to this that would distinguish between those resources that are "self-describing" (and for which transcription would be important) and those that are **not** "self-describing."

✓ The responses also identified additional rules that might be generalized.

➢ *General material designations*

✓ The draft of part I included proposed revisions to the general material designation (GMD) to distinguish between the type and form of content contained in the resource and the medium in which it was conveyed. The constituency responses agreed that change was needed to the GMD, but expressed a number of concerns about what had been proposed in the draft.

✓ In the new approach to part I, the separation of instructions for recording information from guidelines for presentation will allow more flexibility in recording and displaying information on the type and form of content and the type and form of carrier.

✓ At the meeting, the JSC decided to form a working group to propose terms to be used in place of the current GMDs and SMDs.

6.7 The new structure for Part 1 of *RDA* contains elements for terms that describe "type and form of content" separately from "type and form of carrier". These separate elements will allow resources to be categorized without the current constraints imposed by display requirements.

The JSC has issued the Terms of Reference for the new GMD/SMD Working Group (*5JSC/Chair/6*). This group will identify terms to be used in both of these

areas, provide definitions of each term, articulate how the terms will be used, ensure that all terms are intelligible to catalog users, and propose guidelines for when more than one content term or more than one carrier term is applicable to a resource. The group will also make proposals on how both types of terms could be displayed in both an ISBD or an OPAC display. The group will submit an initial report by August 1st that will be discussed at the October 2005 JSC meeting.

➢ *Resources in an unpublished form*

✓ At the meeting the Library of Congress representative indicated that LC would be presenting a rule revision proposal for including archival rules at a basic level in the code.

6.8   This document from LC is expected on August 1st, with a deadline for ALA's response of September 12th.

➢ *Resources issued in successive parts / Integrating resources*

✓ Some responses to the draft of part I suggested that the rules for resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources not be in separate chapters from the general rules.

✓ In the new arrangement, rules for these materials will be placed directly following the relevant general rule with the scope clearly indicated.

✓ One feature of the draft of part I was the expansion of the numbering area to all multipart resources. In general, constituency responses were not in favour of this, and the numbering area will revert to being applicable only to serials.

6.9   The JSC also discussed concerns raised in responses to the draft related to the generalization of rules for multiparts, and the need to record bibliographic rather than physical units in the technical description for resources issued over time.

➢ *Technical description (ISBD area 5)*

✓ In the draft of part I, rules pertaining to technical description were included in the general rules, with supplementary rules applicable to specific types of media in a separate section. This arrangement met with a great deal of criticism in the constituency review.

✓ In the new arrangement, the rules for each element in the technical description will present both general instructions and instructions applicable to specific formats together, with the scope of each instruction clearly indicated.

✓ In the new arrangement the instructions for recording both type and form of carrier and type and form of content will be presented independently of instructions on extent, and will allow greater flexibility in the way extent is recorded.

The JSC did not make any specific decision about the rules for recording extent. This issue will be addressed as the specifics of the constituency responses begin to be folded into the Editor's work on a new draft of Part I of *RDA* (see 6.12).

> ➢ *Simplification*

> ✓ Prior to the meeting, the Library of Congress submitted a proposal for simplification of the rules in ISBD area 4, and this will be commented on by the constituencies.

6.10   The constituencies have also been asked to comment on another LC proposal (*5JSC/LC/2*) on simplifying the rules for publication information. This document will be on the CC:DA agenda for ALA Annual.

6.11   *Cost Efficiency* is one of the Objectives of *RDA*, and is one of the motivating factors in the simplification of rules within *RDA* and in the emphasis being placed upon the compatibility of records created under *RDA* with those created under *AACR2*. As anticipated, feedback received on the Draft of Part 1 indicated a great concern, especially from administrators, on keeping costs to a minimum. In discussing how to address this objective, however, the JSC acknowledged that cost efficiency is relative: it depends upon an individual library context. For example, a library that has the capability to capture descriptive data directly from another source, such as CIP or ONIX data from book publishers, may find it most cost-effective to include most of the descriptive data in the form that it is received without editing data or altering capitalization or punctuation in individual records to comply with detailed rules for transcription. Another library, whose catalogers must key all descriptive data, might find it more cost-efficient to only transcribe certain data to save keystrokes. The new code should be flexible enough to handle both situations, so that libraries can optimize the use of technology within a cataloging workflow.

The JSC also decided on a method to deal with the large number of detailed comments from constituencies. This method will focus on identifying comments on which there is consensus as soon as possible, so that they can be incorporated by the Editor in the draft of part I. For constituency comments on which there is not consensus, there will be discussion at the October 2005 meeting.

6.12   **Addressing Constituency Responses.** The process described above is now going on among the JSC representatives. When issues from the various constituency responses to Part 1 are identified for which there is no clear consensus, the constituencies will have the option to reconsider whether to put forward the comments as rule revision proposals with additional justification. As controversial issues from the ALA response are identified by the JSC, I will bring these back to CC:DA for further discussion, reconsideration, and possible resubmission. Many of the comments in the ALA response that were actually requests to change an *AACR2* rule rather than a comment on something new in the Draft of Part 1 may need to be resubmitted as formal rule revision proposals if there is not widespread agreement about them during the first round of "triage" by the JSC. CC:DA may want to start identifying and prioritizing those items from the ALA Response to Part 1 that it most wants to see implemented within

RDA so that we can act quickly to develop proposals should there not be enough consensus within the JSC for these to go forward during the preliminary assessment process.

7   Part II of *RDA*

Discussion of draft of part II

At the meeting, the JSC discussed the constituency responses to the draft of part I at a general level, in the context of the change in direction.

➢ Prior to the April 2005 meeting, the Editor created a draft of part II for discussion by the JSC. Because of the change in direction, this was discussed only at a general level.

➢ Part II of *RDA* will focus on the use of access points to reflect relationships between the four primary entities in the *FRBR* model (works, expressions, manifestations, and items) and the persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with those entities. It will also cover the use of citations to reflect the relationships between works, expressions, manifestations, and items.

7.1   Note that Part II would cover not only persons and corporate bodies, but also families as a distinct category of entity, to address a concern of the archival community that families are distinct from corporate bodies. The FRBR Review Group has agreed to add "family" to the list of Group 2 entities in the *FRBR* model, and this will allow *RDA* to follow *FRBR* in this respect.

7.2   Part II as discussed would cover the roles that persons etc. responsible for the content of a resource fulfill, and so would carry forward the concept of designations of function (as currently expressed in *AACR2* 21.0D).

➢ As part of the work on part II, the JSC is exploring the feasibility of simplifying rules for choosing the primary access points for purposes of citing a work.

7.3   One possible approach is to focus the rules for determining primary access under "creator", to make these rules more compatible with metadata practices. Once a cataloger has consulted the general rule for selection of primary access point, they would then consult a second tier of rules dealing with secondary access points.

7.4   The JSC has also discussed eliminating any current general rules that allow a person or body responsible for an *expression* (as opposed to a *work*) to be given primary access. Performers, such as on sound recordings, are the only example of this situation within *AACR2*.

➢ Chapter 21 of *AACR2* currently contains detailed special rules for musical works, art works, certain legal works, certain religious works, and certain academic works. In time for discussion at the October 2005 JSC meeting, the JSC constituencies will be asked to assess whether any of these rules could be either eliminated or simplified, and to make proposals for doing so.

7.5 A call for proposals for the elimination of special rules within *AACR2* Chapter 21 has been issued as *5JSC/Chair/5*, with a deadline for these proposals set for July 25th. The proposals will be compiled into a single document for constituency review (responses due Sept. 12th). The proposals and comments will then be discussed at the October JSC meeting and the results folded into the Editor's work on Part II. One important goal of the simplification and/or elimination of these rules is to try to make the special rules more understandable to generalist catalogers who may not have special expertise in cataloging music, legal materials, religious works, etc. Constituencies are also encouraged to put forward a justification for the continued inclusion of particular special rules, if there is strong feeling that certain rules should be retained within *RDA*.

As CC:DA discusses the possibility of issuing proposals for the elimination or simplification of these rules, we should keep in mind the possible implications of these changes for compatibility with existing catalog records. A change in primary access point between expressions or manifestations of a work should not impede retrieval because headings (citations) for the work and expression would still be present in the record. However, some collocation in OPAC displays is likely to be affected.

8 Part III of *RDA*

Discussion of approach to part III

➢ At the meeting, JSC discussed how part III will build on the work done previously by the Library of Congress to introduce authority control principles into *AACR*.

> Specifically, the JSC looked at *4JSC/LC/54* and the responses to it. As work on Part III moves further along, CC:DA may want to revisit those documents.

➢ Part III of *RDA* will focus on the formulation of access points reflecting both authorized and variant forms of names for persons, families, and corporate bodies, and titles for works. Part III will also cover the formulation of data elements used in citations for works, expressions, manifestations, and items, and other data elements used in authority control.

➢ In late 2005 the JSC constituencies will be asked to assess whether any of the special rules currently in chapters 22-25 of *AACR2* could be either eliminated or simplified, and to make proposals for doing so.

8.1 Because the JSC considers the compatibility of headings created under *RDA* with headings created under *AACR2* to be a high priority, extensive changes to the Special Rules from Chapters 22-25 are not anticipated. Nevertheless, the development of *RDA* presents an appropriate opportunity to reaffirm the need for these special rules, to identify any existing problems with them, and to make them as understandable as possible to non-specialist catalogers. CC:DA will need to discuss the call for proposals for these rules at ALA Midwinter, as any such proposals will be due to the JSC in February 2006.

9   Other Sections of *RDA*

Discussion of the General Introduction

➢ The General Introduction will cover the purpose and scope of the code, the underlying objectives and principles, and related standards and guidelines.

➢ There was discussion at the meeting about the need for more detail on the conceptual background to the rules, and the best way to convey this in readable style.

9.1   The JSC discussed various options for a longer conceptual "introduction," including the possibility of issuing it as a separate document. Some users of the new code (e.g., cataloging students, professional catalogers) will find the information in such a statement very important, but other users of the code, such as metadata communities, won't find it as relevant to their needs. Whatever decision is made about how a conceptual statement might be issued, the code itself will at least contain a more practical introduction (e.g. "How to use this code").

Another possible topic for a conceptual introduction might be a discussion of implementation scenarios for records created according to *RDA*. This topic was mentioned only briefly at the JSC meeting, but merits more discussion and thought. This could possibly be a place where the "single record technique" could be described, and thus address the concerns of those ALA members who would like to see this technique somehow included within the new code.

Discussion of appendices

➢ At the meeting, the JSC discussed constituency responses to a CILIP discussion paper on the principles behind usage of abbreviations in *AACR*.

➢ JSC decided that revision of the appendices on abbreviations, capitalization, and numbering, will focus on aligning these appendices with the structure of *RDA*, and that the work would be scheduled at the October 2005 meeting.

9.2   A document will **not** be forthcoming for constituency review on the appendices at this time; instead the JSC will discuss at the October meeting the principles behind what should be in each appendix and will consider creating a Working Group (or groups) to work on aligning the appendices.

Along with discussing the appendices, the JSC also discussed the current policy for the inclusion of terms in the Glossary (*4JSC/Policy/3*). The JSC will consider a revision to this document so that the necessary policies are up to date before work starts in earnest on the glossary during October 2006-April 2007.

10 Next JSC Meeting

Next meeting

JSC will meet October 10-13, 2005 in London, England.

10.1   The major topics for discussion at the next JSC meeting will be as follows (some described above):

> The *RDA* Prospectus that will be issued this summer
> Triage from the JSC feedback to Part 1; discussion of topics which did not have consensus during the first round
> Report from the CC:DA Digital Media Task Force
> A forthcoming LC proposal on archival materials
> Report from the JSC GMD/SMD Working Group (now being formed)
> Levels of description, access, and authority control (*5JSC/ACOC rep/1*)
> A forthcoming LC proposal on musical presentation area
> Punctuation within elements of the description (response to forthcoming analysis by the JSC Secretary)
> Proposals for the simplification of/justification for special rules in Chapter 21
> Principles behind appendices, and formation of a working group

11 Other topics discussed by the JSC

11.1   Outreach about *RDA*

The review process for the Draft of Part 1 made it very evident that the JSC and its constituencies need to focus their energies on providing accurate, and proactive, publicity about the new direction being pursued toward development of *RDA*. Groups identified as targets for this publicity and outreach include the following:

> Catalogers
> Other rule-makers
> Library administrators
> Professionals in other related disciplines: archivists, the museum community, social scientists (current users of DDI)
> System vendors
> Metadata providers
> Digital content providers (repositories, etc.)
> WWW consortium, regarding work on the Semantic Web

During the JSC's April meeting, Matthew Beacom reported in his role as Chair of the JSC's Outreach Working Group. Currently, Chris Oliver (McGill University) is the only other person on the group, and the JSC agreed to appoint additional members. The Outreach Group will work on providing an FAQ on *RDA* for the public JSC site. They will also begin to identify specific liaisons in other metadata communities, such as Dublin Core and VRA.

11.2 Project Manager for *RDA*

The JSC's meetings with the Committee of Principals were quite productive and have resulted in specific actions that will directly support the development of *RDA*.

The CoP will hire a Project Manager for *RDA*, and has already formed a Search Committee to review potential candidates. The search for a Project Manager will be directed toward individuals who are familiar with both the resource description and access communities and the vendor communities.

The *RDA* Project Manager's duties will include the following, among other things:

coordinating a Project Team comprising the following parties:

The Chair of the JSC
The Chair of the CoP
The Chair of the Co-Publishers
The Editor of the revision
The Online Product Developer
The JSC Secretary,

developing and implementing the project plan

managing the schedule (including the JSC's schedule)

developing and implementing a communication plan

organizing and coordinating community consultations and

assisting the JSC with administrative support for meetings

Appendix A

From *AACR* to *RDA:* Executive Summary

The two international committees who oversee the development of *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR)* met in Chicago from April 24-28, 2005 to discuss the best way to proceed with the development of a new cataloging code to replace *AACR2*, the current edition of this widely-used standard for library cataloging. Increasingly *AACR2* is criticized for being too complex, too dependent upon outmoded card catalog concepts, and too difficult to apply to new types of digital resources.

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of *AACR* (JSC) and the Committee of Principals for *AACR* (CoP) discussed feedback received recently from library constituencies and other rule-making bodies on a draft of Part 1 of an intended new edition of *AACR*. The two committees reaffirmed the need to develop a new code to replace *AACR2*. However, the feedback was clear that a different approach is required than what was represented in the draft of Part 1.

To signify the change in direction, the JSC and CoP have agreed on a new working title for the code: ***RDA: Resource Description and Access***.

RDA will be a new content standard for resource description and access designed for the digital world. *RDA* will provide: a more flexible framework for addressing the challenges of describing digital resources
- data that is more readily adaptable to newly emerging, more efficient, database structures
- data that is compatible with existing records already in online library catalogs because of *RDA's* foundations in the principles set by *AACR.*

RDA will be designed as an online product for use in a Web environment. It will have the following specific features:
- Organization around IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR)* and related new data models
- Instructions for recording data presented independently of guidelines for data display, to provide more flexibility for records used in a variety of online environments
- More "user-friendly" layout and formatting, with instructions written in "plain" English so that the code can be used more easily beyond the library world.

In addition to the constituencies formally represented on the JSC and the CoP, major stakeholders in the development of RDA include library administrators, system developers, metadata communities, MARC format developers and international cataloging programs. As *RDA* is developed, drafts of each section of the new standard will be made available for these major stakeholders to review, and the developers of *RDA* will actively seek feedback from all of these groups.

The publication of *RDA* is now planned for 2008.

A more complete report of the meetings of the Joint Steering Committee is available at:
http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0504out.html