TO: ALA Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

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

SUBJECT: Report from October 2006 Joint Steering Committee Meeting

The Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR (JSC) met in Washington, D.C. from October 16-20, 2006. The following is a report of meeting discussions and outcomes for the benefit of ALCTS/CCS/CC:DA members and others. It draws heavily from, and expands on, the JSC document, *Outcomes of the Meeting of the Joint Steering Committee held in Washington, D.C., 16-20 October 2006* (hereafter referred to as the *Outcomes* document).

RDA Development Process

The JSC meeting began with a discussion of the portion of the ALA response to the draft of RDA Chapters 6 and 7 (*5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/ALA response*) that articulated ALA's concerns about the RDA development process. The JSC attempted first to understand and address the overarching concern expressed by ALA: that there is a growing crisis of confidence within ALA regarding the development process for RDA. This crisis of confidence has been partially caused by concerns about the content and quality of the drafts of RDA Chapters 0 through 7, and by what is perceived to be an unreasonable development schedule that provides only brief review periods for each section of RDA without allowing for a constituency review of the standard in its entirety.

The JSC was particularly concerned about the skepticism among ALA members surrounding whether or not RDA will ultimately be a viable standard, and the committee discussed several ways to address this concern, focusing on the five specific ALA recommendations for addressing the development issues. (The five ALA recommendations are discussed below in the order that they appear in the JSC *Outcomes* document)

ALA Recommendation I. Adopt a top-down development approach.
ALA Recommendation IV. Do not use AACR2 alone as the source of ideas and practices for RDA.

The *Outcomes* document states the following in response to the 1st and 4th ALA recommendations:

> The JSC affirmed the role of the IME ICC draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles as the basis for the cataloguing principles used throughout RDA, and the role of the FRBR and FRAD models as the basis of RDA parts A and B respectively. RDA will be used to create metadata that supports user tasks, and

represents the entities and attributes/relationships identified in the FRBR and FRAD
models. The JSC and Editor will prepare a scope statement for RDA to articulate
more clearly the role of the models.

The JSC response to these two concerns (Recommendations I and IV, above) focuses
upon more clearly communicating how FRBR, FRAD and the IME ICC draft statement
already provide the underlying models for RDA, and how AACR2 is being used as a part
of that development process. The planned scope statement will reaffirm that RDA is
intended as a standard used to create metadata to support the user tasks in FRBR and
FRAD and to represent the entities, attributes, and relationships in those two models.
The scope statement is expected to be available prior to ALA Midwinter in January, and
so is a possible agenda topic for CC:DA meetings.

It is hoped that responding to the ALA call for an RDA scope statement as described
above will also help to articulate what RDA is, and is not, attempting to achieve. The
JSC has already begun closer contact with other resource description communities as
described in the *Outcomes*. While RDA is based upon very different underlying models
than those used by other metadata standards, there is nevertheless considerable interest
among the RDA Project Management Committee in conducting further discussions with
other communities (particularly with Dublin Core and IEEE-LOM) to compare the
underlying conceptual models for the various standards. There is likely to be a more
specific announcement for how this might be achieved within the coming months.

**ALA Recommendation II. Revise the development timeline, allowing an opportunity
to review RDA as a whole.**

The JSC was very understanding of ALA's concern that there needs to be a review of
RDA as a whole. Discussions at the JSC meeting focused upon how to achieve this
review of the standard as a whole while also continuing to gather feedback on those
sections of RDA that are seen by the JSC to be of highest priority for the development
process. The JSC developed a revised development schedule, which has now been
officially approved by the Committee of Principals (the group to which the JSC reports,
which includes representatives from the Co-Publishers and the AACR Fund Trustees as
well as from the JSC constituencies).

The new extended content development schedule allows for the following constituency
reviews:

- March-June 2007: Review of revised chapter 3
- July-September 2007: Review of revised chapters 6-7
- December 2007-March 2008: Review of part B
- July-September 2008: Review of complete draft of RDA

This revised schedule will push back the first release of the RDA product to early 2009,
although plans are still underway to "roll out" the RDA online product in some manner at
the IFLA meeting in Quebec City in August 2008. It is hoped that this roll out can

include the entire content of RDA, although perhaps not the final version of that content, so that development of the product and final review of the content can take place during the same time period.

CC:DA members will notice in the schedule above that the immediate focus for the next part of the development schedule has moved away from Part B, which had originally been slated for a review beginning in December 2006, and toward reworking Chapter 3. Discussions at the JSC meeting affirmed that it is important for constituencies to have an opportunity to review Chapter 3 in its entirety, including Sections 3.2 on Media Type and 3.3 on Carrier Type. The previous abbreviated constituency review period of the draft of Chapter 3 in early 2006 revealed many concerns with the content of the chapter that the JSC would also like to address sooner rather than later in the development process.

The review of Chapter 3 will be followed by a review of a reworked Chapters 6 and 7 (with the order of the chapters reversed, as was recommended by many of the constituencies), and then by a review of Part B, which is seen as having potentially fewer major issues that need early resolution during the development process. While Part B will include a significant reworking of Chapters 22-26 of AACR2 and include new guidelines for access point control (authority control), the JSC anticipates that the guidelines within Part B will not result in significant changes to cataloging records from those created using AACR2 as will the guidelines in other chapters (such as Chapter 3). Therefore, at this point it seems to be less urgent to put Part B forward for review.

ALA Recommendation III. Provide additional support for the development of RDA.
ALA Recommendation V. Clarify the decision-making authority and responsibility.

Again, the JSC Outcomes document addresses how the JSC is responding to these ALA concerns:

> The JSC affirmed that the RDA Editor is working under the direction of the JSC. The Editor is responsible for conceptual analysis, the development of frameworks for the organization of the guidelines and instructions in RDA, and (in conjunction with the Editorial Team) for preparing drafts. The JSC reviews and approves final drafts. The JSC noted that some identified tasks, such as the final copy-editing and the design of the web product, will be separately resourced.

ALA also commented, regarding ALA Recommendation V., that "The viability of RDA as a standard depends on the resolution of problems raised during the constituency review." Much of the remainder of the October JSC meeting was spent doing exactly that, as the JSC discussed over 150 specific comments made by ALA, the other constituencies, and other cataloging communities, on the previous draft of Chapter 3. ALA will have an opportunity to see the JSC's resolution of these comments in the forthcoming draft of Chapter 3.

Meeting with Other Resource Description Communities

As part of the JSC's outreach work to other communities, exemplified most recently by the ONIX discussions with representatives of the book trade, the JSC was pleased to meet with both Diane Hillman and Robby Robson, representing the Dublin Core and IEEE-LOM communities, respectively, as part of our Executive Session on Friday. The meeting was seen as an informal first step toward opening direct discussions between these three communities, and to pave the way for future discussions related to mutual understanding of the data models that underlie the three metadata standards.

RDA Project Management Issues

The JSC discussed various ways to facilitate and monitor the development of the online RDA product. Marjorie Bloss, RDA Project Manager, serves as chair of the RDA Project Management Committee, which meets regularly via conference call, and these discussions include progress reports from the RDA CoPublishers. Marjorie now reports directly to the Chair of the Committee of Principals (Sue Brown, who at one time was the CILIP representative to the JSC) rather than to Don Chatham (ALA Publishing, who serves as one of the AACR Fund Trustees on the CoP).

Marjorie maintains several documents related to managing the RDA project that were discussed by the JSC. These include a Risk Register for the project, and the RDA FAQ, which will soon have a section on training for RDA added to it on the RDA website.

The JSC CILIP representative has expressed concern that his constituency would like to see a prototype for the whole standard at some point before the final product is released, and the other JSC members concur with this. Such a prototype could use a version of the content that is not yet finalized, so that it could be tested during the same time period during which the JSC is finalizing the content.

The JSC also heard from the national libraries represented on the JSC about their preliminary plans to coordinate their implementation of RDA. They will need additional lead time to work out these plans after the content of RDA is settled, but will be starting their discussions in the near future about how to coordinate their actions.

Preliminary discussions are also underway regarding the creation of a "Where's That Rule?" concordance between AACR2 and RDA. Such a tool may be able to be generated automatically from the RDA data store that will be used to create the RDA product. It is hoped that tools such as this, as well as the mappings between RDA and MARC 21 described below, will facilitate the implementation of RDA.

Chapter 3

In order for the JSC to provide guidance to the Editor regarding as many Chapter 3 issues as possible, the agenda for much of the JSC meeting was reworked to allow discussion of all active documents and portions of documents that somehow relate to Chapter 3. What follows is a description of many of the major decisions made regarding Chapter 3 – the results of the more minor decisions will be included in the draft of Chapter 3 that is released for comment in the first half of 2007.

One change has been to rename Chapter 3, which was formerly entitled "Technical Description" as "Carrier", based upon comments from various constituencies.

It is hoped that the next draft of Chapter 3 will include some or all of the examples for the chapter as well, although there is still some uncertainty about whether or not this can be achieved within the next few months.

Categorization of Content and Carrier

As announced in the *Outcomes*, the JSC decided to rename the element defined in Section 3.2 as Media Type, and the element defined in Section 3.3 as Carrier Type (i.e., to call them "types" rather than "categories"). The JSC reaffirmed that the function of these data elements is the user task "select", and that there is indeed a need for both broad and specific levels of resource categorization, thus the need for both of these data elements within Chapter 3. For example, the broader categories may be useful in defining search limits, while the more specific categories are useful for users selecting specific resources that meet their needs.

The JSC also discussed the apparent repetition of data between the new Carrier Type element and the statement of units of measure in the Extent data element. It was noted that it will still be essential to include both a quantity and a unit of measure within the element Extent, and that it would be risky to separate them and then try to put them back together in a meaningful manner. Plus, there is still a desire among various cataloging communities to include some information about "content" in the Extent element so it is not possible to map a rigorous deconstruction of categories directly to this element without losing that content information. Recording information in two different elements will allow communities to continue to use the content information that is currently contained in SMDs, while still providing rigorous categorization in the Carrier Type element to conform to the RDA/ONIX categorization. It was also noted that this apparent repetition of data involves no more repetition than is currently done using MARC 21. The RDA Editor also reaffirmed that Carrier Type will be a closed list of terms with an "other" category possible, while the Extent element will still allow the use of terms in common usage (i.e., it will NOT be a closed list).

The JSC discussed several possible additional categories that will be proposed as additions to the RDA/ONIX Framework, based on constituency comments. For example,

there is a need to add a category to cover choreographic notation, as well as one for natural sounds. For the portion of the framework that will appear in Chapter 4 of RDA, the JSC decided to change the name of the data element defined at 4.2 to Content Type (rather than Content Category) and to add this element to the list of RDA mandatory elements in the next draft, because of its importance to the "select" and "identify" user tasks.

Because of the need for a way to be able to implement recommended changes to the RDA/ONIX framework and to have work continue in this area, there was some discussion about the possibility of forming an ongoing Working Group between the two communities to accomplish these tasks.

Other Proposals Related to Chapter 3

- **Technical Description of Digital Media** (*5JSC/ALA/2*): As reported in the Outcomes, the JSC agreed to add a data element for File Format rather than expressing it as part of Extent. Other decisions regarding details of this proposal were made based upon constituency responses to the document, and will be incorporated into the next draft of Chapter 3.

- **Video Format Characteristics** (*5JSC/LC/9/rev*): The JSC approved a revised version of the proposal that was distributed at the meeting, and which took into account most constituency concerns. The revised version of the proposal will be included in the Minutes for the October JSC meeting.

- **Dimension of Binding** (*5JSC/CILIP/2*): The JSC agreed with the CILIP proposal. However, the next draft of Chapter 3 will not contain a distinction between local and common dimensions, as some ALA members preferred. If ALA is unhappy with the way that these guidelines appear in the next draft of Chapter 3, we will be asked to provide specific wording for how our concern could be incorporated into the chapter.

- **Accessible Formats used by the Visually Impaired** (*5JSC/CILIP/3*): As reported in the *Outcomes*, the instructions proposed by CILIP for Chapter 3 will instead be divided between Chapters 3 and 4.

Comments from Previous Chapter 3 Review

The JSC spent considerable time during the meeting reviewing individual comments related to Chapter 3 from the constituency review early in 2006. These comments appear in the following response table: *5JSC/RDA/PartI/Sec follow-up/Rev*. (Note: Only those comments that were not resolved by the JSC during previous rounds of triage via email were discussed). Major decisions affecting Chapter 3, which will be reflected in the next draft of the chapter, include the following:

1. The JSC reaffirmed that Carrier Description in its entirety is not required for any resources, although Carrier Type and Extent will be required elements for some resources.

2. Extent will not be required for any resources that are issued over time and are not yet complete.

3. The JSC reaffirmed the decision made at the April 2006 Ottawa meeting not to use abbreviations within the Extent element (e.g., "p.", "col." will now be spelled out, etc.) except those that occur as part of abbreviations in common usage (such as "DVD") or part of a system of measurement (e.g., "ft.").

4. Resources that exhibit characteristics of both audio and digital resources (e.g., an audio CD) may be described in terms of either resource type, or of both.

5. For accompanying material, the description of the carrier will not be treated as a separate element for the accompanying material per se. Instead, elements related to individual aspects of the carrier description may be repeated to describe the accompanying material, or the accompanying materials may be described in a note. The JSC decided to postpone making a final decision on this issue until after seeing constituency comments on the next draft of Part 3. However, the next draft will reflect this tentative decision, in order to solicit feedback.

6. The concept of a "common system of measurement" will be removed from the tables in Chapter 3. Instead, the general instruction will be to use metric, but with alternative guidelines to use a different system of measurement if preferred.

7. RDA will also drop the idea of explicitly not recording the size of a carrier if it is a "typical size" for that type of carrier, since the element is optional anyway.

8. ALA has been asked to provide an informal suggestion for wording to add an instruction for regional encoding for videos so that it can be included in the draft of Chapter 3. OLAC's CAPC committee has been asked to submit some wording before Thanksgiving.

Chapters 6 and 7

Because of the JSC meeting's change of focus to discussion of Chapter 3, the comments from the Constituency Review of the drafts of Chapters 6 and 7 were not discussed in detail at the October JSC meeting, but have been deferred to the April JSC meeting. The JSC *Outcomes* document provides a summary of the discussions of these chapters that did take place at the October meeting:

The JSC discussed responses to the draft of chapters 6 and 7 at a high level, reviewing the content of the chapters against the objectives and principles, and

discussing implementation scenarios. It was agreed that the order of the two chapters
would be switched. The conventions for referencing related resources will be
simplified, and more guidance given on when to apply particular conventions. The
JSC asked the Editor to prepare alternative outlines for the chapter on related
resources for JSC's consideration and decision on the best arrangement. One
alternative will parallel the relationships between Group 1 entities as presented in
FRBR; the other will parallel the relationship taxonomy developed by Barbara
Tillett[1]. The chapter on persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a
resource will also be reorganized to parallel the relationships between Group 1 and
Group 2 entities as presented in FRBR. The concept of "primary access" will be
removed from that chapter and will be addressed in chapter 13 in the context of
naming works and expressions.

Many of the overarching concerns expressed in the ALA response to the draft have been
addressed in the decisions above. However, the JSC did not discuss the detailed
guidelines within Chapter 7 regarding choice of primary access for works of mixed
responsibility or for performances, which CC:DA members had discussed extensively
during the preparation of the ALA response. With the decision to move the concept of
"primary access" to Chapter 13, discussion of these issues will now take place in
conjunction with the draft of Part B.

Other JSC decisions related to Chapters 6 and 7

- **"Citation":** In response to comments on the draft expressing confusion about the
  use of the term "citation" in Chapters 6 and 7, the JSC decided to avoid using this
  term within RDA. Instead, RDA will use wording that more clearly distinguishes
  between the "naming" and "describing" of an entity.

- **"Embedded description":** This term also caused considerable confusion among
  reviewers of the draft. Instead of referring to this technique as an "embedded
  description", the JSC decided to instead refer to it in terms of referencing another
  resource by using a description of the other entity – and by explaining that the
  description of the other entity may have varying levels of completeness.

- **Designation of roles:** In response to comments from ALA (and others)
  requesting that RDA emphasize the use of role designations, the JSC decided to
  add wording (perhaps to the General Introduction) explaining why designations of
  role are important to the function of a catalog.

- **Examples:** Adam Schiff participated in discussions with the JSC regarding
  progress on the examples for Chapters 6 and 7 in his role as the Chair of the
  second RDA Examples Group.

---

[1] "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.

Appendices Working Group

The JSC discussed the interim report of the RDA Appendices Group (*5JSC/Chair/9/Chair follow-up/1*) and gave the group further direction for its work in the coming months. It should be noted that while most RDA Working Groups (such as the two Examples Groups) include members from all or most of the JSC constituencies, this particular Working Group consists of only three members who are all located within the same geographic area, so that they are able to meet and conduct their work within a condensed amount of time. The members are Kathy Glennan and John Attig, both CC:DA voting members, and Judy Kuhagen, Working Group Chair, from LC.

The JSC held considerable discussion of the group's suggestion that there be no appendix on capitalization within RDA. However, even though the guidelines on capitalization in Part A of RDA are becoming less prescriptive, the JSC affirmed that an appendix will still be needed to guide capitalization for Part B. The JSC also reaffirmed that RDA needs to retain an appendix on abbreviations. The AACR2 appendix will be reworked to remove instructions on the use of abbreviations in transcribed elements to reflect the earlier JSC decision to not use abbreviations in transcribed elements within RDA.

The JSC approved several proposals for additions to the list of initial articles for the appendix, but will defer any other similar proposals that may be received until after the first release of RDA.

The Working Group will next concentrate on issues related to abbreviations in Chapter 3 so that these issues can be resolved before the next draft of the chapter is issued. They will also then continue working on the content of all the appendices.

RDA and MARC 21

The JSC discussed a preliminary version of an "early notification" report that will be submitted to MARBI prior to the ALA Midwinter meeting. The final version of this report to be submitted to MARBI will include a mapping of MARC 21 elements to RDA, and will also bring up various issues for discussion. The JSC plans to request a joint JSC/MARBI meeting during ALA Annual 2007, although not all JSC members will be in attendance.   It is hoped that this meeting could to take place during one of the regularly-scheduled MARBI meetings to facilitate scheduling and attendance by interested observers, such as CC:DA members.

Because the content of RDA is still being developed, the planned "early notification" report for MARBI will identify some issues related to implementing RDA within a MARC 21 environment. The paper will discuss RDA in general and list two areas where it is already known that RDA elements will have implications for MARC 21:

- The need to encode new RDA data elements for categorization of content and carrier: Media Type, Carrier Type, and Content Type.

- New values for both the MARC 21 bibliographic and authority formats to indicate that a record has been prepared using RDA.

The report will also list various other issues, some regarding specific RDA elements that may be topics for discussion as the development of RDA continues.

The JSC will be continuing its discussions of MARC 21 implications for RDA by developing the reverse mapping from RDA to MARC 21, and by discussing possible new RDA elements based upon MARC 21. This discussion will be informed by the RDA scope statement that is being drafted by the Editor.

Mode of Issuance

As a result of discussions at the April 2006 JSC meeting, the RDA Editor prepared a discussion paper for the JSC dealing with the categorization of guidelines in RDA for various modes of issuance: multipart monographs, serials, and integrating resources. The paper included a chart that was designed to assist the JSC in analyzing the guidelines that are already in RDA and identifying where additional instructions might be needed. Again, because of the JSC meeting's emphasis upon Chapter 3, the JSC discussed only the portions of the chart that refer specifically to this chapter, so that the Editor can incorporate these decisions into the next draft. The discussion resulted in the following additional JSC decisions regarding Chapter 3:

- **Carrier type:** the JSC decided that a new record will not be required when the carrier changes from one issue to another. The JSC noted that this will be an issue for ISBD harmonization that will need to be addressed.

- Headers and guideline categories within RDA relating to mode of issuance will not be altered to attempt to address concerns expressed by constituencies for facilitating keyword searching in the online RDA product. (ALA had expressed concern about the inconsistencies between sometimes using the terms "multipart monographs", "serials", and "integrating resources" as headers and at other times using other headers such as "resources issued in successive parts".) The JSC reaffirmed that controlled access in the index will take care of this need.

- When Other Technical Details change for a resource that is issued in successive parts, the element may be repeated to add new information, rather than changing information that was previously recorded in the data element. Any clarification of what applies to which issue can be made in a note.

Specialist Manuals (*5JSC/ALA/3* and *ALA follow-up*)

During the review period for RDA part 1 in early 2006, ALA offered to compile a list of potential specialist cataloging manuals for inclusion within RDA, and the JSC agreed that it would like to see ALA put together such a list. ALA submitted *5JSC/ALA/3* and a follow up to it in response to this request. Because of the size of the lists that ALA compiled, however, the various constituencies preferred to see the list mounted on a separate RDA website (perhaps as a Wiki) rather than contained within the RDA product itself. ALA has been asked to combine the two lists that were submitted to the JSC, and reorganize them so that the JSC can discuss them again at a later time, closer to the actual release of RDA. The JSC was very appreciative of the work that ALA members put into creating such a valuable resource for catalogers. CC:DA may want to discuss how to manage ongoing work on this resource.

JSC Future Work

While a detailed JSC Program of Work has not yet been finalized, the following action items and their effect upon CC:DA's work are fairly certain:

- A review of Chapter 3 will be forthcoming, with the review period now scheduled to run from March through June 2007.

- The JSC will issue a new version of the response table for part 1, omitting the comments for Chapter 3 since they that have already been dealt with. Members of JSC will work through the remaining comments between now and the April JSC meeting: clarifying comments and responses, and suggesting exact wording for guidelines where possible. I have put together a small group of volunteers from CC:DA to assist me with this ongoing triage, which will be done via email (and we hope with the help of a Confluence site). Large issues that cannot be resolved during this process will be discussed at the April JSC meeting.

- Constituencies that would like to present further rule revision proposals to the JSC at this point are encouraged to submit a one-page abstract of the proposal to the JSC before writing the actual proposal, so that the JSC can decide whether or not the proposal can be considered for possible inclusion within the first release of RDA or instead will be considered for a future release. (Note: the possible ALA proposals regarding "pages of music" and regarding the CONSER Core Record are exceptions to this – the JSC has already agreed to consider them at the April meeting if they are approved by CC:DA and submitted prior to the March 2007 deadline).

The JSC will meet again from April 16-20, 2007 in Ottawa, Canada. The JSC *Outcomes* lists the following topics that were on the agenda for the October meeting that are being carried over to the April meeting:

- Responses to chapters 1-2, 4-6 of the December 2005 draft of RDA part I (the JSC will continue their review of the comments in the lead up to the meeting);
- Internationalization of part I (*5JSC/LC/5*, excluding chapter 3 issues, which were discussed at this meeting);
- Persistent identifiers and URLs (*5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev*);
- Detailed constituency comments on June 2006 draft of chapters 6 and 7;
- Proposals affecting 7.9.5, Treaties, International Agreements, etc. (*5JSC/LC/5*, sections Q–S, and *5JSC/CCC/1*);
- Editor's draft of part B (and outstanding issues to do with the RDA objectives and principles, mandatory elements, and rule proposals for archival and manuscript resources);
- Family names (*5JSC/LC/6*);
- Bible uniform titles (*5JSC/LC/8*).