

TO: ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Report on the JSC meeting, Glasgow, Scotland, November 1–4, 2011

The Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA met in Glasgow, Scotland, on November 1–4, 2011. This report is based on the blog entries that I posted after each day's meeting. It was based on my own notes and recollections of the discussion. It is intended to provide an early report on the meeting, but should not be treated as authoritative. The JSC will soon issue a summary of the outcomes of the meeting, and, in due course, the official minutes.

The Joint Steering Committee members present were:

Alan Danskin, British Library, chair
John Attig, American Library Association
Deirdre Kiorgaard, Australian Committee on Cataloguing
Marg Stewart, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress

Also participating were

Gordon Dunsire, substituting for the CILIP representative
Kevin Marsh, incoming ACOC representative
Thurston Young, British Library, the JSC Secretary

Joining the group for the first time was the representative of the German National Library, Christine Frodl. In October 2011, the Library had accepted the invitation of the Committee of Principals to join the JSC.

Tuesday morning, November 1, was spent in Executive Session. The Committee prepared for the meeting with representatives of the ISBD Review Group and the ISSN Network later in the week. We also discussed revisions to the Committee's internal policies and procedures.

On Tuesday afternoon, the following proposals were discussed:

GROUP 3 ENTITIES AND “SUBJECT”

6JSC/LC rep/3: Group 3 entities and “subject”

Gordon Dunsire, based on his work with the FRBR entities, recommended that we consider the “subject” entities [Concept, Object, Event, and Place] independent of their grouping in FRBR as Group 3 “subject” entities, but rather consider them as bibliographic entities and define whatever attributes and relationships seem appropriate to each entity. One implication of this is that entities should not be limited to the subject relationship, but considered more broadly within the context of bibliographic information. The JSC accepted this as a basis for further discussion.

The suggestion was made that we delete the “placeholder” chapters from RDA outline — because they are so closely related to Group 3/Subject concepts — and rethink how we wish to define and document additional entities.

Based on the LC paper, there was tentative consensus that there should be a very general definition of the subject relationship; that the Concept and Object entities should be defined in RDA; and that further discussion was needed about the Event/Time/Place entities.

The Library of Congress will prepare another discussion paper that embodies these ideas, and the discussion will continue.

6JSC/CILIP/1: Group 3 entities and “subject”

There was a sense that the recommendations in this paper had been overtaken by events, and the proposal was withdrawn.

MUSIC

6JSC/CCC/1: Glossary definition of “vocal score”

The JSC approved this proposal, with the wording change proposed by LC.

6JSC/CCC/2: Compilations of musical works [etc.]

JSC accepted the recommendation of the Library of Congress and ALA to refer this issue to a group of North American music catalogers — the RDA Music Revisions Facilitation Task Force, which has participants from the Canadian Association of Music Libraries, the Library of Congress, and the Music Library Association.

6JSC/CCC/3: Instrumental music intended for one performer to a part

There was agreement in principle; CCC will prepare a revised proposal that incorporates the comments.

6JSC/CCC/4: Groups of instruments

CCC will prepare a revised proposal that incorporates the comments.

6JSC/CCC/5: Accompaniment for songs, Lieder, etc.

The proposal was approved.

PERSONS, FAMILIES, CORPORATE BODIES

6JSC/ACOC/1: Names written in a non-preferred script

The proposal was approved. The JSC accepted the changes suggested by LC, as well as the suggestion by ALA to remove the *exception* at 9.2.2.5.3.

6JSC/LC/5: Clarifying date associated with the person and Core requirements

The proposal was accepted, with the changes suggested by ALA, BL, and CCC.

6JSC/BL/1: Title of person

The proposal was withdrawn.

6JSC/ALA/3: Affiliation

The proposal was not accepted. The issue of recording additional information about affiliation will be discussed with the FRBR Review Group. In the meantime, the nature of the affiliation may be recorded as a relationship to the affiliated body (with appropriate relationship designators) or as a note in the Biographical information element.

The JSC affirmed that proposals may be submitted for additions to the list of relationship designators in Appendix K.

The JSC decided that “data about data” should be considered out of scope for RDA at this time.

6JSC/CILIP/3: Field of activity and Profession/Occupation

The JSC agreed that both elements should be retained; JSC approved the LC suggestion to revise examples under Field of activity and to remove Field of activity as a possible addition to authorized access points. ALA will provide wording for its suggestion that the instructions call for Profession/Occupation to be recorded as a “class of persons” term.

6JSC/ALA/2: Heads of state and Heads of government

The JSC had near consensus that preferred names for heads of state and heads of government should be based on the language preferred by the agency recording the data. ALA was asked to prepare a revised proposal on this basis, and to address any other comments that remain relevant.

6JSC/LC/3: Elimination of treatment of “names not conveying the idea of ...”

The proposal was withdrawn.

6JSC/LC/6: Additions to 19.2.1.1.1, Corporate bodies considered to be creators

The JSC approved the proposal; “hearings” (not “legislative hearings”) will be added to category c) iii) an event ... falling within the definition of a corporate body.

APPENDICES

6JSC/LC/1: Appendix A

The JSC approved changes to A.2.1 and A.2.4.

The word “transcribing” in A.0 will be corrected to “recording” as the scope of the Appendix is not limited to transcribed elements.

The JSC accepted a recommendation from ALA Publishing to use the ISO 2-character language code as part of the numbering of the instructions for other languages; this would allow an ordered sequence of languages to be maintained as new languages are added — but not a sequence based on the name of the language in English.

6JSC/LC/4: Punctuation guidance for *see also* references

The JSC approved the proposal, with the wording changes suggested by ALA and CCC.

On Wednesday, November 2, the JSC completed action on the constituency proposals on its agenda, making the following decisions:

Manifestations and Items

6JSC/ACOC/2: Recording place of production [etc.]

The JSC approved the optional addition of the name of the larger jurisdiction to Place of Production, Place of Publication, Place of Distribution, and Place of Manufacture.

6JSC/LC/2: Date of manufacture

The JSC approved the proposal to delete several instructions that were not applicable to the Place of Manufacture element.

6JSC/ACOC/3: Designation of named revision of an edition

The JSC approved one minor revision, changing “Terms” to “Statements” in the caption at 2.5.2.5.

The remainder of the proposal was withdrawn. It was clear that there is confusion between the two elements — Designation of Edition (2.5.2) and Designation of a Named Revision of an Edition (2.5.6). The JSC would like to merge the two elements into a single element for Designation of Edition; we will discuss with the ISBD Review Group.

Works and Expressions

6JSC/Chair/3: Initial articles

The JSC approved the proposal with a number of wording changes. The instruction will now call for initial articles to be included in preferred titles of works and in preferred names of persons or corporate bodies when present. An alternative instruction will allow them to be omitted; the proposed exclusion of inflected languages from the alternative was not approved, as the inability of most library systems used in North America consistently to ignore initial articles in sorting applies to inflected languages as well.

The Library of Congress representative reported that LC and OCLC have begun talking about implementing the approved MARC 21 technique for marking nonfiling characters. We are all looking forward to the time when we are not forced to apply the alternative instruction to omit articles.

6JSC/ALA/1: Reports of one court

The JSC approved the proposal, using the revised wording proposed by LC.

6JSC/LC/8: Person or family as creator of a serial work

The JSC agreed with ACOC that the issue should be dealt with in 19.2.1.1 which gives the scope of the Creator element.

There was considerable discussion about what guidance could be offered that does not simply repeat the definition of Creator. It was suggested that the key concept might be that the person or family be deemed to be responsible for the serial as a whole and not simply for one or more issues. LC will rework the proposal based on the discussion.

6JSC/LC rep/2: “Selections” as used in Chapter 6

There was general agreement on the revisions to clarify that the preferred title for a part of a work is always a work attribute and that the elements in the authorized access point representing a work should be recorded in a fixed order, with the expression elements added after the work elements. LC will prepare a formal revision proposal.

There was general opposition to changing the term “Selections” to either “Excerpts” or “Extracts”.

6JSC/LC/7: Changes in content characteristics

The JSC agreed to add instructions for recording a Note on the Expression element to Chapter 7, with an element subtype for Changes in Content Characteristics. This is a new element in RDA — although there are comparable Note elements relating to manifestations in chapters 2 and 3 — and the JSC will need to establish procedures for updating the RDA Element Analysis and other derivative documents.

6JSC/CILIP/2: Date of signing a treaty

The JSC agreed to allow recording the full date (when available) for both single treaties and compilations. The basic instruction will be “Record the date as fully as possible, in the form: year, name of the month, number of day” and the instruction for access points will be “add the date, earlier date, or earliest date of signing”.

6JSC/ALA/4: Artistic and/or Technical Credit

The JSC agreed to expand the scope of this element to include sound recordings. The scope will read: “An artistic and/or technical credit is a listing of persons, families, or corporate bodies making contributions to the artistic and/or technical production of a moving image resource, sound recording, or multimedia resource not recorded in another element.”

The JSC agreed that there were difficulties distinguishing in a principled way between information about persons, families, and corporate responsible for a resource that is transcribed in a Statement of Responsibility (2.4) and that recorded in Notes (7.23, Performer, Narrator, and/or Presenter; 7.24, Artistic and/or Technical Credit). The JSC invited ALA to prepare a discussion and recommendations on these issues.

The JSC spent the remainder of the day in Executive Session discussing issues and developments relating to the RDA Toolkit with Troy Linker of ALA Publishing. Information about Toolkit developments is available at www.rdatoolkit.org.

On Thursday, November 3, the Joint Steering Committee met with representatives from the ISBD Review Group and the ISSN Network. The discussions concerned harmonization of the three standards in cases where their respective provisions differ.

The morning session focused on issues between RDA and ISBD.

The group agreed that the objective of harmonization was to achieve a practical level of interoperability of records created according to each standard, and to support the mapping of elements across standards.

The following issues were discussed:

- **Sources of information:** There are differences between the ISBD and RDA provisions which result in the values of certain elements being different because they would be taken from different sources. There was tentative agreement that elements such as Parallel Title and Other Title Information might be mapped, because RDA descriptions should include a note on the source of these elements that would allow the ISBD Parallel Titles taken from the preferred source to be distinguished from those RDA Parallel Titles taken from other sources. This sort of mapping was one way of supporting interoperability. Another was to include information in an application profile that would indicate that certain RDA options and alternatives should not be used in an ISBD-compatible record.

It was also noted that ALA is working on the source of information instructions in RDA, and some of the details might be resolved in that context; in particular, it was suggested that ALA look at the instruction at 2.2.2.4 which allows information on an electronic resource to be taken from a label or embedded metadata, but not from the presentation in the content of the resource (which would require that we use the HTML Title tag as preferred source but not a formal “masthead” presentation on the web page).

RDA calls for certain decisions to be based on the “sequence, layout, and typography” of the resource. This has been interpreted as an order of preference, and JSC agreed to attempt to clarify that it is not. (ISBD prefers typography over sequence).

Finally, the recording of titles (other than the Title Proper) as Variant Titles rather than Other Title Information when they appear on the same source as the Title Proper is a problem for ISBD but not for ISSN. No resolution of this issue was reached.

- **Record requirements:** ISBD would like its requirements for records from national bibliographic agencies to be documented in RDA. It was agreed that these requirements could be added to those already documented in RDA Appendix D. The ISBD Review Group will propose additional requirements, as well as updating Appendix D to the latest version of the Consolidated ISBD.

- ***Credibility and trust of information recorded:*** ISBD is concerned about RDA provisions relating to use of marks of omission, square brackets, etc. The JSC clarified the ways in which supplied information might be identified in RDA.
- ***Common title/part title:*** ISBD has a narrower scope for this type of title proper. The ISBD and RDA positions were clarified; further discussion will be needed.
- ***Statements of responsibility related to expressions (e.g., performers, technical credits):*** JSC indicated that ALA will be investigating this issue (see 6JSC/ALA/4 above), considering such issues as the difference between transcribed statements of responsibility and recorded notes, as well as whether there was a principled justification for separating these elements. Once the JSC has acted on that proposal, the ISBD Review Group will determine whether a conflict still exists.
- ***Musical Presentation Statement:*** Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi indicated that there is considerable concern in the international music cataloguing community on the elimination of this ISBD element from RDA; he will work with IAML to make a proposal arguing for reinstatement of the element.
- ***“New series” for unnumbered series:*** ISBD and ISSN will decide on how they want to treat this situation, and will share the results with JSC.
- ***Other title information:*** In RDA supplied Other Title Information is limited to cartographic and moving-image resources; ISBD will make a proposal to remove that limitation.
- ***Legal deposit as evidence of date of publication:*** JSC agreed to add an example to 2.8.6.6 showing legal deposit used as evidence for a Date of Publication supplied by the cataloguer.

The afternoon session dealt with harmonization between RDA, ISBD, and ISSN instructions affecting the creation of new descriptions.

- ***Major changes in title for languages that do not divide text into words:*** ISSN is drafting instructions for their manual to deal with this issue; they will share the results with ISBD and JSC for possible inclusion in all three standards.
- ***Changes in Media Type requiring a new description:*** In addition to changes in Media Type, ISSN believes that this instruction needs to include changes in Carrier Type from a tangible computer carrier to an online carrier as requiring a new description. There seemed to be consensus that this was a good idea; ISSN will prepare a proposal to revise RDA.
- ***Changes in Mode of Issuance:*** In RDA changes in Mode of Issuance require a new description, but this conflicts with ISSN principles. During discussion, we discovered that part of the problem resulted because FRBR considers Mode of Issuance (and Frequency) as attributes of the Expression. All three groups were encouraged to contact the FRBR Review Group asking them to consider correcting this error, and also to take up the issues relating to seriality and digital media which the FRBR Report identifies as issues requiring further investigation.

- **Cumulations** are treated in practice as distinct manifestations by all three groups, thus requiring a new description. The JSC agreed to clarify the RDA guidance on distinguishing works, expressions, and manifestations (this was also a recommendation from the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee).

ISSN prefers to describe the (current) integrating resource and the (earlier) serial in the same record. They will provide some examples of how this might look in ISSN records.

- **Re-basing an integrating resource as requiring a new description:** ISSN agreed to add an instruction comparable to that in RDA.
- **Title changes for integrating resources:** ISSN assigns a new ISSN and Key title when the title on an integrating resource changes; publishers don't understand the distinction between serials and integrating resources, and ISSN wants to have a consistent message about reporting all title changes. Furthermore, there are historical reasons for retaining control over previous iterations of an integrating resource and they want to do it the same way they do for serials. ISSN and ISBD implicitly suggested that RDA follow the same instructions for title changes (and presumably other changes) for both serials and integrating resources, thus undoing most of the benefits of revised Chapter 12. The JSC indicated that it would be difficult to convince our constituencies to support such a proposal. This is definitely a harmonization issue because it affects the number of records resulting from the two practices; discussions will need to continue.

The final day of the 2011 meeting began with presentations by Gordon Dunsire about two areas of interest to both the JSC and the ISBD Review Group.

The first issue — see [6JSC/Chair/5](#) — concerned mapping ISBD Area 0 terms and RDA Carrier Type and Content Type terms to the base categories in the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization (ROF). Mapping both ISBD and RDA vocabularies to ROF allows the relationship between the ISBD and RDA terms to be specified indirectly. Both groups agreed that this approach should be followed.

The second issue — see [6JSC/Chair/4](#) — concerned the mapping of the ISBD and RDA elements. Again both groups agreed that this should be done. This will involve examining the definitions of the elements in each standard to determine whether they are equivalent or whether one is a subproperty of the other (for example, the ISBD Parallel Title element is a subproperty of the broader RDA Parallel Title element because of ISBD limitations on the sources of information). The revision of the ISBD specifications in Appendix D of RDA, which the ISBD Review Group yesterday had agreed to undertake, will be treated as a first approximation of the mapping specifications and will serve as the basis for a more rigorous analysis that will be needed before the actual mapping can be done.

In both cases, the mappings will eventually be encoded in RDF/SKOS format in the [Open Metadata Registry](#) — where the elements for both ISBD and RDA are registered.

The rest of the meeting took place in executive session. Actions included the following:

- The JSC approved terms of reference for a new Examples Group and discussed details about forming the group.
- The JSC updated its document tracking progress towards implementing the recommendations of the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee; the updated document will be posted shortly.
- The JSC confirmed the outcomes of the meeting and indicated what actions to include in the summary Outcomes report, which should be posted in a few weeks.

Deirdre Kiorgaard, representative of the Australian Committee on Cataloguing, ended her term as a member of JSC; Kevin Marsh (also in attendance at the meeting) will be the new ACOC representative. Alan Danskin ended his term as chair of the JSC, but will continue as the representative of the British Library; Thurston Young ended his term as JSC Secretary.

The new Chair of the JSC will be Barbara Tillett of the Library of Congress; Judy Kuhagen will serve as the JSC Secretary.

The next meeting of the JSC was tentatively scheduled for October 2012 in Annapolis, MD, hosted by the Library of Congress.