

To: ALA/ALCTS/CCS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

FROM: John Attig, ALA representative to the JSC

SUBJECT: Report on the Meeting of the Joint Steering Committee held in Ottawa, Canada, April 16–20, 2007

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) met in Ottawa, Canada, from April 16–20, 2007. This report is an expanded version of the [“Outcomes”](#) of that meeting posted on the JSC website. It also relies on the [“Executive Summary”](#) prepared by the RDA Project Manager, Marjorie Bloss. The [agenda](#) of the meeting provides a listing of the JSC documents for each topic, and the majority of the documents (but not all of them) can be found on the [“Working Documents”](#) pages.

During the same week, the [Committee of Principals for AACR](#) (CoP) also met in Ottawa. The JSC and CoP held a joint meeting, which included discussions on development of the online RDA product. A summary of CoP discussions and decisions is included below.

At the end of April, a meeting of representatives from the RDA, Dublin Core, and IEEE-LOM (Learning Objects Metadata) communities took place at the British Library to compare the models and other standards used by each group. A discussion of the outcomes of that meeting is included at the end of this report.

This JSC meeting dealt with all the parts of RDA, rather than concentrating its attention (as at the October 2006 meeting) on a single chapter. The discussion included decisions on very specific points (based on responses to the drafts of Chapters 1–6 and on specific proposals). However, significant time was devoted to the discussion of larger issues.

It should be noted that the JSC and the RDA Editor have been working on RDA for several years now. Much of this work has not yet been incorporated into revised drafts, but we are now beginning to see some of the results — in the revised draft of Chapter 3 and later this month in the revised drafts of Chapters 6 and 7. Both on a conceptual level and in specific instructions, RDA is beginning to take shape.

## **RDA Scope and Structure**

The JSC discussed the [RDA Scope and Structure](#) document, as well as the ALA comments in [5JSC/ALA/5](#). However, the main focus of the discussion was in relation to the upcoming Data Model Meeting in London at the end of April.

With regard to ALA comments, the following points were made:

- ✓ We were reminded that the document represents the current state of thinking about RDA, not necessarily the state of the drafts that are publicly available; a great deal of work has been done on RDA that is not yet embodied in public drafts. “RDA Scope and Structure” will be updated throughout RDA’s development as the JSC’s thinking progresses.

- ✓ It was acknowledged that some of the categorical statements in the document about the reliance on the models needed to be qualified; however, it was felt that the exceptions needed to be documented. This is one of the purposes of the analysis documents that are described below.
- ✓ ALA had repeated its belief that the description of the structure of parts and chapters in RDA in relation to the FRBR and FRAD models, both in this document and in the drafts, is inadequate to explain the organization of RDA to its users. On behalf of CC:DA, I offered our services to draft language that might be used to explain the organization of RDA and its relation to the models. This offer was accepted by the JSC. [Note: This decision was made after the Ottawa meeting and is not included in the JSC Program of Work; no timeframe has yet been established.]

The discussion was informed by two documents prepared by the Editor. The first was the **"Scope Analysis"** document, which mapped the RDA elements, element sub-types, and sub-elements to the various related models and standards, thus providing (a) a precise statement of extent of RDA's compatibility with those models and standards, and (b) convincing evidence of RDA's relationship to those models and standards. A revised version of this analysis will be issued in two tables: (a) an RDA Element Analysis; and (b) an RDA to FRBR Mapping.

One of the points noted in relation to this analysis is that there are elements throughout RDA that do not describe the resource per se, but are actually "data about data" (e.g., details of the issue or part used as the basis for the description of a serial or multipart monograph). The JSC agreed that in the interests of well-formed metadata, instructions on recording such elements should be moved to a separate section of RDA, tentatively designated as Part C. [Note that Part C has not yet been developed and is therefore not yet reflected in the Scope Analysis documents; the same applies to Part B.]

The second document was **"Encoding RDA Data"**. This document argued that RDA implicitly comprises a metadata schema and an application profile, as well as a content standard; that in the absence of a formal RDA metadata element set, RDA data will need to be encoded using a "proxy" syntax such as MARC 21, MODS, or XML implementations of Dublin Core; and that alternatives need to be considered for encoding (a) controlled lists of values, and (b) designations of roles and relationships. The JSC discussed these issues, and some of the decisions are reported below. The JSC affirmed that although RDA will specify the use of "terms" in these cases, allowance will be made for the use of equivalent terms or coded values taken from other schema in place of the RDA terms. If a term or coded value from another schema is used, the source of the term or coded value will need to be identified.

Both of these documents were prepared in part for consideration at the Data Model meeting, where it was thought that the relationship of RDA to various standards and models, and the status of RDA as a metadata schema and potential application profile might be considered.

## Content Development: Details

### Part A, Chapters 1-2, 4-5

#### *Constituency proposals:*

1. Internationalization of part I ([5JSC/LC/5/Rev](#)): A set of revisions was agreed to which generally call for recording information as it appears (i.e., in the language and script of the resource), but with alternatives for various types of normalization, e.g., adding or substituting transliterated data for data in original scripts, and using arabic numerals (or other numerals preferred by the cataloguing agency).
2. Persistent identifiers and URLs ([5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev](#)):
  - ✓ The JSC agreed that the distinction between Standard Identifiers and Other Resource Identifiers in chapter 2 should be removed.
  - ✓ The Fingerprint Identifier used in the identification of early printed resources will be covered by the instructions in chapter 2.
  - ✓ New instructions on Uniform Resource Locators (including resource identifiers that potentially resolve to an online resource) will be placed in chapter 5 of RDA.
3. Extent of item for notated music ([5JSC/ALA/4](#)): The JSC agreed with the ALA proposal to redefine the use of the term "score" so that it covers all notated music except parts; this reflects both common and specialist usage of the term. Changes were made to the instructions that eliminated the option to use a term other than those in the list provided and to the definition proposed by ALA; these changes were later confirmed by the Music Library Association.
4. Additions to RDA based on MARC 21 elements ([5JSC/ACOC rep/2](#))
  - ✓ Projected date of publication (MARC 21 tag 263) will **not** be included in RDA.
  - ✓ Scale of graphic content (MARC 21 tag 507) will be included in RDA chapter 4. There will be a general element for Scale, with sub-types for Scale of cartographic content and for Scale of still image or three-dimensional form.
  - ✓ Date/Time and place of an event (MARC 21 tag 518): Provisions will be made for date/time and place of events such as recording and broadcast. Tentatively, provisions will also be made for date/time and place associated with the "finding" of an object (naturally occurring or otherwise).
  - ✓ Preferred citations (MARC 21 tag 524) will be included in RDA chapter 2. The scope will not be limited to citations preferred by the custodian, as is that of the MARC 21 element.
5. Numbering for serials ([5JSC/LC/10](#)): Instead of the approach in the LC proposal, the JSC decided to include separate elements for the following:
  - Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of first issue or part;
  - Chronological designation of first issue or part;
  - Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of last issue or part;
  - Chronological designation of last issue or part.

This will allow for better structured metadata and the generation of improved OPAC displays.

6. CONSER standard record: The JSC decided on a policy not to respond to requests to comment on the compatibility of any existing or proposed rules or practices with RDA while RDA is still under development. Any decisions made about the content of RDA must be considered tentative until the text has been finalized. The practices announced for the CONSER standard record were framed within the context of AACR2, and it is premature to define any cataloging practices with regard to the draft text of RDA.

On the other hand, the JSC did consider that the CONSER documents raised issues that it would be useful to discuss in terms of the development of RDA, and plans to do so at the October 2007 meeting, based on the Editor's analysis of the CONSER proposals [[5JSC/Editor/1](#)].

### ***Comments on the December 2005 draft of Part I***

Since the October 2006 meeting, the JSC members have been discussing outstanding constituency comments on the December 2005 [draft of RDA Part I](#). This process continued at the Ottawa meeting. As a result, agreement was reached in some areas, and some original comments have been withdrawn. Some of the issues discussed at the meeting included:

1. Mode of issuance in RDA: The JSC agreed that there needs to be an element in RDA for mode of issuance (i.e., whether a resource is issued as a single unit, in two or more parts simultaneously, in successive parts, or as an integrating resource). The JSC asked the Editor to ensure that this element also covers intended termination for resources issued in successive parts (i.e., whether it is a multipart monograph or a serial).
2. Sources of information: The JSC continued a discussion begun during a teleconference in February 2007 and provided further direction to the Editor.
3. Provenance, custodial history, and immediate source of acquisition: The JSC agreed that the meaning of the term "provenance" differs among user communities. The JSC decided not to use the term in RDA; instead RDA will provide instructions on:
  - Creation of a collection or an archival resource
  - Custodial history
  - Immediate source of acquisition.
4. Alternative title: Alternative titles will no longer be considered part of the title proper. An element sub-type for "Alternative title" will be added to the Title element. It was noted that the connective (e.g., "or") is part of neither the Title proper nor the Alternative title; it will have to be displayed as a result of the encoding.
5. No publisher/place/date identified: Constituency comments on the draft of Part I suggested a number of English language alternatives to the terms "Publisher unknown" (2.7.1.3), "Place of publication unknown" (2.8.1.3), "date unknown" (2.9.1.3.) used in the draft. The JSC decided to use

“Publisher not identified”, “Place of publication not identified”, and “Date of publication not identified”. [Note: according to 0.1.9 agencies preparing descriptions in different language contexts will be able to use equivalent terms in the appropriate language.]

## **Part A, Chapters 6-7**

At the October 2006 meeting, the JSC had decided to reverse the order of the chapters issued in the [June 2006 draft of chapters 6 and 7](#), and to move the instructions for choosing the primary access point to Part B, Chapter 13, as instructions on “naming” works, expressions, etc. At this meeting, the JSC reviewed new Editor’s drafts of chapters 6 and 7.

### ***Chapter 6 – Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies Associated with a Resource***

The chapter reviewed by the JSC contained instructions on assigning access points arranged in terms of the function played in relation to the resource:

- creators and contributors of content (of works and expressions);
- other persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the content of the resource;
- producers, publishers, etc. (of manifestations);
- owners, custodians, etc. (of items).

The JSC confirmed that instructions on assigning access points for persons and corporate bodies associated with the following specific categories of works would remain separate:

- legal works;
- religious works;
- official communications;
- academic disputations.

There was agreement at this meeting to simplify the instructions on assigning access points for creators and contributors of content, including removing the distinction between creators (one) and collaborators (more than one), and the deletion of the special instruction for editors of serials.

The JSC decided to give more prominence to the instructions on Designation of role and to include in an appendix a controlled vocabulary of terms designating role. It is anticipated that further work will be necessary after the initial release of RDA to refine and map this vocabulary to other controlled lists. There will also be an alternative instruction to allow the use of terms taken from other standard lists.

The JSC decided that only the Creator element will be required; if there is more than one creator, only the first recorded will be required.

### ***Chapter 7 – Related Resources***

The constituency responses to the June 2006 draft of the chapter indicated a number of difficulties with the structure of the chapter. Following the October 2006 meeting, the JSC decided to organise the chapter according to the taxonomy of relationship

types developed by Barbara Tillett.<sup>1</sup> The Editor's draft contained the following sections:

- Equivalence relationships;
- Derivative relationships;
- Descriptive relationships;
- Whole-part relationships;
- Accompanying relationships;
- Sequential relationships.

A section on Primary relationships (between the FRBR entities work, expression, manifestation, and item) was also added in this draft of the chapter. The JSC decided that the Primary relationships between a manifestation and the work or expression embodied in that manifestation will be required; if more than one work or expression is embodied in the manifestation, only the predominant or (if that is not appropriate) the first-named work or expression will be required.

The JSC agreed to give more prominence to the instructions on designation of relationship and to include a list of terms designating relationship in an appendix. There will also be an alternative instruction to allow the use of terms taken from other standard lists.

The phrase "intended to be used with" will be removed from the definition of the Accompanying relationship; it will include both issued with and bound with relationships, although the distinction will be preserved, as "issued with" is a relationship between manifestations and "bound with" between items.

A revised draft of chapters 6–7 is scheduled to be issued for review on June 18, 2007; responses are due on September 17, 2007.

## **Part B of RDA (Access Point Control)**

### ***General considerations***

The JSC discussed whether RDA should contain changes to AACR2 practice in terms of choice of main entry and form of access points. There was agreement that there should be no deviation without strong justification, but that some change may be justified.

In particular, the JSC intends to monitor closely the status of the IME ICC draft [Statement of International Cataloguing Principles](#) and particularly one recommendation on the form of uniform titles:

- 5.2.4.1 The uniform title should be the commonly known title in the language and script of the catalogue when one exists for the resource, otherwise*
  - 5.2.4.1.1. the uniform title should be the original title or*
  - 5.2.4.1.2. the title most frequently found in manifestations of the work.*

---

<sup>1</sup> "Bibliographic Relationships", Barbara B. Tillett. Ch. 2 in: *Relationships in the Organization of Knowledge*, edited by Carol A. Bean and Rebecca Green. Dordrecht, Boston, London: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001, p. 19-35. See also the Appendix in [5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/ALA response](#).

This differs from the rules in AACR2 chapter 25 which instruct, for works created after 1500, to use the form of title in the original language. As the IME ICC recommendation is still under consideration by participants, the JSC will discuss this issue further at the October 2007 meeting, and the CILIP representative will prepare a paper to assist with that discussion. The IME ICC also considers an access point for the work to be an indispensable element. These two recommendations would have a significant impact on existing AACR2 practices.

The JSC considered the recommendations of the ALA/ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access. It was noted that the RDA drafts to date assume that data is recorded in the language and script of the resource, and also provide alternative instructions allowing the addition or substitution of transliterated data for the original scripts. This would seem to provide maximum flexibility in supporting access to resources in non-roman scripts.

### ***Constructing access points for works, etc.***

At the October 2006 meeting, the JSC had agreed that the instructions on choosing the primary access point that had been in the June 2006 draft of Chapter 7 would be moved to Part B, Chapter 13, as instructions on "naming" works, expressions, manifestations, and items.

At the April 2007 meeting, the JSC discussed a strawman proposal from the Editor on how section 13.1 could be written and organized. The strawman suggested a radical simplification of the instructions on choosing a primary access point, and included many of the recommendations made by ALA and other constituencies. [The text of the strawman proposal will be included in the minutes of the JSC meeting.] In assessing this simplification, the JSC agreed

- (a) to make an explicit distinction between new works and new expressions of a work;
- (b) to remove language about basing decisions on the presentation of information on the resource being described;
- (c) to remove the "rule of three" in determining the primary access point;
- (d) to include an alternative allowing the inclusion of the names of more than one collaborator in the access point for collaborative works, i.e., all of the joint authors, as is the convention in many style manuals;
- (e) to consider a compiler to be the primary creator of an aggregate work; and
- (f) to remove special rules for performances (a footnote will specify when performance is to be treated as an adaptation and thus a new work).

On the other hand, they did **not** agree

- (a) to include an alternative for following citation practices of specialist communities;
- (b) to omit the specific criteria for considering a corporate body to have responsibility for a work; or
- (c) to allow citation of collaborative works under title in cases where the works are commonly cited in that form.

There was general support for moving toward a more simplified set of guidelines, but it was felt that this could not be done for the first release of RDA because of its impact on existing records.

***Specific proposals relating to Part B:***

1. Treaties and international agreements ([5JSC/CCC/1](#) and [5JSC/LC/5/Rev](#)):
  - ✓ There was agreement that an instruction is needed in RDA to cover the naming of a work for an agreement between two or more national governments and one or more other jurisdictions.
  - ✓ JSC discussed the LC proposal to use the title as the primary access point for all treaties and international agreements. ALA had expressed a strong preference for choosing one of the parties in the primary access point for bilateral treaties, but the ALA proposal to use the first named party was not considered feasible by the JSC.
  - ✓ LC was asked to prepare a revised response to [5JSC/CCC/1](#) to show all of the proposed revised instructions. ALA will then decide whether to prepare an alternative proposal for constituency response and review at the October meeting.
  - ✓ The JSC also agreed to remove the special rule for agreements involving the Holy See and to treat the Holy See as a jurisdiction.
  
2. Family names ([5JSC/LC/6](#)): The JSC discussed the nature of the instructions that should be included in RDA on formulating access points for families. The issue is difficult because there are significant differences in practice amongst the various communities. LC has suggested that the chapter on Family names not be included in the first release of RDA, but wait until there is more international agreement. Other constituencies were reluctant to lose this opportunity; a new proposal will be prepared by either ACOC or the ACOC representative (possibly in combination with LAC), with responses to be discussed at the October 2007 meeting.
  
3. Bible uniform titles ([5JSC/LC/8](#)): All constituencies supported removal of the bias inherent in the current AACR2 rules for uniform titles for the Bible, but there was disagreement about whether this was feasible. The JSC agreed on some specific changes:
  - ✓ Abbreviations will not be used for the Old and New Testaments.
  - ✓ Access points for individual books of the Bible will give the name of the book immediately following "Bible" rather than interposing the name of the appropriate Testament.
  - ✓ Access points in the form "Bible. Old Testament", "Bible. New Testament", and "Bible. Apocrypha" will be used to identify those parts of the Bible as aggregate works.
  - ✓ An instruction will be added for sacred works identified as works of personal authorship to allow for the use of the name of the personal author as the primary element in the access point representing the work.

There is agreement that these changes could be made for the first release of RDA, but that fundamental change to address the underlying bias would have to be considered later. The constituencies will be asked to confirm that they agree with the changes listed above, and that the expense of implementation is justified.
  
4. Internationalization of Part B: The Library of Congress will prepare a proposal on how Part B can be internationalized, as part of the process begun with

5JSC/LC/5. This will include an identification of obsolete instructions such as those in the current chapter 23 of AACR2 which refer to former jurisdictions (e.g., Yugoslavia).

5. "Department": The JSC agreed not to add "Dept." to the list of abbreviations in Appendix B.

The complete draft of RDA part B will be made available in December 2007.

## Required elements

JSC discussed the labelling of elements, and agreed to have only two labels: "required" and "optional". The "required if applicable" label will no longer be used; it will be made clear at 1.4 that an element labelled as "required" is required only if applicable to the resource being described.

To summarize, in the revised chapters 6–7 the following will be labelled as required:

- ✓ Creator (if more than one, only the first recorded is required).
- ✓ Relationship between a manifestation and a work or expression embodied in the manifestation (if more than one work or expression is embodied in the manifestation, only the predominant or first-named work or expression is required).

## Next meeting

The JSC will meet from the 15–19 October 2007 in Chicago.

## Meeting of the Committee of Principals

While the Joint Steering Committee was meeting in Ottawa, the Committee of Principals (CoP) was also meeting there, along with representatives from the Co-Publishers and the Fund Trustees. CoP actions and discussions included:

- ✓ The name of the Joint Steering Committee was changed to Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA. This change becomes effective immediately.
- ✓ An invitation was extended to the National Library of Australia to join the CoP, to parallel the participation of the other national libraries. The invitation has been accepted.
- ✓ The CoP discussed different configurations for the governance of the RDA development process after publication of RDA in 2009, particularly the possibility of expansion to include rule-making groups in other countries interested in RDA. These discussions will continue; no further change is anticipated until 2009.
- ✓ The Co-Publishers (American Library Association, Canadian Library Association, and CILIP) reported on plans for development of *RDA Online*. A draft Request for Proposals (RFP) was discussed by the CoP and the JSC, and

a final version will be issued to select vendors at the end of April. Responses are due at the end of May, and a vendor will be selected in mid-July 2007.

- ✓ The Co-Publishers agreed with the JSC that a more developed prototype of RDA would be a useful marketing tool. It was agreed that some sort of prototype (perhaps using an initial version of the *RDA Online* product, perhaps another mock-up) will be developed by spring 2008.
- ✓ There was considerable discussion on outreach activities. The CoP agreed to fund participation at the upcoming Dublin Core meeting in Singapore, and is supporting the JSC's proposal for a satellite meeting on RDA at the 2008 IFLA Conference, in Québec City.
- ✓ The CoP also discussed communications strategies with the RDA Project Manager (Marjorie Bloss) and the chair of the Outreach Group (Christine Oliver).

## **Data Model Meeting**

Shortly after the JSC meeting in Ottawa, a meeting was held at the British Library on April 30–May 1 which brought together participants in the RDA, the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative, and the IEEE LOM communities, to discuss the relations between their respective models.

The meeting proved tremendously fruitful. The outcomes of the meeting were stated succinctly:

### **Recommendations:**

The meeting participants agreed that RDA and DCMI should work together to build on the existing work of both communities.

The participants recommend that the RDA Committee of Principals and DCMI seek funding for work to develop an RDA Application Profile — specifically that the following activities be undertaken:

- development of an RDA Element Vocabulary
- development of an RDA DC Application Profile based on FRBR and FRAD
- disclosure of RDA Value Vocabularies using RDF/RDFS/SKOS

### **Outcomes:**

The benefits of this activity will be that:

- the library community gets a metadata standard that is compatible with the Web Architecture and that is fully interoperable with other Semantic Web initiatives
- the DCMI community gets a libraries application profile firmly based on the DCAM and FRBR (which will be a high profile exemplar for others to follow)
- the Semantic Web community get a significant pool of well thought-out metadata terms to re-use
- there is wider uptake of RDA

**Further suggestion:**

The meeting further suggests that DCMI and DC Application Profile developers consider the value of using conceptual models such as FRBR as the basis for describing intellectual or artistic creations.

It is impossible to overstate the significance of this meeting. At the meeting in Ottawa, JSC members had not been optimistic about prospects for a fruitful discussion. It was unclear that the other metadata communities found anything relevant to their work in RDA. When the results of the meeting were announced, it was like a weather front had moved through. (You can decide whether it was a warm front or a cold front depending on how you wish to imagine the temperature change!) It was clear to the JSC from the outcomes that the other metadata communities saw very definite benefits to be gained from particular aspects of the RDA project, and were prepared to collaborate actively in projects that would have important benefits for all the communities involved.

Key to this successful discussion were the two documents prepared by the RDA Editor: "RDA Scope Analysis" and "Encoding RDA Data". These documents made it clear that a metadata schema was implicit in RDA and that a formally-defined element set could be extracted from RDA. They also showed a preliminary mapping of RDA elements to FRBR, which suggested the possibility of a library application profile based on the FRBR model. The documents also pointed to the existence within RDA of internal vocabularies that might be formally defined and disclosed according to accepted Internet protocols. These observations formed the basis for the recommendations of the meeting's participants.

The JSC is still coming to grips with the results of the meeting. Their reaction is generally positive; the recommendations from the meeting would indeed be beneficial to the RDA user community, at least to the extent that the models and protocols being referenced are indeed standard to the digital environment and not simply one view of what constitutes well-formed metadata. On the other hand, the recommendations call for major initiatives that will require significant resources of both time and money; that will have to be arranged. The JSC is hopeful that these activities can take place in parallel with the RDA development, and can be done by persons not fully occupied with RDA work; for the moment, no change in the RDA development schedule is anticipated. The proposed projects could also have a major affect on the RDA product(s). One of the implications is that significant parts of RDA will come into the public domain (that is the implication of formal disclosure of the schema, application profile, and vocabularies); this means that RDA as a commercial product will need to be marketed in terms of either its full content (which may be of limited interest beyond the hard core of library catalogers) or the functionality of the online product. Significant changes to the business and marketing plans for RDA may need to be made.

For most RDA participants, the results of the London meeting imply significant changes in how we view RDA, and I need to make it clear that the following are personal reflections. The current Strategic Plan for RDA seeks to reach out to other metadata communities by offering them "a new standard for resource description and access, designed for the digital world" [if we build it they will come?], and we have been frustrated by the extremely vocal lack of interest expressed by members of those communities. Now it is becoming clear to me that this was the wrong

approach; this is not **how** one makes a standard accessible, adaptable, or extensible to other communities in the digital world. RDA really **is** a library application; the way to make it useful beyond the library cataloging community is to express the basic features of that library application (the metadata schema, application profile, and vocabularies) using standard Internet protocols. In order to be relevant in a Web environment (one of the objectives of RDA), we need to play by the rules of the Web. [As an aside, one example of this occurred in the recent discussion on RDA-L about identifiers; we need to understand that in a Web environment (where RDA is designed to operate) anything that does not have an identifier does not exist! One of the main results from the projects recommended at the London meeting is to give identifiers to major components of RDA, which will support mapping of metadata elements and interoperability of applications.]

In this light, I am now seeing RDA in a completely different light. Although much of the content of RDA is all too familiar from users of AACR2, RDA is truly a radical departure. The most radical features are beneath the surface, but they are there nevertheless. The effort to provide a well-formed metadata schema has a profound effect on the structure and content of RDA.

## Conclusion

The past two months have been both busy and productive. On the one hand, the JSC has made considerable progress dealing with all parts of RDA, making both general and specific decisions about content. This work is cumulative, and the results of the past two years' work are beginning to come out in the form of revised drafts of sections of RDA. This will continue through the end of the project in 2009. There has also been progress on the development of the *RDA Online* product, and we hope to see the first results of that development by October.

On the other hand, the London Data Model Meeting has completely recast the broader context into which RDA needs to fit — as a metadata schema, as an application profile, and as a content standard. The projects proposed by the meeting will greatly enhance the relevance of RDA in the digital environment.

## List of CC:DA Actions

ALA response to revised draft of Chapter 3: Due 7/16/2007

*New proposals for discussion at the October 2007 JSC meeting: Due 8/6/2007*

ALA follow-up on Bible uniform titles (5JSC/LC/8): Due 8/6/2007

ALA response to 5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/Rev (bilateral treaties):  
Response (if we choose to make one) due 8/6/2007

ALA response to revised draft of Chapters 6 & 7: Due 9/17/2007

*Responses to proposals for the October 2007 JSC meeting: Due 9/17/2007*

ALA response to CILIP proposal on introductory words in titles (RDA 2.3.0.5):  
Proposal distributed 8/6/2007; response due 9/17/2007

ALA response to proposal on names of families:  
Proposal distributed 8/6/2007; response due 9/17/2007

ALA response to proposal from LC on internationalization of Part B:  
Proposal distributed 8/6/2007; response due 9/17/2007

ALA response to paper from CILIP on IME ICC specifications for uniform titles:  
Discussion paper distributed 8/6/2007; response due 9/17/2007

ALA response to proposal from LC on uniform titles:  
Proposal distributed 8/6/2007; response due 9/17/2007

Combine and organize list of specialist cataloguing manuals (5JSC/ALA/3):  
Due 12/31/2007

ALA paper on language to explain organization of RDA and its relation to FRBR/FRAD:  
Due date to be determined.