

TO: ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
FROM: John Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
SUBJECT: Report on JSC Activities, January–June 2012

The following report is based on my contribution to the RDA Update Forum, June 23, 2012, with some additions included in my report to CC:DA later that same day.

The Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA has not met since November 2011. Our next meeting will be in November 2012. This does not mean that the JSC has not been working. We continue to have constant email discussions, as well as irregular conference calls on those occasions when all the JSC members are available.

There are four principal areas of activity that I want to highlight:

1. ***Rewording RDA:*** The rewording of RDA continues. The JSC has been reviewing both the draft reworded chapters from the Copy Editor, Chris Oliver, and the comments from the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee. Chris has now moved beyond the initial five chapters that she was asked to reword. We have just received her draft of Chapter 2. Chapters 3 and 7 will be next, and the rest of the chapters will follow. The intent is to include whatever chapters are ready in the December 2012 release of the RDA Toolkit.
2. ***RDA vocabularies and element sets on the Open Metadata Registry:*** The JSC is working on completing and publishing the RDA controlled vocabularies. As I indicated at Midwinter, the main requirement is for definitions of the terms. We have the majority of the definitions currently under consideration (in a Google Docs shared spreadsheet). I am behind on entering the definitions contributed by CC:DA representatives, and there are some I have yet to receive. Once I get the rest of those added, the list will be almost complete. I want to thank those who have provided definitions. The JSC hopes to approve the terms in June and publish them in the Registry shortly thereafter. The definitions will also be added to the RDA Glossary in one of the monthly releases this fall. In the process of reviewing definitions, we have identified some issues related to some vocabularies that will require further discussion and perhaps revision proposals.
3. ***Correcting the text of RDA:*** The JSC established a Fast Track process for approving minor revisions to the text of RDA; these revisions are included in monthly releases of the Toolkit. This year we worked through a large backlog of corrections, many of them generated by the US RDA Test. The changes include obvious typos, incorrect or inconsistent terminology, changes to examples, and additions to the Relationship Designators. Many of these have already appeared in the Toolkit.
4. ***Revision proposals for the November JSC meeting:*** The JSC will be meeting in Chicago on November 6–9, 2012. ALA has already contributed about half a dozen proposals, and more are under consideration by CC:DA. The other constituencies are also at work. In addition to a number of proposals already received (which I will list in a

minute), we are expecting further proposals, including some from outside the JSC “family” — from EURIG (the European RDA Interest Group), the ISBD Review Group, the ISSN Network, and the Danish National Library. There is a page on the JSC website listing the proposals that each constituency is currently working on and might submit for the November meeting:

<http://www.rda-jsc.org/2012possibleproposals.html>.

You can check there to see what will be on our agenda. A reminder: the deadline for submitting proposals for the November meeting is August 8.

I have received proposals from LC and from the British Library, but too late to put them on the CC:DA agenda — which in any case was already too full. We do not have to respond to these proposals until October 8, so we will have plenty of time to discuss them after we finish our own proposals. I thought I would list the ones that have already been received:

- 6JSC/BL/3: Terms of rank, honour or office (RDA 9.5.2 and 9.19.1)
- 6JSC/BL/4: Other designation associated with the person (RDA 9.0, 9.6.1, 9.19.1)
- 6JSC/BL/5: Fuller forms of name (RDA 9.19.1.4, optional addition)
- 6JSC/BL/6: Other place associated with the person (RDA 9.11)
- 6JSC/LC/9: Date associated with the person (RDA 9.3, 9.3.2, 9.3.3)
- 6JSC/LC/10: Number, date, location of a conference (RDA 11.13.1.8)
- 6JSC/LC/11: Date associated with the corporate body (RDA 11.4, 11.4.3, 11.4.4, 0.6.4)
- 6JSC/LC/12: Priority order of additions to authorized access points representing a person (RDA 9.19.1.1, 9.19.1.5, 9.19.1.6)
- 6JSC/LC/13: Adjustment to exception for recording acronym/initialism titles (RDA 2.3.2.5 exception)
- 6JSC/LC/14: Recording dates associated with persons (RDA 9.3.1.3, Appendix H)
- 6JSC/LC/15: Reorganization of instructions on saints (RDA 9.2.2.18)
- 6JSC/LC/16: Additional exception in 9.19.1.2 for titles of religious rank
- 6JSC/LC/17: Reorganization of instructions for recording extent (RDA 3.4.1.3, 3.4.1.5)
- 6JSC/LC/18: Change of name of jurisdiction or locality (RDA 11.3.3.4)
- 6JSC/LC/19: Additional instructions for preferred sources and preferred titles in different languages and scripts (RDA 2.2.3.1, 6.2.2.4)

Regarding ALA proposals, I would like to note that I have realized that only proposals considered and approved by the JSC in November will be published before we implement RDA next year. Therefore, I am particularly anxious that certain proposals be put forward by ALA for consideration in this cycle. I am referring particularly to the work of

the Task Force on Sources of Information. I think that the Task Force will agree that they still have a lot of work to do on their charge; however, there are two or three issues with sources of information that I would really like to see resolved before implementation. If CC:DA agrees, I am willing to argue that these proposals should be approved, even though there remain further issues to be resolved. I think that this is a question that we might well ask about all the proposals that we are still working on: Are these critical for RDA implementation or are they matters that can be dealt with at a later date?