

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

FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee

SUBJECT: Report on the April 2008 JSC Meeting

Acknowledgements

I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone who prepared drafts for parts of the ALA response to the draft of RDA sections 2-4 and 9. For the record, those who contributed drafts were:

Paul Weiss (Chapter 5)
John Hostage (6.0-6.1.1)
Dorothy McGarry (6.1.2-6.2)
Everett Allgood (6.3-6.16)
Kathy Glennan (6.17-6.22)
Kathy Winzer (6.23-6.26 and 11.2.6-11.2.17)
Judy Knop (6.28-6.32)
Manon Th eroux (Chapters 8 and 10)
Bob Maxwell (9.0-9.2)
Cheri Folkner (9.3-9.19)
Kevin Randall (11.0-11.2.5)
John Myers (11.3-11.12 and Appendices F-H)
Betsy Mangan (Chapter 16)

Everyone did a tremendous job. I was really impressed with the quality of the work, particularly your ability to summarize and condense discussions that had only compounded the complexity of the issues involved. I rarely had to expand on the drafts; mostly, I further condensed and summarized.

I'm particularly grateful for those of you (both in your comments on the wiki and in the drafts) who provides specific wording. The JSC is more likely to act on such specific proposals than on a general call to improve the wording; the fact that many of our proposals were accepted is due to this work.

So my thanks to everybody for the diligence and expertise and good judgment with which you dealt with an extensive and highly complex document that raised unusually difficult issues. I believe that the ALA comments are important and will be taken seriously by the JSC.

After the response went out, more work was needed both prior to the JSC meeting and since. In particular, Kathy Glennan and Mark Scharff spent a lot of time helping me understand and comment on the 5JSC/LC/12 music proposals; the JSC decided that this document needed discussion by experts, rather than the JSC, so we organized a one-day meeting at the Library of Congress; Kathy and Mark attended with their colleagues from LC and from Canada; we worked out areas of agreement on the instructions for musical works. For the next week or so, they spent a lot of time hammering out the details, and there are some areas of agreement that will be sent forward to the JSC.

Finally, there were a number of questions involving AV material, and I want to thank Greta de Groat, Martha Yee, and Kelley McGrath and the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee for responding to my requests for comment on very short notice.

Actions taken at the April 2008 JSC meeting

This report is divided into two parts: covering what was decided at the April JSC meeting (with an addendum of decisions made since the April meeting) and then what will happen next. These decisions reported in the first section have been made, it is unlikely that the JSC will reconsider them.

The JSC met for about 8½ days with 1½ days of breaks in the middle. It was grueling, but we were able to survive it, still friends at the end, and being highly productive even on the final day.

Most of the main issues with RDA have already been decided, and we are down to details; most of what I will be reporting are lists of decisions on details. I will follow the order of the JSC agenda, which is not the order of chapters in RDA.

I will start with general issues from the December 2007 draft.

- ✓ Perhaps the most interesting discussion had to do with required elements. Tom Delsey, the JSC Editor, suggested a different approach. Rather than designating each element as "required" or "optional", he suggested that we include a list of recommended *core elements*. These will be based on our assessment of which elements are most significant for supporting the FRBR user tasks; we still need exact language for describing that rationale. The idea was accepted; only the core elements will be labeled as such; below the label will be a statement giving the details of the core requirement (these would replace the current footnotes that give the conditions under which the element is required).
 - Regarding the specific elements, we agreed to add the Statement of Responsibility to the core list (without the exception that LC urged, which would not require the Statement of Responsibility when there is an access point for the persons, etc., named; LC will probably not follow the RDA core in this regard). We chose **not** to add the Place of publication to the list.
 - We are also thinking that a view of RDA that includes only the core elements might serve as a sort of "concise" that could be produced mechanically within RDA online. We would consider a more formal concise version, that would involve identifying and rewriting the key instructions; but work on this cannot take place until after the initial release of RDA.
 - The lists of required elements (now *core elements*) will be divided into separate lists for work elements and expression elements.
- ✓ The JSC decided against the ALA reorganization proposals. The primary reason was that the current organization of the early chapters approximate a typical cataloger workflow: beginning making decisions about what to catalog, sources of information, and transcribing the title proper and other attributes of the manifestation before going on (in Section 2) to access points for works, etc. The JSC were not willing to organize RDA like a data dictionary, as that would require navigational aids to be added to the text.
- ✓ In the process of making this decision, we confirmed the significance of the user tasks in the FRBR model and therefore in the organization of RDA.
- ✓ We did agree to make an explicit division in the table of contents between the sections on Attributes and the sections on Relationships.
- ✓ Entities as elements: The JSC rejected the ALA argument that certain attributes should be treated as relationships to entities such as Place; the rationale for this

decision is that FRBR/FRAD treats these as attributes rather than as relationships, and that what is recorded in these elements is not usually a controlled access point, but something based on what appears in the manifestation

- ✓ ALA had suggested drastically reducing the required elements for the group 1 and 2 entities to the Preferred Title or Preferred Name. The JSC confirmed the need for elements that were collectively sufficient to identify the entity and distinguish it from other entities, whether these elements are recorded in an access point control record (scenario #2) or as attributes of the entity (scenario #1).
- ✓ The JSC agreed to move the instructions on access points to the end of the respective chapters, following the element definitions and instructions, agreeing with ALA that this reflected the priorities of RDA and also provided the basis for a simpler specification of the access point, since all the elements had already been defined.
- ✓ ALA had argued for removing all punctuation instructions to the appendix on display; the Editor noted that punctuation between elements is specified in the appendix, but that punctuation internal to an element **must** be in the instructions because that punctuation has to be recorded as part of the data content; it is **not** added for display.
- ✓ The JSC agreed that preferred and variant names and titles would be treated as subtypes of elements Name of Person [or whatever] and Title of Work.

Priorities: In order to survive, we had to prioritize the issues and comments. Based on a recommendation from the Editor, we gave highest priority (a) to those issues that affected the RDA element set; (b) to those that dealt with controlled vocabularies; and (c) to those that affected core elements.

We began discussing priority issues in the responses to chapters 5 and 6.

- ✓ The Library of Congress presented a new document (later issued as 5JSC/LC rep/2). It consisted of three proposals:
 1. The concept of emanating body from AACR2 is missing in RDA; LC offered two options: reinstate 21.1B2 (the list of types of works that could be entered under corporate body) or make a dramatic change in current practice which would apply to corporate bodies the definition of creator in Section 6 of RDA. We decided that there would need to be too many exceptions to the second option (we would need to retain present practice for main entry of serials, for example).

So, the decision was to remove the Originating Body element from Chapter 19 (ALA had supported that); add the substance of 21.1B2 to the definition of Creator in Chapter 19; in Chapter 6, add instructions to deal with works that have both personal and corporate creators.
 2. LC proposed to reinstate the concept of principal responsibility when deciding which of multiple creators is to be included in the preferred access point for the work.
 3. LC noted missing instructions: When different identities (according to the definitions in Chapter 9) are responsible for manifestations of the same work, how should one decide which name to include in the preferred access point for the work. The JSC agreed to add an instruction in Chapter 6 (somewhere following 6.1.1.1).

More decisions on Chapter 6:

- ✓ We had a long discussion on "Selections"; after looking at several choices, the JSC agreed with ALA and others that incomplete expressions needed to be identified as such; the first instruction will be to give an access point for each work present, but the alternative will be added to call for treating the aggregate work as an expression, adding "Selections" in the Version element. One of the things about which the Editor and the rest of us were out of synch was that he believed that parts (the instruction in question comes under a caption "Two or more parts") were confined to divisions of the work made by the author or publisher and therefore did not include "extracts" or "excerpts"; the JSC insisted that both needed to be covered, probably by broadening the definition of part to include parcels of content made by a compiler.
- ✓ Bob Maxwell had pointed out that the instructions for manuscripts and incunables was intended be for access points for a manifestation or item, not for a work; the Editor disagreed that this is what these instructions were doing; they were dealing with cases in which the name of a manifestation or item is used as the name of the work; we also use such access points to refer to the specific object apart from the work(s) it contains, but this is out of scope for RDA and is not what these instructions are about.
- ✓ ALA (and others) were confused that the hierarchical access points for parts (adding the title of the part to the title of the whole work) were not being followed in the instructions on preferred title; it was pointed out that the hierarchical construction is used only for the access point; the Title of the Part is still just the title of the part; it is what is added to the Title of the Work in the access point. We couldn't see a way to make this clear in the instructions on Preferred Title for the Part; it is just something that has to be explained when teaching this section of RDA.
- ✓ Date of Work will all be collapsed into a single element, although date of creation and date of first publication will still be mentioned in the instructions; we just won't treat these as distinct sub-types; ranges of dates will be allowed; we will use "earliest date" rather than "first date" associated with the work.

Chapter 7 of RDA (formerly chapter 4)

- ✓ Square brackets will not be specified for scale statements that are calculated rather than transcribed, because Scale is not a transcribed element; as the information can be taken from "any source" use of square brackets is not appropriate; if catalogers of cartographic materials wish to continue the practice, they will need to base that on a community application profile or cataloging manual, not RDA.
- ✓ 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 (Nature of Content; Coverage of Content; and Intended Audience) will not be based on lists of controlled terms. **N.B.** A general decision was made that there will always be possible to add a term not in the controlled list when none of the terms provided is applicable.
- ✓ 7.8 (Place and Date of Capture) will be treated as an element with sub-elements, rather than as separate elements, so that a place and a date applicable to a particular work can be kept together.
- ✓ 7.10.2: Musical Notation System will be based on a list of controlled terms, and I am working with MLA to recommend a list and definitions.
- ✓ 7.12 (Format of Notated Music): The JSC wants to place the lists currently in the instructions for extent of notated music (such as "score" and "score and parts") in

7.12; MLA confirms that the lists in Chapter 3 are complete, so long as the decisions made pursuant to 5JSC/ALA/4 are taken into account.

- ✓ 7.13 (Medium of Performance): The JSC wanted a controlled list; they suggested the MARC 21 list for field 048. The eventual decision was to give this information about medium of performance for an expression (i.e., an arrangement) as an unstructured description, without use of controlled terms.
- ✓ Coordinates, Equinox and Epoch are to be made optional (i.e., they will not be core elements). If catalogers of cartographic resources want to make any requirements, they can do so in community application profiles.
- ✓ 7.11 (Illustrative Content): The JSC confirmed that the scope was general and not confined to illustrations in printed texts; we acknowledge that all the specifics are for illustrations in printed texts, but in the absence of specific proposals, were unwilling to act; proposals for additional terms may be made after the initial release of RDA. The JSC did agree to add "graphs", the one additional term that we did propose.
- ✓ In a late afternoon brainstorm, we decided (subject to reconsideration in the light of day) to handle captioning, audio description, and such features in a new element to be called Interpretive Content. Subtitles will be handled under Language of Content (as ALA had argued), as will information about the language of captions. Upon reflection, the name of the new element was changed to Accessibility Content.

Section 8, chapters 8-11:

- ✓ General decision: The Editor is neutralizing the language so that it talks about differentiating the person, family or corporate body, rather than creating a distinctive access point — because in scenario #1, it may not be necessary to create unique access points.
- ✓ In the list of additions to differentiate personal names, Dates of Birth/Death and Period of Activity will be separated so that our current priority (dates of birth/death, fuller form of name, period of activity) can be preserved. The instruction will also make is clear that one may record the fuller form of name even when a date of birth/death is available and is sufficient to differentiate.
- ✓ Change of name: ALA had suggested that the instructions for dealing with changes of names for persons and for corporate bodies be reconciled. The JSC decided that this issue could not be dealt with until after the first release of RDA and would require a specific proposal.
- ✓ Gender: The ALA Task Force's comments were considered, but the JSC declined to delete the element; we did decide to delete "other" from the list of terms and to add an instruction that allows the use of another term if "male" and "female" do not apply.
- ✓ B.C.: B.C./A.D. will be used rather than B.C.E./C.E.; the instruction will appear in Appendix H, rather than in RDA itself. The question of the proper abbreviation may be reconsidered after the initial release of RDA.
- ✓ Instructions for government and non-government corporate bodies: ALA had suggested that these two categories be merged into a single set of instructions. Again the JSC decided that this change could not be made until after the first release of RDA.

- ✓ The Editor informed us that all footnotes will appear in the online product as separate paragraphs following the paragraph containing the footnote reference. In some cases, nothing needs to be done, but in other cases, the Editor will rewrite the instruction in the light of its placement.

Chapter 16:

- ✓ ALA was interested in expanding the scope of Chapter 16; this will require a specific proposal and will not be considered before the first release of RDA.
- ✓ Identifier for the place (as opposed to the identifier for the jurisdiction) will be added to the list of elements "to be added in a later release".

Section 9, chapters 29-32:

- ✓ The JSC confirmed that there are no core relationships in Section 9.
- ✓ The Library of Congress will draft an appendix (Appendix K, now being considered by the JSC) on relationship designators for relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies.

Section 6, chapters 18-22 (based on an Editor's draft):

- ✓ The JSC fine-tuned the special instructions for legal resources. The instructions on court reporter and compiler will be moved to the chapter on responsibility for the expression. The issuing body for legal works and the issuing agency/agent will be merged. Harmonizer will be moved to the chapter on responsibility for the expression, as will the compiler of a collection of official communications. The official making an official communication will be moved to the section on creators.

Appendix I, Role designators (5JSC/LC/11):

- ✓ The JSC agreed that, although the creation of the work and the expression were the result of a single set of actions in the case of motion pictures, it was still possible and necessary to distinguish the roles that resulted in the work from those that resulted in the expression of that work.
- ✓ Based on the CCC response to the draft appendix we agreed that "screenwriter" would be moved to the list of Creators (as a narrower term under "author") and that "film producer" and "production company" would be added to the list of Other Persons, etc. Associated with the Work. All of the roles related to the performance would remain in the list of Contributors [to the expression].
- ✓ ALA had proposed an extensive list of additional terms in various lists. These were accepted pending provision of definitions; the definitions have been provided.

Section 8, chapters 24-28:

- ✓ The JSC had noted earlier that the series relationship is a whole-part relationship, but that the inclusion of series numbering in the series access point made it a part-part relationship — which RDA does not support. The Editor indicated that the numbering is in fact an attribute of the relationships: If the relationship to the whole is "In series X", then our normal series access point would be "In no. n of series X". He proposed to add another element in Chapters 24-28 for Numbering of Issue or Part, which would be used in conjunction with the access point and the relationship designator.

At this point in the agenda, the JSC returned to the beginning of RDA and considered those chapters, based on Editor's drafts and comments from responses to earlier drafts.

Section 1, Chapter 2:

- ✓ When there are multiple edition statements in different sources, the one in the priority source of information is the Edition Statement; statements from other sources may be given in a note; a new instruction will be added in 2.18.3 to allow for any annotation on edition information to be given.
- ✓ LC proposed to change Production Statement to Manufacture Statement; the JSC decided to separate the Production Statement for unpublished resources from the Manufacture Statement; in Section 6, Producer will be changed to Manufacturer in Chapter 21 (manifestation) and Producer will be added to Chapter 22 (item).
- ✓ A range of sources of information in priority order will be added at 2.4.1.2 (Statement of Responsibility); the list is that which appears at 2.9.0.2, etc.
- ✓ I was asked to say whether the Sources of information instructions for sound recordings answered the ALA objections; I asked Kathy Glennan for her assessment. I presented her points, and we worked out the sequence of instructions that apply to the selection of a collective title; the upshot was that the source of information instructions do not need to be revised (they just need to be read in a non-linear fashion)!
- ✓ We looked for a final time at Alternative Title; we decided that there was no reasonable way to deal with the "or" (which is neither a part of the Title Proper nor of the Alternative Title), we reconsidered our decision to separate the two. Alternative titles will be treated as part of the Title Proper; access to the alternative title may be provided through a Variant Title; the instructions in Chapter 6 will indicate that the alternative title is not included in the Preferred Title for the Work. We decided that this would have to be a final decision; I agreed to accept this as a final decision even though I disagreed with it.

Chapter 3:

- ✓ In the light of ALA's screams of pain over the spelling of "colour" it was agreed that there would not be a controlled vocabulary for the Colour element, so we may spell it as we prefer.
- ✓ Media Type: JSC decided that for audio or video carriers that can be played on a computer, that more than one type should be recorded and that the instruction to record "one or more terms" is sufficient to allow this.
- ✓ Media Type, Carrier Type, etc.: JSC decided that devices with preloaded content may be described as such in 3.22 (Notes on Equipment and System Requirements) and examples should be added at appropriate places in chapter 3. For Media Type, it was noted that this relates to the medium of the *content*, not the carrier.
- ✓ Carrier Type: We decided that globes, models and other objects should be described by applying 3.3.0.2.3 (as "Other unmediated carriers").
- ✓ Extent Statements for Notated Music: The list for scores and parts (3.4.2.1) will remain a closed list, but the list of other notated music formats (3.4.2.2) will have an instruction to allow the use of terms not in the list. [After some research into the decisions made on 5JSC/ALA/4, it is likely that these two lists will be merged.]
- ✓ The lists relating to Production Method for Manuscripts (3.9) will not be a closed list; provision for other terms will be added.

- ✓ Colour (3.12): JSC agreed to move the Colour element to the Expressions section of Chapter 7, with the exception of the references to "hand coloured" which will be moved to 3.23 (Item-level characteristics). This wasn't exactly what ALA had wanted, but it is a lot closer than the last draft.
- ✓ Foliation (3.13) will be renamed Book Format; the instructions in 3.13.1.3.1 about details of how the leaves are numbered will be moved to the Extent instructions.
- ✓ Sound Characteristics (3.17): 3.17.0.3.1 and 3.17.0.3.2 will be moved to the Expression section of Chapter 7. Again, not exactly what ALA wanted, but close.
- ✓ 3.17.0.4: JSC agreed that analog/digital and magnetic/optical were separate element sub-types; ALA was asked to suggest names for each sub-type, and to provide definitions. Following the meeting these names were agreed upon (see below).
- ✓ Regional Encoding: JSC agreed to make Regional Encoding a new element sub-type under Video Characteristics.
- ✓ Streaming media: Streaming speed is covered by Transmission Speed at 3.20.6; an example of "streaming" will be added at 3.20.0.4.2 to show that this can be included in the File Type element.

Other actions:

- ✓ The JSC accepted the list of specialist cataloguing manuals prepared by ALA (5JSC/ALA/3/Rev), with thanks. The document (with a more accurate title) was to be sent to the RDA product developer as an example of an external document that might be linked to from RDA. The document may be posted on the JSC web site, to be revised as new manuals relating specifically to RDA are issued.

After the April meeting

1. Teleconference to finalize the RDA element set:
 - Separate elements for Identifier of Manifestation and Identifier of Item.
 - Confirmed split between Type of Recording (analog/digital) and Recording Medium (magnetic/optical); Type of Recording refers to the type of recording for playback, not the original capture.
 - New element for Aspect Ratio, applicable to both film and video; to be an attribute of the expression; the terms agreed upon were: "full screen", "wide-screen", "mixed"; other terms may be recorded as Details of Aspect Ratio (note).
 - 3.18.0.4.1: Presentation Format will be retained, but the terms for Aspect Ratio will be deleted from the list.
2. Expert meeting at LC on the 5JSC/LC/12 proposals: The group seems to have reached agreement on:
 - Treating cadenzas as separate but dependent works: If desired (and when available) these are identified using the name of the composer of the cadenza, rather than the name of the work that the cadenza was composed for.
 - Treating librettos as (textual) works separate from the operas they're associated with: This decision was difficult, since an opera does not intellectually exist without the libretto, but a libretto may exist without an opera. We noted the applicability of the FRBR concept of systemic parts ("a systemic part is an integral aspect that extends across and is interwoven with the rest of the content of the *work*"—FRBR 2008, p. 67).
 - A definition of chorus score that parallels this terminology use from AACR2.
 - Usage of the terms "distinctive title" and "non-distinctive title" in place of the AACR2 terminology "types of composition." However, although we've agreed to

- the terminology, we have not reached a common understanding of the definitions of these terms.
- Revisions to the instructions on Medium of Performance, although more work needs to be done.
 - Agreement with the JSC decision to reinstate the AACR2 use of "Selections" in preferred access points.
3. 5JSC/LC Rep/3 (Changes over time): JSC members have all commented (thanks to Kevin for providing me with some comments); a final version has been compiled.
 4. Work continues on Appendix J (Designators of relationships among group 1 entities) and Appendix K (Designators of relationships among group 2 entities). At the moment these two appendices take somewhat different approaches, so we are trying to reconcile them. These will be included in the full draft, and there will be an opportunity to comment on them.
 5. Workflows: The JSC decided to invest some effort in developing workflows; this is a feature of RDA Online that allows a user to create a document that guides the cataloger step by step through the process of creating a description, with links to the appropriate RDA instructions. At least one sample workflow is being developed by LC to be included with the full draft of RDA; additional workflows will be created to be included in the first release of the RDA Online product; institutions, organizations such as the PCC, and individual users, will be able to create their own workflows. We feel that this feature will help catalogers to find their way through the complexity of the instructions in RDA.

What happens next

Prior to the meeting, the JSC members had been given strong indications that the Committee of Principals (CoP) would hold strictly to the development schedule. In the light of this and in the light of the impossibility of producing a complete draft by July 3 with no access to the authoring system until early June, the JSC looked at other dates on the development schedule and noted that (a) we had always wanted to review RDA in the online product, not on paper; and (b) the development schedule called for a release of "Phase 2" of RDA Online to demonstrate at IFLA in August. We decided to propose that we would complete our work on the content for the full draft at the end of July (giving us four additional weeks to catch up) and would use RDA Online for the review rather than a PDF output from the authoring system.

At the joint meeting, the CoP did confirm in the strongest terms that the schedule for RDA content and product development must be adhered to. RDA has reached the point where a good product can be achieved within the schedule, even if everyone is not happy with all the decisions that will have to be made. It is important to release the product on schedule, so that it can be tested and modified based on the results of that testing.

The JSC then made our suggestion about reviewing the full draft in an early version of the RDA product. The CoP actually loved this idea for many different reasons. The people working on developing the product were not certain that "Phase 2" would actually support this; they were not sure what features were included in "Phase 2" — but they were willing to propose the idea and see if they could make it work. The CoP thought this would be a good marketing initiative; it would allow the constituency review of the content to also be part of the testing of the RDA Online product. So that is now our plan and the schedule now hinges, not on the JSC's ability to deliver the content, but on the Co-Publishers' ability to deliver the product on schedule.

The position of ALA (or at least CC:DA) — that we did not care about the schedule, but were only interested in getting RDA right — was noted; we also made the point that the major market for RDA (the US) was the most skeptical about whether RDA was in fact the quality product that the CoP assumes it must be.

On the other hand, apparently the development of the online product will not be held to the same rigorous schedule that the development of the content is being held to. In a decision announced to the JSC late on June 25 and formally announced by Don Chatham at the RDA Update Forum on June 28, the finalization of the specifications for the online product will be delayed two months. This will mean that the full draft will be issued at the beginning of October; the constituency review will take place between then and early January; the JSC will meet in early February to make final decisions, and the final text will be turned over to the publishers at the end of April.

The JSC has all the work it can handle resolving the priority comments already received in previous constituency reviews. We decided that we could only make a very limited call for comments on the full draft: we would entertain comments about how the parts of RDA hang together, any major problems of continuity or consistency between sections, and any glaring omissions; we would entertain comments on sections that had never been made available in public drafts before (primarily appendices); we would **not** entertain comments on content that had already been distributed in some form for review previously — which means almost everything. This is the only way we can finish on the schedule that has been imposed on us.

One general decision about the future after April 2009: We decided that we would not carry any unresolved comments forward beyond the final version of RDA that will be turned over to the publishers. Any issues that a constituency wants to pursue will need to be submitted as a revision proposal. There are some issues that the JSC has generally agreed upon but feels that it cannot deal with prior to the first release; we will maintain a list of those, but again one of the constituencies will need to submit a revision proposal before these changes can be considered.