

TO: ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

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

SUBJECT: Report of April 2006 Joint Steering Committee Meeting

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) met in Ottawa from April 24–28, 2006, and in a joint meeting with the Committee of Principals for AACR (CoP) on April 25th. Deirdre Kiorgaard, ACOC representative to the JSC, presided as the new Chair of the JSC. I attended these meetings in my role as the ALA representative to the JSC. The official Outcomes of the JSC meeting are available at <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0604out.html>. In the following report, I will repeat some parts of the Outcomes document, but provide additional detail and discussion of interest to ALA. This report discusses the general issues first, and then is organized according to the sections of RDA.

While the JSC and the CoP held some discussions regarding progress toward the RDA online product, I will not include a report of those discussions in this report, since Don Chatham will be presenting more up-to-date information to CC:DA on the development of the RDA product in his report from ALA Publishing at ALA Annual.

I have indicated those areas where CC:DA action will be required in the near future in *bold italics* below.

1. RDA Strategic plan

A revised Strategic Plan for RDA has now been issued, and approved by the Committee of Principals: <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/stratplan.html>. The plan has been rearranged somewhat to differentiate between longer-term goals and shorter-term strategies (i.e., achievable before the first release of RDA in 2008) toward achieving those goals.

2. JSC document issues (distribution, etc.)

At the request of the JSC, the CoP approved making those JSC documents that have previously only been available to constituencies available publicly in the future. As I write this, we are in the process of implementing a plan to redesign the JSC websites to make this happen. These documents (from the “5JSC” numbering series) will be available publicly (in their PDF versions) sometime in June 2006. The JSC hopes that making these documents available will provide useful background information for the evaluation of those JSC documents for which public comment is requested.

The JSC also decided that future JSC minutes will be focused on key discussions and action items, rather than attempting to record all discussion. This should reduce the effort

necessary for the JSC secretary to prepare the minutes, and it is hoped will make it possible for the minutes to be issued sooner after the meeting.

3. General discussion of “RDA Lite”, data modeling, etc.

The ALA response to the draft of part I included several suggestions for accommodating the needs of both the library community and other resource description communities. One ALA suggestion was the creation of a high-level overview of RDA data elements, principles, etc. that could be made freely available to inform the work of other resource description communities. The JSC discussed this suggestion (which was also made by CILIP), and is interested to hear additional feedback from metadata communities about what such a document might look like, and how it might be used. This would help the JSC to more fully assess whether or not it would be worthwhile to propose the development of such a document to the Committee of Principals. At this time, the JSC’s primary focus must be on the development of the RDA online product, and the creation of an additional document during the same timeframe would be a difficult undertaking.

Another approach suggested in the ALA response was the creation of “application profiles” within the RDA product that would guide users to the appropriate guidelines based upon their community of interest (library or metadata). The RDA Editor offered to begin to explore the feasibility of this option.

The JSC also considered the ALA recommendations (from the IEEE LOM representative and others) that the JSC engage in high-level data modeling that would take into account educational objects, data sets, and other online resources that are much more fluid in content than resources traditionally collected by libraries. The JSC is pleased that ALA has taken the initiative to begin to understand the needs of communities that generate and handle such resources. Again, however, the group reiterated its need to focus on its central goal of making RDA available in 2008. Incorporating specific guidelines for the description of these particular types of digital materials into RDA will likely require longer-term discussions, which will need to continue well beyond the initial release of RDA in 2008.

4. Review of draft of part I of RDA

The JSC spent over two days of its April meeting discussing responses received during the public review period of the draft of part I of RDA. In addition to the constituency responses, the JSC also reviewed responses from rule-making bodies in several other countries, and informally considered a summary of comments from the RDA-L discussion list compiled under the direction of the RDA Project Manager. The review of the draft of part I yielded over 700 specific comments from constituencies that need to be addressed. Rather than attempt to discuss the vast majority of these detailed comments during the JSC meeting itself, the JSC identified several major issues to be discussed — these, and the decisions made regarding them, are discussed below. The remainder of the comments from constituencies, as listed in the *5JSC/RDA/Part 1/Sec follow-up* response

table, will be handled over the next few months using the same triage system developed last year to handle comments on the review of part 1 of AACR3.

To assist me in responding during the initial round of triage on the part I comments, I request that CC:DA members examine the other JSC constituency responses to the draft of part I and indicate to me any comments that you fundamentally disagree with or that you feel need discussion before being worked into the guidelines in part I, so that I can respond appropriately on behalf of ALA. In some cases CC:DA may need to discuss these responses via email between now and August 7th.

CC:DA Action: All CC:DA members and liaisons look through non-ALA comments and identify any that you strongly disagree with — send to me with an explanation of your rationale. Deadline: July 28th.

5. Relationships between data elements

One concern expressed in the ALA response to the draft was how to retain the relationships between data elements within RDA now that RDA is no longer centered around the ISBD areas. Repeatable elements present a considerable challenge. As described in the Outcomes, the JSC decided to establish hierarchical relationships between elements to address this. High-level elements will be defined, and these higher-level elements may have both sub-types and sub-elements. For example, the high-level element “title” will have sub-types “variant title”, “parallel title”, “title proper”, etc. Some high-level elements will consist of several smaller sub-units or sub-elements, which when taken together form the larger element. This is the case for the high-level element “publication information”, for example, which will contain sub-elements for “publisher”, “place of publication”, and “date of publication”. As noted in the Outcomes document, however, it may be necessary to rely on the method used to store or present the data to maintain these relationships within a record and display the relationships appropriately.

6. Relationship to other standards (RDA draft 0.1.1)

ALA offered, in its response to the draft, to develop proposals related to specific rules (especially in situations where we were requesting a change to an AACR2 rule). In most cases the JSC has not yet discussed ALA’s offers, as they are being folded into the triage process described above. In one case, however, the JSC has requested that ALA provide a list of specialist cataloging manuals to be listed in the 3rd paragraph of RDA 0.1.1.1.

Suggested CC:DA Action: Submit citations for relevant documents to new Confluence document by July 31 (list will go to the Editor by August 7th)

7. Overall structure of RDA (RDA draft 0.1.4 etc.)

Comments received on the draft of part I (some from ALA) noted an increasing overlap between part I (Description) and part II (Access), and questioned the rationale for

continuing to make this distinction, especially since other resource description communities do not make a distinction between description and access elements. In response to these comments, and also to make RDA more consistent with FRBR and IME/ICC principles, the JSC decided to structure RDA in just two parts rather than three, by combining parts I and II into a single part. For clarity, the parts of the new structure will now be called “Part A” (encompassing former parts I and II) and “Part B” (formerly part III).

As described in the Outcomes document, some of the chapters in what was previously part I will be rearranged during this process, although the organization of the guidelines within most of the chapters will remain roughly the same as in the draft of part I. The JSC agreed to make the following changes for the new Part A:

- ✓ **Introduction:** will be expanded to also include text that had been planned for the Introduction to part II.
- ✓ **Chapter 1:** will be expanded to incorporate general guidelines on reflecting relationships that had been planned for the first chapter of part II
- ✓ **Chapters 6** (from the draft of part I): will be eliminated, with the guidelines from this chapter redistributed between **Chapters 2–5**.

It is hoped that the changes to the structure of part A will address some of the comments in the ALA response to the draft of part I that called for a better alignment between the structure of RDA and the FRBR user tasks (*find, identify, select, obtain*).

A draft of the chapters that were formerly designated as “part II” (now called Chapters 6 and 7) will be issued this summer for public comment, as planned. A revised Prospectus will also be issued that will describe the overall new structure.

8. Numbering of RDA Guidelines

Based upon comments during the review of part I, the JSC has asked the Editor to add an additional level of numbering to the RDA guidelines at the paragraph level to facilitate citing a specific guideline.

9. Options (RDA draft 0.1.7)

Some constituency comments on the draft of part I indicated concerns about the number of options within RDA, and with the nature of these options. JSC discussions confirmed that there were three types of option statements in the draft of part I:

- a. Options to record or transcribe additional data
- b. Options to omit either an entire data element or a portion of an element
- c. Options to record different data or take a different approach

The JSC affirmed the desirability of eliminating most of the second category when the option is to omit the entire data element, since the optional status of most data elements

should take care of most of these cases (see discussion of Required elements below). The remaining types of options within RDA will be clearly labeled as one of the following:

- ✓ “Optional addition”
- ✓ “Optional omission” [to omit data from within a data element]
- ✓ “Alternative:”

It is hoped that this will make it much easier for cataloging agencies to locate all instances of a certain kind of option within RDA and to set and maintain local policies for these options.

10. Terminology (1.1)

Some constituencies’ comments continued to express concern about the use of the term “resource” within RDA to refer to the “thing that is being described”. The suggestion was again made that if RDA descriptions are at the manifestation level that RDA should use that more specific term instead. The JSC discussed this concern and reiterated its support for using “resource” as a general term rather than “manifestation”, since some RDA guidelines actually refer to item-level information and not to manifestations.

11. Mode of issuance (RDA draft 1.1.2 etc.)

ALA and other constituencies submitted many comments relating to mode of issuance in the draft of part I, especially regarding the categorization of resources under guidelines for mode of issuance. The RDA Editor is now preparing a discussion paper on these issues that will facilitate JSC discussion of these issues at the October JSC meeting by providing guidance on when a category of resource required a separate instruction within RDA. While the constituencies are not being asked to prepare formal responses to the discussion paper (since it is not an actual proposal), I am happy to hear comments from ALA members on the issues discussed in this paper, to aid me in preparing for this discussion at the October meeting. The discussion paper should be available around the beginning of July.

The JSC deferred its discussion of topics related to mode of issuance from the draft of part I until the Editor’s paper is available. As a result, JSC discussion of ALA comments on related topics (such as changes requiring a new description) has also been deferred.

12. Mandatory (now “Required”) elements (RDA draft 0.1.6 and 1.4)

Some ALA reviewers of the draft of part 1 found the wording of RDA’s instructions to record or transcribe data elements misleading, as they assumed that the implication was that the elements were all somehow required. To clarify the status of an element (whether or not it is required), the JSC agreed on formatting changes to the text that will indicate at the beginning of guidelines for each data element whether the element is:

- ✓ **Required** (i.e. it must be recorded in all descriptions)
- ✓ **Required if applicable** (i.e. required if it is available - either explicitly or implicitly - from a source of information within the resource itself) or
- ✓ **Optional.**

The listing of RDA Required Elements (formerly called “Mandatory elements”) within Chapter 1 (1.4) will also be revised to make the distinction between “required” and “required if applicable”. This listing at 1.4 will also make a further distinction regarding “Required if applicable” to place those elements that are applicable only to certain categories of materials (e.g. serials or cartographic materials) in a separate list. Within the RDA guidelines themselves, the elements will be clearly labeled regarding the categories of materials to which they are applicable.

Other than now designating which elements are “required” or “required if applicable” as described above, the JSC did not add or delete any elements from the list of fourteen elements that appeared in the draft of 1.4. However, the JSC intends to continue discussions in the future about possibly making “type of content” (4.2) a required element, and will perhaps also discuss the status of “coordinates of cartographic content” when the data is not taken from the resource itself.

The **Required if applicable** category will be used for those data elements where data may or may not be explicit on a resource. It is hoped that this, plus separating some data elements (such as technical detail) into separate optional subelements, should alleviate the concern expressed by ALA regarding the need for guidance on what to do when an element can’t be recorded.

The JSC engaged in substantial discussions regarding the option to use an access point in lieu of a transcribed statement of responsibility. While ALA and some other constituencies voiced concern about the potential impact of this option upon duplicate detection processes and the ability to document usage patterns for authority work, the JSC agreed to retain the option because of strong support for it from other constituencies. The JSC acknowledged that the controversial guideline is in fact an option — those institutions or cataloging programs that rely heavily upon such transcribed data may choose to continue to transcribe statements of responsibility. It was also pointed out during JSC discussions that concerns regarding the potential loss of the ability to identify a person or body associated with a resource that this identification function could be fulfilled by an authority record rather than a bibliographic record. The JSC rejected the suggestion that the option be labeled as something applicable only to use by other metadata communities because there are indeed some libraries that intend to implement the option.

The JSC also discussed whether or not RDA elements should be repeatable, and the decision was that it will depend upon the encoding format that is used, and whether that encoding format allows repeatable elements. A general statement will be added to RDA to this effect.

13. Transcription issues (RDA draft 1.6)

In discussing issues related to data transcription (especially the potential simplification of data transcription toward “take what you see” from the resource), the JSC decided that it was necessary to clarify which data elements are to be considered “transcribed” elements, as opposed to “recorded” elements. This distinction will be clearly labeled within the text of the guidelines within RDA.

The list of transcribed elements includes the following elements (with the numbers in parentheses indicating those rules in the part I draft that deal with that transcribed element, its subelements and subtypes):

Title (2.31–2.3.6)

Statement of responsibility (2.4.0–2.4.1)

Edition (2.5.1–2.5.4)

Publisher, distributor, etc. (2.7.1–2.7.3)

Place of publication, distribution, etc. (2.8.1–2.8.4)

Series (2.10.1–2.10.5, also 2.10.7)

Other elements of the description, including numbering, dates, frequency, and resource identifier, are NOT considered transcribed elements. Making this distinction as clear as possible within RDA will not only make the guidelines ultimately easier to use, but in the meantime will allow the guidelines for abbreviations, etc. to be simplified more easily (see also discussion of abbreviations below).

14. Numerals and numbers expressed as words (RDA draft 1.6.2)

This section will be renamed “Numbers expressed as numerals or as words”. As a result of JSC discussions, **1.6.2.1** and **1.6.2.2** will be deleted from the general guidelines in Chapter 1, with the instructions moved to the specific guidelines where they are needed. For example, the 2nd paragraph from 1.6.2.1 will be added at 2.6.0.3. The JSC also discussed other changes to 1.6.2 that were proposed in the LC proposal (*5JSC/LC/5*). LC has prepared a revised version of this document for constituency review based upon the constituency responses to the original document, and reflecting JSC discussions during the Ottawa meeting (see also below).

15. Abbreviations (RDA draft 1.6.7, etc.)

In response to feedback from constituencies urging the JSC to limit the usage of abbreviations, the JSC decided to move away from using any abbreviations within the transcribed data elements defined above, unless the abbreviation appears on the resource being described or a specific exception is made within the RDA guidelines. One result of this change is that “edition statement” and “statement relating to a named revision of an edition” **will** now be considered transcribed elements, and so abbreviations will no longer be used for these elements. Again, this is part of the general trend toward “taking what you see”.

As described below, the RDA Appendices Group will be evaluating the Appendix on Abbreviations from AACR2, which could potentially result in changes in the usage of abbreviations within RDA for non-transcribed data elements. Specifically, the JSC also discussed the desirability of not using any abbreviations in the data element “extent” (RDA draft 3.4), and using copyright and phonogram symbols for dates if possible (or spelling out the word if not) instead of using the abbreviations “c” and “p”, for these dates, respectively.

16. Inaccuracies (RDA draft 1.6.8)

While some constituencies had some concerns about the provision to record an inaccuracy as found on the resource, the JSC decided to leave the guideline as it stands in the draft, to be consistent with the overall approach of “take what you see”. An instruction will be added, however, to say that the corrected form of the element should also be recorded. It is assumed that access points would be made for both the incorrect and corrected form.

17. Notes (RDA draft 1.7)

ALA commented on the need to redefine the concept of elements that are considered “notes”. Taken apart from the ISBD structure, the need for notes is now much more limited. The JSC decided to redefine many data elements that had been previously considered to be notes to now be defined as separate data elements, and will refine the use of true notes as those data elements that provide additional information about another element, such as:

- ✓ Additional information relating to or about a transcribed element, including “overflow” from a data element where there is too much data to be transcribed within the element itself, and
- ✓ Additional information for an element that has a closed set of possible values

Some “notes” will thus take on the same type of function as “footnotes”. Other data elements that had previously been considered notes, such as those that record additional dates, places, or technical information, will no longer be considered notes but will be defined as separate data elements in their own right.

18. Sources of Information (RDA draft 2.2)

The JSC did not discuss the ALA proposal regarding sources of information during the Ottawa meeting. The other constituencies will comment on the proposal as part of the triage on the part I comments described above.

19. Types of content and carrier (formerly GMD/SMD)

During the past few months, the JSC has been engaging in this area on two different fronts: first, through the activities of the JSC GMD/SMD Working Group, which

presented a report for constituency review prior to the April JSC meeting. Secondly, the JSC has also been participating in a joint investigation with members of the book publishing community to attempt to develop a framework for resource categorization that can be used both in RDA and in the ONIX standards. The RDA Editor has been representing the JSC in this work. At the April meeting, the JSC reviewed a draft of this framework, and affirmed that it looks to be promising.

The final report of the joint RDA/ONIX effort is due in mid-June, after which the JSC GMD/SMD Working Group will have an opportunity to respond to the RDA/ONIX document, and the RDA Editor will use the framework as the basis for drafting instructions for the RDA elements Media category (at 3.2), Type of carrier (at 3.3) and Type and form of content (at 4.2). ALA will then have an opportunity to respond to the draft of the new sections of RDA by September 18th. Finally, the JSC will discuss the constituency comments on the draft guidelines, along with the work of the GMD/SMD Working Group and constituency comments, at the October JSC meeting.

It is important to note that the intent of the joint RDA/ONIX framework is to provide a sound, consistent basis for categorization of resources. The actual application of the framework within RDA, however, will not necessarily require RDA users to consult the actual framework (which is quite complex). Catalogers may work instead with pre-set categories of resources that are based on the framework. These categories would be much easier to record, and more appropriate to display to catalog users. Assuming that the JSC ultimately affirms the use of the framework within RDA, the JSC will bring it forward for discussion with MARBI as an implementation issue for RDA.

CC:DA Action: Response to drafts of 3.2, 3.3, 4.2 (available by August 7th) due Sept. 18th.

20. Update on previous part I proposals

URLs (5JSC/ACOC/1). ALA will have an opportunity to comment on a revised version of this proposal, which ACOC is now preparing. This revision will take into account the comments received on the original proposal and some preliminary decisions made by the JSC, such as to use the term “online” instead of “remote access”. The revised proposal is expected by August 7th.

CC:DA Action: Response due Sept. 18th.

Digital Media Task Force Report (5JSC/ALA/2). Because there was not sufficient time for the constituencies to comment on this document prior to the April JSC meeting, the other constituencies will be responding by September 18th, and the proposals in this report will be discussed at the October JSC meeting. No CC:DA action needed at this time.

Internationalization (5JSC/LC/5/rev). LC is revising this proposal in light of comments received from constituencies, with the general intent of moving as many

specific instructions to the specific guidelines as possible, and including only general statements under 1.5 and 1.6. The goal will be to move the instruction to where it is most needed within RDA. The revised proposal is already available for ALA review.

CC:DA Action: Response due Sept. 18th.

21. Other comments from the ALA review of part I

As a part of the constituency review of part I, ALA members submitted comments on the **Glossary, Objectives and Principles**, and **Examples**. Because these comments were not requested as part of the constituency responses to the draft (and therefore not included in the ALA response), I have submitted all three of these sets of comments as separate, informal (unnumbered) documents to the appropriate groups or persons who are continuing to work on these aspects of RDA (e.g. the examples comments to the Examples Group). [More on progress on these other sections of RDA below.]

22. Upcoming review of part A-II (formerly known as part II!)

The draft of the RDA chapters (Chapters 6 and 7) that had formerly been designated as part II should be available the week of ALA. While this does not provide an ideal situation for discussion at ALA, we nevertheless will have the opportunity to discuss the draft as a group in New Orleans. As with the previous review of drafts, CC:DA will need to set internal deadlines for submitting comments (and “agree/disagree”) in Confluence to allow me sufficient time to prepare the ALA response by September 18th. The draft that is distributed for review will take into account recent JSC decisions regarding the overall structure of RDA, hence the extra time needed to have the draft ready for review.

CC:DA Action: Comments entered into Confluence by August 14th; agree/disagree by August 21st. ALA response due to the JSC by Sept. 18th.

Possible CC:DA Action: If ALA decides to submit any new proposals regarding the content of these chapters, they must be submitted to the JSC by August 7th.

Below are a few specific topics within Chapters 6 and 7 that CC:DA may want to pay particular attention to:

Family Names (5JSC/LC/6). The JSC made some preliminary decisions regarding incorporating the treatment of family names within Chapters 6 and 7. I encourage those CC:DA members who participated in the review of the original LC proposal to look at this aspect of the chapters carefully during the constituency review period. The JSC is continuing to look at those aspects of the proposal that are applicable to part B (such as whether or not to attempt to differentiate names of families), and in particular is looking at how family names are handled in other international standards for archival material.

Primary access for performers (7.2). The intent of this rule is to elevate performers to the status of primary access point (or principal creator) only if their involvement in the resource goes beyond performing. The wording of these new guidelines needs to be examined carefully (especially by the MLA, OLAC, and ARSC representatives) to see if they are easy to understand and apply, as they now take the place of the AACR2 rules for main entry for sound recordings.

Chapter 7 Special Rules. The cover memo to Chapters 6 and 7 will request that specialists in the areas represented by these special instructions (musical works, art works, legal works, religious works, official communications, academic works) consider whether or not these guidelines could be folded back into the earlier parts of the chapter. While this issue was addressed previously in responses to *5JSC/Chair/5*, seeing the instructions from AACR2 placed within the new RDA structure may suggest additional reorganization.

23. Other parts of RDA

Examples. The Examples Group is continuing its work on examples in part I, and is now being joined by an additional member, Kevin Randall, who will be helping the group evaluate the examples from AACR2 Chapter 12 for possible inclusion in RDA. A second Examples Group is also being formed to begin working on the remaining chapters of RDA, with some of the members of the initial group to serve on this group as well. The JSC is currently looking for someone to serve as chair for the second group.

CC:DA should note that there is no separate constituency review planned for the RDA examples. The examples are a “moving target” in the sense that they need to be continually revised as work progresses on the various sections of RDA. As guidelines are revised, moved around, and renumbered, the Examples Group needs to keep revising their work. So, while the examples for part I are now mostly complete, they must now be revised to take into account the merging of parts I and II — and therefore there is still no finished document that could be issued for review. To add in a review period for the “finished” examples at the end of the process would significantly delay initial release of RDA. The JSC hopes that by including members from all constituencies that want to participate within the Examples Groups will help to alleviate any concern about the lack of a separate review period. Constituencies will see the examples in the context of the entire document when the final drafts are completed in September 2007.

Appendices. As mentioned in the Outcomes, the JSC is putting together a small Working Group to work on the appendices on capitalization, abbreviations, and initial articles. Because of the quick deadline for a report from this group (August 7th), the group is all situated in one geographic area to facilitate their working together. The group consists of John Attig, Kathy Glennan (both from ALA), and Judy Kuhagen (Chair, from LC).

CC:DA Action: The ALA response to this group's report is due September 18th.

MARC 21, DC mappings (Appendix D). The JSC discussed the increasing need for a mapping between RDA and MARC 21 data elements, especially as RDA moves farther away from the ISBD area structure. ACOC and CCC are now working on a draft mapping that will be discussed by the JSC at the October meeting. This mapping will become the basis for a Discussion Paper that will be targeted for submission to MARBI for discussion at ALA Midwinter.

The RDA Editor has drafted a mapping between RDA and the Dublin Core Library Application, which the JSC will evaluate for inclusion within Appendix D as well.

Glossary. The JSC has now completed a revision of the policy document governing the inclusion of terms in the glossary (*5JSC/Policy/3/Rev*). Terms from the AACR2 Glossary and those already suggested for inclusion in the RDA Glossary will now be assessed against the policy document. Sally Strutt, the previous JSC Chair, will be carrying out this initial assessment, and her work will be discussed by the JSC at the October meeting.

Objectives and principles. As I mentioned above, I have submitted ALA comments received during the review of part I to the JSC so that he can consider them for inclusion in the Objectives and Principles document (*5JSC/RDA/Objectives and Principles*).

24. New proposals requiring CC:DA responses

Breton Initial Articles: LC has submitted a proposal (*5JSC/LC/7*) related to Breton initial articles — now available for review.

CC:DA Action: Response due Sept. 18th.

Maori Initial Articles: ACOC plans to submit a proposal in August.

CC:DA Action: Response due Sept. 18th.

Bible Headings: LC has submitted *5JSC/LC/8* regarding possible changes to part B of RDA — now available for review.

CC:DA Action: Response due Sept. 18th.

25. Next JSC Meeting:

As announced in the Outcomes, the next JSC meeting will be October 16–20, 2006, in Washington, D.C., at the Library of Congress. Alan Danskin will attend this meeting as the new representative from the British Library, replacing Sally Strutt, who resigned at the end of the April JSC meeting.