JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE FOR REVISION OF AACR

MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2005 MEETING

The British Library, London, U.K.

10-14 October 2005

[Note: does not include Executive Sessions]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Session 2

End of Executive Session 2

Executive Session 3

End of Executive Session 3

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Appendix E

Minutes: of the thirty-first meeting of the Committee held at the British Library, London, U.K., 10-14 October 2005.

Present: Sally Strutt, British Library, in the Chair
Marjorie Bloss, RDA Project Manager
Jennifer Bowen, American Library Association
Tom Delsey, RDA Editor
Deirdre Kiorgaard, Australian Committee on Cataloguing
Nathalie Schulz, Secretary
Margaret Stewart, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
Hugh Taylor, CILIP: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress

Observers in attendance:
John Attig, Pennsylvania State University
Alan Danskin, British Library
Paul Davey, Wellcome Library
Thomas Duszak, Catholic Library Association liaison to CC:DA
Lucy Evans, British Library
Katharine Gryspeerdt, British Library
Judy Kuhagen, Library of Congress
Andrew MacEwan, British Library
Heather Rosie, British Library
Ann Selwood, National Library of Wales

Executive Session 1

23   Arrangements for reviewing and editing AACR (incorporating GMD/SMD Working Group)

23.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

End of Executive Session 1

24   Welcome

24.1   The Chair welcomed the observers and introduced the new RDA Project Manager, Marjorie Bloss.

25   Approval of the agenda

25.1   The following documents were added:
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/BL response
5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up
5JSC/LC rep/1

25.2   The Chair noted that that in addition to the list of unnumbered documents that had been circulated prior to the meeting, there was a status report from the Examples Group, for agenda item 24 (RDA Examples Group).

25.3   Barbara Tillett asked whether agenda item 11 (A0 rules for what is being described …) should be considered before agenda item 7 (Draft of RDA chapters 11-16). The Editor replied that during the discussion of the draft chapters he proposed to skip over any rules covered by a formal proposal, and deal with them later.

25.4   The draft agenda (5JSC/A/2/Rev) was approved with the above amendments. The minutes reflect those agenda items and document series that were discussed. The following draft agenda items were not discussed: 18 (Functions of the catalogue); 19 (Terms of reference for revising chapter 21); 26 (Update on related projects and other resource description communities); 29 (JSC list of tasks); 35 (AACR3 Editor Statement of work).

26   Minutes of the previous meeting held 24-28 April 2005

26.1   The Chair noted that a full list of corrections had been circulated to JSC members prior to the meeting. The Secretary said that she would only read out the substantive changes (marked with "*" below).

26.2   The minutes of the previous meeting held 24-28 April 2005 (5JSC/M/1-22 and 5JSC/M/Restricted/1-22) were approved with the following corrections:

26.2.1   5JSC/M/Restricted/1.2, last sentence: Change "that the slides that were based" to "that the slides were based".

26.2.2   * 5JSC/M/Restricted/1.4, 5th sentence: Change "it was an ALA issue" to "it was more of an issue for ALA".

26.2.3   * 5JSC/M/Restricted/1.4, 8th sentence: Change "ARL members" to "ARL directors".

26.2.4   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.2, 2nd sentence: Add a space between "5JSC/ALA rep/1." and "The Chair".

26.2.5   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.3.6, 1st sentence: Change "The Editor said that other thing" to "The Editor said that another thing".

26.2.6   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.6.2, 2nd sentence: Change "was that resource needed to be dedicated to the task" to "was that a resource needed to be dedicated to the task".

26.2.7   * 5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.7.2, 2nd sentence: Change "as opposed to definitions that were useful to the profession" to "as opposed to defined terms that were useful to the profession".

26.2.8   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.8.6, 2nd sentence: Change "treated as primary focus" to "treated as the primary focus".

26.2.9   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.13.5, 3rd sentence: Change "Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she was concerned that the possibilities" to "Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the possibilities".

26.2.10   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.14.9, 1st sentence: Change "The Chair that her impression" to "The Chair said that her impression".

26.2.11   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/5.15.2, last sentence: add a full-stop to the end of the sentence.

26.2.12   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/8.2.9, 7th sentence: Change "it had been included as an option" to "it had been included in the ALA response as an option".

26.2.13   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/8.6, 4th sentence: Add a full-stop after "for identification".

26.2.14   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/10.2.8, 4th sentence: Change "The Editor replied that all of the persons who could potentially be primary access point" to "The Editor replied that all of the persons who could potentially be the primary access point".

26.2.15   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/12.13.2, 5th sentence: Change "helpful say" to "helpful to say".

26.2.16   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/12.17.2, 3rd sentence: Change "name-time" authorities to "name-title" authorities".

26.2.17   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/12.18.1, 3rd sentence: Change "seen confusing" to "seem confusing".

26.2.18   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/12.19.1, last sentence: Change "The Chair said that helped to look" to "The Chair said that it helped to look".

26.2.19   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/12.19.2, 9th sentence: Change "He noted that using the named first" to "He noted that using the person named first".

26.2.20   5JSC/M and 5JSC/M/Restricted/16.7, 1st sentence: Change "Appendix B already allowed you transcribe" to "Appendix B already allowed you to transcribe".

27 **RDA Prospectus**

27.1 Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/RDA/Prospectus

27.2 The Chair said that the Prospectus was at the beginning of the agenda because it provided context for the draft of part I and all of RDA. She added that comments had been received on the Prospectus, which the JSC needed to review. The Chair noted that an additional document had been circulated prior to the meeting: "RDA prospectus comments for visual material resources". Barbara Tillett explained that this document was for information, and that LC intended to issue a formal proposal in the future. She added that the detail in the document would change, and it was not necessary for it to be discussed at the meeting. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she would be very pleased to see such a proposal.

27.3 The Chair asked if the JSC members had any issues to highlight from the compilation of comments received on the Prospectus. Hugh Taylor said that there should be discussion on any issues that had an impact on the overall structure. The Chair noted that there were comments on the "big picture" and also comments on specific issues such as the numbering used for RDA. The Editor said that before the end of the meeting there needed to be a decision made on the numbering scheme. He added that the implications of changing the numbering were not trivial. [Note: see 5JSC/M/51.]

27.4 The Chair said that she was interested to hear from the JSC members how they thought the Prospectus had been received in their constituencies. She added that CILIP/BL had had an interesting discussion. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had not really discussed the Prospectus because it had come out after the ALA annual meeting. Margaret Stewart said that there had been discussions at Library and Archives Canada and she thought that people were interested in the detail, which was the next stage. Barbara Tillett said the Library of Congress had also held discussions, and generally, people liked the overall direction and the way that exceptions were set off. She added that there were problems with the numbering and concerns about being able to cite particular rules. The Editor said that he had changed what was a solid square in the Prospectus to be "a), b), c)" numbering in the drafts.

27.5 Hugh Taylor said that the Prospectus had achieved one objective in that people were able to see what was being planned. He added that he did not think that this necessarily meant that everyone was "signed up" to what was included. He said that he was a bit worried about the relative lack of comment either formally or informally. Barbara Tillett said that in terms of the comments that had come in, she would like to find out the JSC's reactions e.g. to the National Library of Medicine comment that use of the term "notes" was too card based. The Editor said that other metadata schemes used notes. He added that there was a clear division in the draft between formal structured elements and more "free-form" things such as notes. The Editor pointed out that he had added to chapter 11 instructions on the formulation of notes, and that he thought there was no justification to expurgate the word "notes". He added that he was very careful in the language to always say, "make a note" as opposed to "record" or "transcribe". Hugh Taylor said that he agreed that the general concept should be retained. Barbara Tillett said that she also agreed.

27.6   The Chair asked if there were any other comments to discuss. Hugh Taylor said that he thought there was a need to sell the term "primary access point". Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that something could be issued to say why the concept was important. The Chair asked if this would happen in conjunction with the first draft of part II. The Editor said that it also had to be covered elsewhere; as the JSC had to counter the opinion that "main entry" had no use. He added that a lot of the baggage of main entry would be removed, but there was the underlying value of the standard citation form. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that it would also be an issue for the internationalization of the code. The Editor said that it would and it would not, as there was a kind of parallel with the way Unimarc was set up, which used the terms "primary" and "secondary". Barbara Tillett said that the week after the meeting she would be in Korea and talking with rule makers from China and Japan, who did not use main entry. The Editor said that even those who said they did not have main entry, by default had main entry by title, as that was the citation form.

27.7   The Chair asked if there were any other points to raise from the specific comments. The Editor said that Die Deutsche Bibliothek had made the comment that "Resource Description and Access" implied subject access. He added that subject access was not part of the scope and this needed to be addressed in the General Introduction. Barbara Tillett said that early on in the discussion of levels for records she had included subject headings and classification. She added that it could be said that these were part of a record, but were outside the scope of RDA. Jennifer Bowen said that if subject access was not going to be addressed until the General Introduction, the information had to be put out soon; otherwise, people would keep making the same comment. She suggested that it could be included in FAQs for RDA.
        Action=Project Manager (FAQs)

27.8   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that in terms of the use of "access" in the title, this actually related to the record and not to the resource. She added that RDA would not cover things such as holdings statements. The Editor said that this had been a major lacuna up until now and had to be discussed in terms of the scope. He added that most data to fulfil the FRBR function of "obtain" was not covered in the rules.

27.9   The Chair asked whether the JSC wanted to directly respond to the comments and queries received on the Prospectus. The Editor noted that in some cases there could be value in including the response in an FAQ as then many people could see the answer rather than just one. The Project Manager said that it was important to let people know that their message had been received. The Secretary said that she had sent brief replies to most people who had commented on the Prospectus. Hugh Taylor said that as long as there were a small number of people it was feasible to get back to them individually.

28   Draft statement of objectives and principles for RDA

28.1   Received and considered the following document:
        5JSC/Editor/RDA/Objectives and Principles

28.2   The Chair noted that JSC members had been asked to bring to the meeting the latest IME ICC draft "Statement of International Cataloguing Principles" and the associated Glossary. The Chair asked the Editor to introduce 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Objectives and Principles.

28.3   The Editor explained that the document was a merger of the draft statements of objectives and principles for parts I and II that had previously been distributed. He added that nothing specific for part III was included, but that he had flagged a few things at the end of the covering memo from the draft "Statement of International Cataloguing Principles". The Editor said that the document was created because there was a feeling that the statement of objectives and principles needed to go up on the JSC Web site. He added that he had flagged in the covering memo issues that had come up either in the constituency review of part I (on the formulation of the principles), or arising from discussion on the Prospectus.

28.4   The Editor said that one issue he had not flagged, because it had not come out of either of these sources, was that "comprehensiveness" had been defined in only one dimension, i.e. covering all types of material and all types of content. He added that other dimensions had not been dealt with, i.e. the full range of complexities you may encounter in a resource, or comprehensiveness in terms of covering every way to approach the description of a resource. The Editor noted the ALA comments that AACR had always reflected a bibliographic approach, and queries as to whether an archival approach or a museums approach would be grafted in. He added that the JSC needed to clarify this issue, and the best way to do this would probably be during discussion of different proposals, e.g. the archival proposal. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there was an understanding that RDA would not be all things to all people, and would refer to other standards and guidelines. She suggested that a sentence could be added to this effect. The Editor noted that part of this also came up under compatibility.

28.5   The Chair asked if there were any comments on the document. Barbara Tillett confirmed that it would go up on the JSC public Web site as further background. Hugh Taylor said that this would provide a layer of background that would not be appropriate in the text itself. The Editor said that much of the detail would be worked into the General Introduction and the introductions to the parts. He noted that there had been comments that the General Introduction should be made available with the draft of part I, but that this would not occur. He added that instead there would be the Prospectus and the statement of objectives and principles. Margaret Stewart said that the objectives and principles would be useful for the constituencies when they were reviewing the drafts.

28.6   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she would like something added up front to say that principles can conflict. The Editor noted that this had been done with the December 2004 draft of part I. He added that the document did need to be labelled as a draft, because it was unlikely that there would be time to develop the objectives and principles for part III at the current meeting. Jennifer Bowen said that if the aim was to get the document up soon, then there should be something to say that it was a working document. Barbara Tillett said that if all that was going to go up on the Web was from page 3 onwards, there needed to be some sort of introduction. The Editor agreed.
        Action=Editor

28.7   Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the document headings needed to have more than "Scope, structure, terminology, etc." and "Functional requirements" as a number of responses indicated they were not clear as to what these applied to. She added that it needed to be explained that one related to the rules and one related to the catalogue record. The Editor noted that this was covered in the introductory paragraph. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought it needed to be included in the headings.

28.8   The Chair asked the Editor what issues from the document the JSC needed to address. She noted that the first issue listed in the cover memo was the objective of "compatibility". The Editor said that there did not seem to be a full sense of comfort about this when the Prospectus was being drafted, and that in the end he had not even used the term. Margaret Stewart noted that this issue was related to the strategic plan. The Editor suggested that perhaps there needed to be the more detailed discussions, such as on the archival proposal before decisions could be made. Hugh Taylor noted that the phrase at the beginning of the Prospectus was a useful way of expressing things: "… alignment with the conceptual models for bibliographic and authority data …" The Editor commented that it also said "effective level of alignment". The Chair noted that the JSC would need to return to the issue later in the meeting.

28.9   The Chair said that the next objective noted for discussion in the cover letter was "adaptability": "the ALA response to 5JSC/AACR3/I suggested adding a reference to the adaptability of the rules to new and emerging technologies and formats." Hugh Taylor asked if what was in the cover letter was what the ALA response was getting at. Jennifer Bowen confirmed that it was. Hugh Taylor noted that there was also the issue of "user communities". The Editor commented that this was also listed in the cover memo. He suggested that another term be found to cover one of them. Hugh Taylor asked about "flexibility". The Editor said that there had been another proposal for this to mean something else. Hugh Taylor asked if "extensibility" was a useful synonym. The Editor said that maybe the ALA proposal for "flexibility" would cover the first suggestion for "adaptability". Hugh Taylor said that you wanted the rules to be extensible so that when new media or technologies came on board, the rules had the right shape, structure and approach to incorporate them. The Editor said that he was not sure what ALA meant by emerging technologies, and he thought it related to database systems. John Attig said that he thought that the ALA comment on "adaptability" was about new types of resources. The Editor suggested that in that case the first ALA comment should be slotted under "currency". JSC agreed. The Editor said that he thought that "flexibility" would cover the database side. The Editor asked if the existing statement on "currency" and the proposed statement on "flexibility" needed anything added to them to cover the first ALA comment on "adaptability". JSC members said that they did not.
        Action=Editor

28.10   The Editor noted that ALA had said that it was not clear what "user communities" meant. He added that in his reading of the strategic plan, "user communities" included linguistic communities. He asked if there were other ways to define the term, e.g. whether the archival and museum communities could be seen as possible user communities. The Editor asked whether some examples should be added in parentheses. Hugh Taylor said that he would rather it be left open, or worded more specifically. The Chair asked whether ALA had made any specific suggestions. Jennifer Bowen said that what was meant was

different demographic groups, different types of libraries/information collections, and other countries. The Editor said that under "adaptability" it did not say that it would meet the needs of other communities, but that it would be able to be adapted to their needs. He added that no special interest group was being excluded from building on the rules. The Editor suggested that maybe ALA was reading too much into adaptability. Jennifer Bowen suggested that the objective be reworded. The Editor said that it could be explained what was meant by "adaptable" and that it did not mean that there was an expectation that the rules would be "adopted by" other communities. The Chair asked the Editor if he had enough guidance. The Editor said that he thought it was worth going back to the strategic plan, as that had been his source. The Chair noted that the strategic plan did refer to language communities. The Editor said that the objective had partly come out of "They will be used worldwide, but will be derived from English language conventions and customs". Hugh Taylor suggested that the objective be "Capable of adaptation by user communities to their specific needs" or similar. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked whether the word "user" should be changed so that there was no confusion with "end-user". The Editor suggested that the objective could read: "Capable of adaptation by various communities to their specific needs." JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

28.11   The Chair said that the next issue for discussion was terminology and that BL and LC had both noted the need for plain English. The Editor said that this was an expansion of what was there rather than a contradiction. The Chair asked if the question was whether plain English should be explicitly mentioned under "terminology". The Editor said that it could be added as a separate paragraph. Hugh Taylor suggested that it be incorporated as an objective rather than a principle; the aim was to produce something written in clear English. The Editor said that in that case there was an overlap with the objective of "clarity" and confirmed that he would expand that objective.
Action=Editor

28.12   The Chair said that the next issue was the functional requirement of "cost efficiency". She added that the ALA response had noted the need for clarification on how the objective differed from the principle of "ease and efficiency of use". The Editor said that the difference was that one was a design objective for RDA as a standard, and the other was a functional requirement for the records created using RDA. He added that they were interrelated, but not the same thing. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that changing the headings to show where you were in the document would help. John Attig said that some people in ALA had difficulty with the distinction between the two sections, and either that was a reason to discount this comment, or a clearer explanation of the function of the two sections was required. The Editor said that he thought that perhaps the first paragraph should be split and put immediately after each heading. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she agreed, but she also wanted to see something in the bold heading.
Action=Editor

28.13   The Chair said that the next issue for discussion was the ALA suggestion that "flexibility" be added as a functional objective. She noted that this had already been covered in the discussion on "adaptability". The Editor said that what had been proposed for "flexibility" overlapped with "format independence". He suggested that perhaps the heading "format

independence" was too narrow and that "flexibility" could become the heading. He added that a few words could be included from the ALA response.
Action=Editor

28.14   The Chair noted that ALA had suggested that "harmony" be added as a functional objective, to reflect the need for the data produced to be compatible with existing records and catalogues. The Editor said that this was another flavour of "compatibility", but this word had been used for something else. He added that "harmony" could have the wrong connotations, e.g., IFLA harmonization. Margaret Stewart said that she thought the concept should be included. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if "interoperability" could be used. The Editor said that what was being talked about was integrating the records with existing files. He suggested that the JSC members think about it. Hugh Taylor asked what "compatibility" meant in this sense. Margaret Stewart said that it meant that records could sit together with no need for retrospective changes. The Editor noted that the issue had been addressed in the Prospectus: "Notwithstanding its new approach, the need to integrate data produced using RDA into existing files …" He added that "integratability" was not really a word. Barbara Tillett noted that the IME ICC draft statement used "integration". The Chair asked if it meant the same thing, Barbara Tillett said that the emphasis was on "based on a common set of rules". The Editor said that there was agreement as to what the objective was, but not the word to use.

28.15   The Chair asked if the discussions were complete. The Editor said that he would circulate a draft of the objectives and principles to the JSC before they went up on the Web site. He added that at some stage the JSC would need to consider the IME ICC issues that related to the objectives and principles for part III. The Editor noted that there needed to be a clear caveat on the document that it was not complete.
Action=Editor

29   Functional requirements for a Web-accessible version of RDA (incorporating Liaison with the co-publishers of AACR)

29.1   The Chair noted that JSC members had brought a number of documents to the meeting to do with the Web-accessible version of RDA: a draft specification; JSC members' responses to the draft specification; comments from Bruce Johnson and John Attig; an extract from the June 2005 CC:DA minutes; notes of the April meeting between the JSC and ALA Editions staff; a document on RDA styles from the Editor; and, Bruce Johnson's comments on the Prospectus. The Chair suggested that the JSC clarify the aim of the functional requirements for a Web-accessible version of RDA. She noted that some time in the past there had been an attempt to prepare a specification but that nothing had come of it. She added that with the agreement in April to focus on the online product there was an urgent need for a functional statement. The Chair noted that the Editor needed a statement in terms of the styles that he used, and there also needed to be an outline of what the JSC wanted to achieve with the product. The Editor said that from his point of view the other utility of having a statement and discussing it with the co-publishers was that currently his contract did not include metadata coding, but that the most efficient way would be for him to do some of it as he went along. He added that he had been including some data such as "C*" for rules to possibly be included in a concise version, and references to AACR2 rule numbers. The Editor said that once there was agreement on the

GMD/SMD categories, codes for these could be included to indicate the scope of application of certain instructions. He added that once the levels were agreed, codes could be added to the appropriate elements. The Editor said that the timeline was already tight, and there was not the time available for someone to retrospectively add the coding. He noted that even with the indexing, there was the facility in Word to "mark" or "insert" the terms to index. The Editor commented that until you decided what functions you wanted to support you did not want to waste time putting in unnecessary coding. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that the JSC wanted the types of coding that the Editor had outlined. She added that another thing that had come up was "optional" instructions.

29.2   The Chair noted that Hugh Taylor had instigated the drafting of the functional requirements, and asked him if he had anything to add. Hugh Taylor said that the Editor needed guidance in order to make the best use of his time. He added that there was also the need to avoid the co-publishers taking the finished text and adding the coding, because experiences with the current printed text showed that this added a layer of obfuscation. Hugh Taylor said that he was still unsure that it was the JSC's job to produce the functional specification. Barbara Tillett noted that the JSC was counting on having a Web designer on board to discuss the issues with. She added that there was also the need to do a marketing survey to find out what the users wanted. Hugh Taylor asked if the next step was for each constituency to set up a focus group to come up with its own list of functional requirements, and from that to identify overlaps and additional features. The Project Manager suggested that the first step was to identify what was to be done, and then to identify who was to carry it forward. She said that there was no question that ALA needed to hire the Web designer as soon as possible. She added that it had to be decided who would do the focus groups with the user communities, and that she thought it would be valuable to have the person from ALA sit in on some of the focus groups.

29.3   John Attig said that it was important to identify the metadata related to the content and that had to be done by the JSC and Editor. The Editor said that it was important for the JSC to determine what views of the data needed to be supported. He said that there were issues to do with extracting a concise version in terms of how he wrote instructions, and what happened to the rule numbering. He said that the JSC needed to think of RDA not as a page 1-300 printed text, but in terms of the views required to make it an efficient and easy to use tool. He added that after this there needed to be a dialogue with the Web expert. The Chair said that she thought it would be helpful if the Web expert could mock something up so that the JSC could comment. The Editor said that there would be a number of features that would be in a Web-designers tool kit, but what would be unique to this product were the views, which would be reflected in the information architecture. Jennifer Bowen said that views and content-related metadata were very related, e.g. a view for cataloguing maps or a concise version. She suggested that the need to define the JSC's territory was maybe more useful than a list of functional requirements. The Editor said that another suggestion was to allow people to only view certain examples. Jennifer Bowen asked if the JSC should brainstorm what was required. The Editor noted that a number of things had already been included in the draft specification.

29.4   The Chair suggested that the JSC discuss the version of the functional requirements document edited by Bruce Johnson. She noted that the document began with an overview,

and that the actual functional requirements began by listing some assumptions for the RDA file. The Chair summarized the assumptions:

- A single digital data library should be the source from which all products are derived;
- The data library will be in the XML format and will employ the UNICODE character set;
- It is anticipated that derivative products will include a Web-accessible version, an online editorial copy to be used for revision development, and one or more printed texts;
- The JSC (and constituent groups) will require online access to a development version of RDA;
- Appropriate online workspace will be provided;
- The RDA data store will also be made available on a licensed basis for incorporation into third-party products (e.g. *Cataloger's Desktop*).

Barbara Tillett asked whether it should be made clear that there would be no rekeying by the co-publishers. The Editor said that he thought this was implied by an "online editorial copy". Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested it be made explicit by adding something to the third bullet. The Chair asked how the JSC felt about the final point regarding the licensing of the data store. The Editor said that he thought this was a business decision for the co-publishers. Barbara Tillett suggested that the point be removed. Hugh Taylor agreed that it was not a characteristic of the source file.
Action=Secretary

29.5   The Chair noted that the next section contained the functional requirements for the Web-accessible text and the first dot point covered customised views (e.g. full, concise). The Editor commented that the next bullet also dealt with views:
Customized subsets of rules based on metadata recorded for each rule:

- data element (title proper, extent, note on contents, etc.)
- scope of rule (all, specific type of content or type of carrier or type of issuance)
- type of instruction (definition, basic, general, exception, supplementary)
- levels of description/access

Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that AACR2 rule numbers could be added. The Editor said that he was not sure that you would want to support pulling out subsets based on this, but you might be able to produce a separate product. The Chair asked if there was anything else that was not covered. The Editor said that looking at Deirdre Kiorgaard's email, definitions appearing in pop-up windows was mentioned. The Chair replied that this was already in the list.

29.6   Jennifer Bowen asked about views of options. The Editor asked what this meant, a view where you only saw options, or where you did not see options? Jennifer Bowen said that she wanted to see where in RDA there were options, as you had to make a policy decision on each one. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wondered if this issue would arise if the JSC decided to have mandatory elements. The Editor said that he had made no distinction in his styles between options and exceptions.

29.7   Hugh Taylor noted that in the list links to external sources were covered, but no provisions were made for links from the outside to specific rules. He added that this was

probably at the product design level. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this was related to what had been removed from the first page of the document regarding licensing. The Editor noted that there were currently no "hooks" in the text, in that the rule numbers were not differentiated from the rest of the paragraph. He added that he needed to find a way to link references to rule numbers so that when a rule number changed, the reference did also. He noted that once links could be made internally, then others would be able to link in from the outside. Jennifer Bowen said that there needed to be made clear somewhere in the document that other groups would want to link to RDA.

29.8   The Project Manager asked Jennifer Bowen about the comment she had made in an email regarding split-screens. Jennifer Bowen said that some very specific suggestions had been made in ALA, and this was the sort of thing that would come out of the focus groups. The Editor said that the JSC needed to discuss those things that were content related. Jennifer Bowen suggested that perhaps the JSC needed to break the functional requirements into two separate lists. The Project Manager said that it could be emphasised that this document was at a high level. She added that she wanted to get it into Don Chatham's hands as soon as possible. Hugh Taylor said that it was important to identify what would affect the Editor's work. The Project Manager said that she hoped that the Web designer would be able to say, "Have you considered this …" and mention things that were cutting edge.

29.9   The Editor noted that RDA was no longer being written as a linear document. He added that whether he did the coding or not, the views were part and parcel of the way it was constructed. The Chair said that it had come out in the CILIP/BL responses that people were still in a print mindset. Barbara Tillett said that it was important to manage the expectations of people who were reviewing the text. Hugh Taylor said that another issue to be addressed was the need to retain access to archival versions of rules.

29.10   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there were two types of things in the list of functional requirements, those that the JSC thought it needed to provide metadata for, and those it did not. She suggested that this be made clearer. The Editor said that he thought there was already a division in the document, although perhaps "hide/expand examples" needed to go up into the content-dependant area. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that "ability to change display size, colour schemes" would need to go down. Hugh Taylor asked where "word search" would belong. The Editor said that he thought this was a feature that would be provided.
Action=Secretary

29.11   The Project Manager asked what the JSC wanted to do regarding focus groups. Barbara Tillett said that in April, ALA Publishing had discussed review of a Web product in 2007. She added that she thought that something needed to happen much earlier, and that it was the responsibility of the co-publishers. The Project Manager said that she agreed that you could not wait until the end to ask people about the product. Barbara Tillett said that beta testing would be needed, but that was something different. The Editor said that the co-publishers might want to work with the JSC to identify the focus group. Margaret Stewart said that when she had been in Chicago recently, Don Chatham had told her that he intended to get a group together soon. Hugh Taylor said that from a political perspective it needed to be a broadly based, representative, group, or groups. The Chair noted that

another aspect was talking to stakeholders, and it would be helpful for them to have something to look at. Jennifer Bowen said that this sounded like a prototype. Hugh Taylor agreed, but said that there needed to be a theoretical stage beforehand. Jennifer Bowen said that focus groups could be involved in the early stage of paper prototyping. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wanted to return to Hugh Taylor's comment regarding the widely based focus groups. She asked if he meant that he wanted groups in the UK. Hugh Taylor said that he did not want to prescribe, but that politically they had to be seen to be including broad representation. The Editor noted that co-publishers would be looking at different markets as opposed to constituencies.

29.12   The Chair asked what the best way to take the document forward was. Barbara Tillett said that she thought that the Project Manager could share it with the Web designer, or it could be sent immediately to the co-publishers. The Project Manager said that she thought that it was important for her to pull things together for Don Chatham, and to ensure that the Web designer was hired as soon as possible. Barbara Tillett suggested that it would help if the JSC prepared a revised document as soon as possible. The Secretary said that she would make the changes that had been discussed to the document. The Editor said that, even with the revised document, the Project Manager needed to communicate to the co-publishers that some requirements were intertwined with content, and that there needed to be reassurance that these could be supported.
Action=Secretary; Project Manager

29.13   The Editor said that he wanted to follow-up on some comments that Bruce Johnson had made on font and other style matters in the Prospectus. He said that he had forwarded the comments to Troy Linker at ALA. The Editor said that what concerned him the most was Bruce Johnson's comment that Web technology did not handle tabs very well. He said that Johnson's suggestion was that these be turned into a table, but the problem was that this could not be done simply by changing the style. The Editor said that Troy Linker and Jenni Fry had differing opinions to Bruce Johnson on fonts, and that in terms of tabs they were fairly confident that if this needed to be done it could happen at the product processing stage. He added that he was not proposing to change the way he was doing things.

30   Draft of RDA chapters 11-16 (incorporating AACR3 - Part I - Constituency Review of December 2004 Draft)

30.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 11
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 12
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 13
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 14
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 15
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 16

5JSC/AACR3/I
5JSC/AACR3/I/CCC response
5JSC/AACR3/I/LC response
5JSC/AACR3/I/CILIP response

5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA response
5JSC/AACR3/I/ACOC response
5JSC/AACR3/I/BL response
5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA rep response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/1
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/2
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/3
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/4
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/5
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/6
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/7
5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/8
5JSC/AACR3/I/Chair follow-up/9
5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up
5JSC/AACR3/I/LC response/ALA response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev

30.2   The Chair said that in terms of part I of RDA the focus would be on the drafts of chapters 11-16 prepared by the Editor, and relevant points in the discussion guide table (5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev). The Editor said that for the drafts he worked from the outline of chapters given in the Prospectus. He added that it would be necessary to keep the Prospectus outline up to date as he had made some changes while working on the drafts. The Editor explained that he had shifted text from the December 2004 draft of AACR3 part I into the appropriate place in the outline. He added that he had made changes to the style as he went along, and that he had made editorial changes that all constituencies had agreed to as identified in 5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev. The Editor said that what the JSC had in front of them was a work in progress to see how things looked. He noted that there were a number of issues that the JSC thought would disappear with the new structure, but this had not always occurred. The Editor said that he had incorporated changes in instances where everyone agreed, but in some cases when there was agreement he had been unable to make the change either because there were conflicts between what people had agreed to, or because the new approach meant that it wasn't as straightforward as it seemed. The Editor explained that line numbers from the table were included after the captions of the relevant rules in the draft, and there were check marks next to them if they had been incorporated. He added that the agenda item was intended to look at comments arising from the draft of AACR3 part I, but that going through the discussion guide table line by line would not be as profitable as looking at the comments in the context of the new drafts. He noted that references to the current formal proposals (5JSC/LC/1/Rev, 5JSC/LC/2, 5JSC/LC/3, 5JSC/LC/4, and 5JSC/ACOC rep/1) were also included in the drafts. The Editor said that he proposed to skip over these rules while going through the drafts, and discuss them with the proposals.

30.3   The Editor said that he had carried forward into the drafts references back to AACR2 rules, and that these could be used to generate data on "where is that rule". The Editor explained that he had put a "C*" where the current Concise AACR2 had a corresponding rule. He said that this was partly triggered by comments from CILIP that the text needed to be looked at in layers. He noted that probably all of chapter 11 would need to be

included in a concise version. The Editor said that there were a few sections which simply had "to be added" because he was awaiting the discussion of a proposal. He added that the exception were rules from 5JSC/LC/1/Rev and 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1 which had already been included in the draft, and he had made changes based on the responses to the two proposals. The Editor noted that chapter 13 only included rules that had been in chapters A1, A2, and A3 of the December 2004 draft. He said that nothing had been included from section C as was waiting for the conclusions of the GMD/SMD Working Group. He added that the exception was when there had been agreement to generalise a rule in section C. The Editor said that the task for the meeting was to work through the drafts and cover all of the constituency comments on the December 2004 draft.

30.4   Chapter 11 – General Guidelines on Resource Description

30.4.1 Barbara Tillett noted that much of the chapter could be skipped as it was covered by 5JSC/LC/1.

30.5   11.0. Purpose and scope

30.5.1 The Editor explained that in "Purpose and Scope" he had pulled over text from the Prospectus.

30.6   11.1. Terminology

30.6.1 The Editor noted that this section was "to be added" and that he saw it including general comments on terminology. He added that including definitions in chapter 11 had not worked as well as for other chapters, and that he thought that this section would include definitions of key terms that occurred throughout part I, e.g. "resource", the different types of resource, and the three types of description: analytic, comprehensive and multilevel. The Editor said that in subsequent chapters the terminology would be dealt with element by element.

30.7   11.2. Type of description

30.7.1 The Editor suggested that the rule be looked at later because there were other versions in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev and 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1.

30.8   11.3. Changes requiring a new description

30.8.1 The Editor said that the section had been added because of a suggestion in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev, and that it would be discussed later.

30.9   11.4. Levels of detail in the description

30.9.1 The Editor noted that this section was "to be added" and was covered by 5JSC/ACOC rep/1.

30.10   11.5. Language and script of the description

30.10.1 The Editor said that the section was covered by 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

30.11   11.6. Transcription

30.11.1 The Editor said that the approach he had taken was to start with one general instruction: "When the instructions in chapters 12–16 specify transcription of an element as it appears on the source of information, follow the general guidelines on capitalization, numerals, symbols, etc., given under 11.6.1–11.6.9 below." Barbara Tillett said that there still needed to be discussion, and agreement or not, with the concept of "take what you see." The Editor said that two options had been incorporated at this high level that sprang from comments at line 28 in the table (from LC): "allow options for normalizing punctuation, abbreviations, capitalization, measurements, etc." The Editor said that instead of using the appendices you could use your own style manual, or if you were doing the process automatically you could follow whatever you had programmed in. He added that he was assuming that scanning involved programming, e.g. to handle mathematical symbols. Barbara Tillett said that future systems might be able to take things as they were from another source. She added that this option referred to "automated scanning or downloading" and the Editor might also want to include "copying", to cover "cut and paste" copying. Barbara Tillett noted that in the first option there was reference to the *Chicago Manual of Style*, and asked if there was continued agreement to use the *Chicago Manual of Style*. The Editor commented that the introduction to AACR2 said that it was followed "for the most part". The Chair suggested that this was something that could be checked at the end of the process. The Editor noted that there was also the issue of spelling, in that the American usage was followed unless the British usage was established.

30.11.2 Barbara Tillett said that she was concerned that there had not been a discussion regarding "take what you see". She added that she was in favour of this because she could see the future capabilities of bringing in metadata from other sources, e.g. from publishers. The Editor said that he thought that this was allowed for in the second option. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the JSC had not discussed the issue, and asked Barbara Tillett if she could provide more information. She added that the reason for transcription rules was to have uniform data elements that you can recognise across systems, and asked how this would be addressed if you transcribed "what you see". Barbara Tillett said that the issues were punctuation and capitalization, and pulling in the text string as you see it. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked about introductory words in the title and whether they would be covered by additional access points. Barbara Tillett said that there would still be intellectual effort needed on the access that was required. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that this would have a big impact, because currently there was normalization of what went into the title, and this would no longer be assured. Barbara Tillett said that the ISBD title statement might look different, but somewhere in the record there would be a data element for the title that looked exactly the same across the board. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that from a systems point of view it was significant where the edited title appeared in the record. She added that some libraries did not do variant titles, and there would be different work flows required. She noted that there was an implication for matching of titles, and with the way things were now, the title statement should be the same no matter who was producing it. Jennifer Bowen said that there would be systems implications, such as with OCLC duplicate detection. She added that this brought up the need to have somewhere a marker or a code in the record to tell you what option the library had chosen, e.g. to follow the RDA appendices or not. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think this was necessary. John

Attig said that he thought that what was being discussed would be covered by standard normalization. He added that he did not think that there were any systems that were case sensitive when doing string matching. Barbara Tillett said that there was also the issue of introductory words, and this was covered by a rule.

30.11.3   The Editor said that his concerns were firstly, whether the options he had presented reflected what was intended by the LC comment, and secondly whether this was acceptable to everyone else. He added that this was a comment in the table for which discussion was requested. Hugh Taylor said that he was comfortable with what the Editor had done, because he had some issues with what LC had originally suggested. He added that the rule as written allowed for what LC wanted, but did not require it. Margaret Stewart said that she agreed. Barbara Tillett said that it did not answer Deirdre Kiorgaard's concern about variations in practice. The Editor said that he had added the option because it would allow accommodation of practices of other communities. Barbara Tillett said that she wanted to make it clear that when you "take what you see" she did insist on a more structured or standardised access point (when an access point was involved). Deirdre Kiorgaard said that her concern was that libraries that had previously only supplied one title element would now have to have an extra level of control. She said that she was also concerned about the system implications for matching. The Editor agreed and noted that even if a normalised title was added, matching was always done on 245$a. Jennifer Bowen said that personally she liked what the Editor had done, but that there needed to be an awareness of the impact. Hugh Taylor said that he liked the two options expressed as they were as opposed to condensing them. Margaret Stewart said that she thought it was very clear. Judy Kuhagen said that as someone who did training she would prefer to see the instructions to "take as you see" in terms of abbreviations and capitalization extended beyond downloading, scanning, and copying, to all records. She said that she would prefer that cataloguers focussed on identification and access, rather than worrying about capitalization and abbreviations. The Editor replied that this was covered by the first option to use in-house guidelines. Barbara Tillett said that if everyone took what they saw, then there would be consistency across the board, and there wouldn't be the issues with de-duping. Hugh Taylor said that he thought the second of the two options had nothing to do with "take what you see" but was rather "take what you get". Barbara Tillett asked how the two things were different. Hugh Taylor said that "take what you see" would be when you were creating or editing a record yourself, while with accepting what you were given, you did not know what the person creating the original description could or couldn't see. The Editor noted that metadata from a publisher could be different from what the publisher had on the title page.

30.11.4   The Editor noted that many of the rules to do with the title proper dealt with the choice of the title proper, and that this was not something that was scanned without intelligence. He added that what was provided in the rules on transcription was a "fork in the road"; either ignore what RDA says, and substitute your own set of guidelines; or ignore what RDA says and program your own guidelines. He added that you couldn't say "this is the only way that you can record data" and also say that you were being accommodating to other communities and taking account of new technologies. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that when the draft went out it needed to be made clear that cataloguers would have to do more work in controlling access points and systems vendors would have to work on their matching algorithms. John Attig said that one element might be inadequate for the purposes of

matching, but the data could be elsewhere. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the title was usually the first point of matching (besides a number) and an algorithm might not go further. Jennifer Bowen said that algorithms had to be more complex. The Editor said that there was also the issue of sorting result sets.

30.11.5 Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if there was agreement with the rules as they were going out in the draft for review. The Editor said that there were still rules that followed that told you to drop introductory words. He noted that the option did not override this. Barbara Tillett said that with a title such as "Welcome to…" when you brought it in from another source you would not worry about capitalization or abbreviation, but when it came to formulating the title proper you would follow the rules to omit the introductory words (and add additional access points as required). Barbara Tillett said that there would be many ways for others to tag their metadata, and local adjustments would have to be made. She added that the point was that if what you were given was all in caps, you would leave it all in caps, and if it used an abbreviation for "Doctor" you would leave that also. Jennifer Bowen said that the "Welcome to …" example was not a good one because it did not illustrate what this rule prescribed. The Editor said that all that was covered was what was in 11.6.1-11.6.9. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that to her the issues were not to do with capitalization, etc. but with things that would not make the title match. The Editor said that the discussion of what would be in the title proper would come later. The Chair confirmed that the JSC was happy with the options going forward.

30.12   11.6.1. Capitalization
         11.6.2. Numerals
         11.6.3. Accents and other diacritical marks
         11.6.4. Symbols

30.12.1 The Editor noted that all of these rules would be discussed with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev. He added that the JSC would then need to discuss the line numbers that were listed

30.13   11.6.5. Punctuation

30.13.1 Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this rule was an instance where AACR was prescribing punctuation. The Editor said that the issue was that ISBD used the mark of omission and square brackets as prescribed punctuation, and therefore you had to provide alternatives. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if this hang-over was required. Barbara Tillett said that it was not, as you only needed to replace the mark of omission and square brackets if you were following ISBD punctuation. The Editor said that AACR also had rules that told you to use the mark of omission, and it needed to have one meaning, i.e. that something has been omitted. Barbara Tillett said that she did not mind two meanings. The Editor said that the rule was intended to disambiguate between when the source of information included the mark of omission and when it did not. John Attig said that in terms of both the mark of omission and square brackets, it seemed to him that the issue was how precisely you wanted to be able to identify the title page. He added that this was important for antiquarian cataloguing, but that this community would have their own guidelines for this type of punctuation. The Editor asked if this meant that he should delete rule 11.6.5. Hugh Taylor asked about the principle of differentiation: "The descriptive data provided for in the guidelines and instructions should serve to differentiate the resource described from

other resources represented in the file." He added that he did not think there was a conflict. The Editor said that what was being followed was the principle of representation. The Chair confirmed that the rule would be deleted.
Action=Editor

30.14   11.6.6. Initials and acronyms

30.14.1   The Editor said that he had reinstated this rule, even though the decision to remove it had been made at the Cambridge meeting. He added that the original AACR2 rule was to do with the title proper, but he thought that the rule affected more than the title proper. He said that the question was whether the instruction should be given or not. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think that it was necessary as almost all library systems allowed normalization. Hugh Taylor said that some systems would treat "T.U" and "T. U." differently. He asked whether the rule was in conflict with the principle of "take what you see". Barbara Tillett said that it was, and you could provide access for alternative forms. The Editor said that sometimes it was difficult to tell from the source of information whether or not there were spaces between letters, and the first part of the rule dealt with this situation. Barbara Tillett said that you could instruct "in case of doubt" not to include spaces. Hugh Taylor said that he thought that the idea was that things that were meant to be read together should be kept together. He noted that systems used spaces to break lines. The Editor noted that sorting would also break at spaces. John Attig added that this was also an issue for keyword searching. The Editor confirmed that the first part of the rule would be retained. Hugh Taylor said that it seemed to him that the rule was really about spacing and not acronyms. The Editor said that the rule was to do with spacing of initials and acronyms. The Chair suggested that "spacing" be added to the caption of 11.6.6. The Editor noted that the second part of the rule dealt with full stops: "If such letters or initials have full stops between them, transcribe them with full stops and omit any internal spaces." The Editor suggested that if he revised the caption, he would omit "transcribe them with full stops". JSC agreed to change the caption to "Spacing of initials and acronyms" and to change the wording of the second part of the rule.
Action=Editor

30.15   11.7. Formulation of notes

The Editor explained that this section was based on AACR2 rules 1.7A3 and 1.7A4. He added that there were a number of comments from the constituency review to be discussed.

30.15.1   Line 584: add text to Introduction to state the function of notes (ALA: 13: p. 86)

The Editor said that because in RDA notes were spread all over the place, and each chapter would have text on purpose and scope, he was not sure about this. Jennifer Bowen said that what was meant was the "function of notes in terms of the FRBR user tasks and bibliographic entities". She added that she thought that the comment was moot because of the new structure.

30.15.2   Line 585: add at A1.7 statement about optionality of notes (ALA: 13: p. 87)

Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this would be addressed in the discussion on levels.

30.15.3   Line 586: break up notes rules with separate headers (ALA: 13: p. 87)

The Editor noted that this comment was covered by the new structure.

30.15.4   Line 589: make subrules with bold captions in A1.7A3 and A1.7A4 separately numbered (ALA: 13: p. 87).

The Editor noted that this had been done.

30.15.5   Line 590: add sentence at A1.7A3 "Order of information" (ALA: 13: p. 87)

The Editor said that this rule told you to use ISBD order when recording a note with several elements. He added that this could hardly be enforced at this level, when ISBD punctuation was not being enforced at a higher level.

30.15.6   Line 595: move final paragraph of A1.7A4 to A1.7B (ALA: 13: p. 87)

The Editor said that A1.7A4 final paragraph dealt with notes relating to reproductions. He added that this came under 11.7.8 (Notes citing other works and other expressions or manifestations of the same work). He said that specific instructions on reproductions were elsewhere.

30.15.7   Line 597: reword rule on order of notes at A1.7B (ALA: 13: p. 88)

The Editor noted that there was no longer any order of notes, so the comment was moot.

30.16   11.7.1. Language and script

30.16.1   Barbara Tillett said that later on, in chapters 12-16, information on language and script was repeated. The Editor said that 11.5 dealt with elements that were listed there, with the instruction to "Record all other elements in the language and script of the agency preparing the description." He added that the first bullet of 11.7.1 said "Record notes in the language and script of the agency preparing the description, except as instructed below." Barbara Tillett asked why it said the same thing in both places. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this could be a case where redundancy was of assistance to the user of the code. The Editor said that the redundancy was already in the rules, in AACR2 in 1.7A3 and 1.0E1.

30.16.2   Jennifer Bowen said that the Asian and African Group in CC:DA wanted more guidance at the second bullet: "When giving names or titles originally in nonroman scripts, use the original script whenever possible rather than a romanization." She said that they had suggested adding "When this is not possible, provide a romanized form of the name or title." Jennifer Bowen suggested that if text was added to 11.5, then 11.7.1 would no longer be necessary. Barbara Tillett agreed that text about notes could be added to 11.5. The Editor said that notes were covered by "Record all other elements in the language and script of the agency preparing the description."

30.16.3   Hugh Taylor said that he thought the issue was being looked at in terms of a print product intended to be read in a linear fashion rather than an electronic product. He added that if the first bullet was removed, context would be lost for the next two bullets. The Editor said that one option was to remote 11.7.1 altogether, but otherwise the exceptions could not be left without the basic rule. He added that if 11.7.1 was removed, 11.5 could say "Record all other elements (including notes) in the language and script of the agency preparing the description." The Editor suggested that the second bullet be moved to 11.5, and that it be made clear that it was for notes. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

30.16.4   Barbara Tillett asked if the decision had been made to use "script of the agency" rather than "script of the catalogue" in 11.5. The Editor said that he was trying to avoid the use of the word "catalogue". Margaret Stewart commented that the current rule said "language and script of the cataloguing agency". Barbara Tillett noted that many agencies, such as in Canada, had more than one official language and she thought that the language of the catalogue should be the focus. The Editor said that all he had done with the original text was remove the word "cataloguing". Barbara Tillett said that she thought it needed to be clear that it was the script or scripts preferred by the agency. She said it was not just the working language of the catalogue, but the policy decision that had been made. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that what was meant was "language(s) and "script(s)." JSC agreed. She also noted that both "agency" and "organization" had been used, and she thought that one should be picked. The Editor said that he thought "agency" was the broader term. Deirdre Kiorgaard confirmed that this was a decision for all of RDA.
Action=Editor

30.17   11.7.2. Capitalization, numerals, and abbreviations

30.17.1   The Editor noted that the two options were the same as those at 11.6. Barbara Tillett suggested that the rule could be simplified so that the instruction was to construct notes as sentences and follow the standards of the language of the agency. The Editor noted that there were some specific instructions regarding Roman numerals, and that the rule was currently based on what was in the AACR2 appendices. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that what Barbara Tillett had suggested could replace the first part of the rule, but that she wasn't sure where the rest fitted. The Editor said that what Barbara Tillett had suggested was different from what was currently in the rule. The Chair asked if the simplification of the rule could be left to the Editor. The Editor commented that there needed to be a discussion on what was meant by simplification. He said that he would try to rewrite the rule, but the reference to appendix A was about more than using sentences. Barbara Tillett said that her suggested covered capitalization, numerals and abbreviations. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the issues were to do with "economy" and suggested that this had changed over time. She asked what the benefit was in having roman numerals in notes in capitals. Barbara Tillett said that it was an issue to do with consistency of display in book catalogues and she did not think it mattered any longer. She added that she did not think that users cared about the formatting as long as they could understand the note. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the issue was that the community standard had changed. The Editor said that the first paragraph would be changed as suggested, the second and third paragraphs would be deleted, and the options would probably go as well.
Action=Editor

30.18   11.7.3. Quotations

30.18.1 Line 591: add explicit instruction about hyphens to A1.7A3 "Quotations" (ALA 13: p. 88)

Jennifer Bowen said that this comment could be ignored in light of the changes that had just been made. Deirdre Kiorgaard confirmed that in terms of punctuation in general, the inclusion of quotation marks aided understanding of the catalogue record, and that instruction in the rule would be retained.

30.19   11.7.4. References

30.19.1 The Editor said that this was the first time that you encountered ISBD punctuation in an example, but that he couldn't see anyway to avoid it. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that you could put "Example in ISBD format". The Editor said that in most cases he had limited examples to the element that was covered by the rule. Margaret Stewart noted that this issue would come up in the Examples Group report. The Chair said that discussion would be deferred. [Note: see 5JSC/M/48.19.3 and 5JSC/M/56/4.]

30.20   11.7.5. Formal notes
         11.7.6. Informal notes

30.20.1 The Editor noted that these rules had been carried over from 1.7A3. Barbara Tillett asked if they were concerned with presentation and display. The Editor said that there were instructions later in the rules that referred to introductory words and phrases. Jennifer Bowen asked if the term "formal note" was used later in the text. Margaret Stewart noted that the display constants were driven by MARC. The Editor confirmed that the two rules could be deleted.
         Action=Editor

30.21   11.7.7. Notes citing other editions
         11.7.8. Notes citing other works and other expressions or manifestations of the same work

30.21.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that these two rules could be combined. The Editor said that there could be two bullets under the same caption, but that this would run counter to the desire for separate captions for each instruction. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wasn't sure, as one instruction specified a citation form and one did not. Judy Kuhagen said that there was a disconnect between the instruction in the 2002 revision of chapter 12 to give the full citation, and the instruction in 1.7A4 to just provide enough information to identify the edition. Judy Kuhagen suggested that the JSC might want to change the instruction to be to always give a citation. The Editor said that you could delete 11.7.7, and remove the parenthetical statement "(other than different editions with the same title)" from 11.7.8. JSC agreed. Barbara Tillett asked if "the citation" could be used instead of "the title or name-title" in the first alternative. The Editor said that he would use: "the citation for that resource". Barbara Tillett queried the instruction to "When necessary, add the edition statement and/or date of publication of the manifestation cited." She said that the cataloguer would not always know when it was necessary. She suggested that the issue was when it was necessary to distinguish from other citations. The Editor said that if you

used alternative b) it was not a citation. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the rule could say "For differentiation …"
Action=Editor

30.22   11.7.9. Applicability of the information recorded in a note

30.22.1 Line 587: expand A1.7A3 to cover integrating resources (ALA 13: p. 83)

The Editor said that there was agreement with the ALA suggestion, so he had included "iteration(s)". Barbara Tillett said that with the way it was worded you could think that the rule applied only to remote access resources. Hugh Taylor suggested that "such as numbering, publication dates, or date(s) on which a remote access resource was viewed" be removed. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

30.23   11.7.10. Combining notes

Barbara Tillett asked if this rule was to do with display. The Editor said that it was not because the input would be combined. Barbara Tillett asked how cataloguers would know when it was appropriate to do this.

30.23.1 Line 592: reword "Combining notes" at A1.7A3 (LC Editorial table)

The Editor noted that LC had suggested removing "when appropriate" and adding, "when it would improve clarity". He added that CCC had requested discussion. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC agreed, but that she wanted to question whether you did want to combine notes, as in the past this had been done for reasons of economy. The Editor said that sometimes things were so closely related it made sense to combine them. Hugh Taylor said that he thought that the LC comment had the user in mind by focussing on clarity. Margaret Stewart said that it seemed to be OK to make the change. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

30.24   12.1. Sources of information

30.24.1 The Editor said that 12.1 would be deferred until the discussion of 5JSC/LC/1 and 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1.

30.25   12.2. Title
         12.2.0. Basic instructions on recording titles
         12.2.0.3. Transcription

30.25.1 Line 149: replace references to A1.0F in A1.1B1, A1.1D1, A1.1E1, etc. with references to appendices A-C. (LC 2A: p. 16)

The Editor said that he had made this change.

30.25.2 Line 164: can delete A1.1B2 if add punctuation instruction for alternative title to A1.1A2 (i.e. new App.) and capitalization instruction to that App. (LC Editorial table at A1.1A2 (modified))

The Editor said that he had made this change.

30.26   12.2.0.4. Names of persons and corporate bodies

30.26.1 Line 158: reword instruction in A1.1A1 (ALA 16: p. 115)

The Editor said that this line number would be discussed with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

30.26.2 Line 166: reword A1.1B4 (CILIP 2A: p. 5)

The Editor noted that this had been done. The Editor confirmed that cases such as this, where everyone in 5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev agreed, and he had made the change, did not need to be discussed.

30.27   12.2.0.5. Introductory words, etc.

30.27.1 Line 167: add "in case of doubt" clause in A1.1B6 [was A1.1B5] (ALA 17, p. 123)

Jennifer Bowen said that this suggestion was aimed at eliminating cataloguers dithering. The Editor said that what he had added to the definition of the title proper would help: "(i.e., the title normally used when citing the resource)". JSC decided not to make the change.

30.27.2 Line 168: incorporate first part of A1.1B6 into A1.1B4 (CILIP 2A p.5)

The Editor said that A1.1B4 covered statements of responsibility that were an integral part of the title proper. He added that he did not think that it would be helpful to combine this with instructions for introductory words. JSC agreed.

30.27.3 Line 169: provide guidance in A1.1B6 on determining what is "intended" to be part of the title (CILIP 2A p.5)

The Editor confirmed that this would not be done.

30.28   12.2.0.6. Abridgement

30.28.1 Line 170: is guidance needed in A1.1B6 on what is considered a "long" title proper (CILIP 2A p.5)

The Editor said that he did not know how you would do this. He said that there was a conflict between cataloguer's judgement and providing guidance. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought this was too case-by-case for guidance. JSC decided not to make the change.

30.28.2 Line 171: potential conflict between A1.1B6 and A1.1B2 as a result of generalizing instructions on abridgement from AACR2 rule on early printed books (ALA 2A: p. 15)

The Editor noted that the second of these rules had been removed.

30.28.3 Line 172: add in A2.1B6 "title" to list of elements that can be omitted [in very specific circumstances] (CILIP 5: p. 11)

The Editor noted that there was no longer a list in the rule, so the comment was moot.

30.29 12.2.0.7. Titles of parts, sections, and supplements

30.29.1 Line 175: potential confusion between application of A1.1B8 and A1.3A1 (ALA 2A: p. 15)

Barbara Tillett noted that all responses in the table had agreed with the suggestion. The Editor said that he did not think that this rule was the place to solve the confusion. Jennifer Bowen said that looking at the original comment she thought that the issue might have gone away with the reorganization. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked how this rule fitted with "transcribe what you see". Barbara Tillett said that it overrode it.

30.29.2 Line 176: reword instruction in A1.1B8 (ALA 16: p. 115)

The Editor said that this had been done.

30.29.3 Line 177: repeat at A1.1B8 instruction and example from A1.6H3 (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that this had been done.

30.29.4 Line 178: change "unnumbered series" in second line of A2.1B8 to "unnumbered monographic series" (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that this had been done.

30.29.5 Barbara Tillett asked Judy Kuhagen to explain a comment she had on 12.2.0.7. Judy Kuhagen said that at the beginning of the rule when it referred to "the title of the main resource" she wasn't sure if people would be clear what "main resource" meant. The Editor said that in the instructions for "in" analytics he had used "larger resource" and he would use that term in this rule also. John Attig asked why this was a general rule instead of being included with the rules for title proper. The Editor said that he had moved the instructions up because they also applied to variant titles and series titles.
Action=Editor

30.30 12.2.1. Title proper

30.30.1 The Editor noted that some rules at the start of 12.2.1 had references to 5JSC/LC/1/Rev and would be discussed later.

30.31 12.2.1.7. Basic instructions on recording the title proper
a) Resources issued in successive parts

30.31.1 Line 161: limit application of A2.1B1 to serials only (CILIP 2A: p. 7)

Judy Kuhagen noted that there was a conflict with the second bullet point at 12.2.8.4, which referred to "a resource issued in successive parts or an integrating resource". The Editor noted that 12.2.8.4 dealt with title variations, inaccuracies, and deletions, while 12.2.1.7 only dealt with inaccuracies. Judy Kuhagen said that the second bullet of 12.2.8.4 dealt with typographic errors. The Editor said that he would remove "or an integrating resource" from 12.2.8.4. Judy Kuhagen said that if the provisions were to be limited to serials it should say this in both places. Jennifer Bowen said that ACOC had disagreed with limiting it to serials. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she did not have a strong counter argument to make. The Editor said that he did not see why it should be limited to serials, and asked if there was a real problem applying it to all successively issued resources. The Editor confirmed that no change would be made to 12.2.1.7. Judy Kuhagen asked whether the last paragraph in 12.2.0.3 ("Correct inaccuracies as instructed in 11.6.9"), needed to have the exception for resources issued in successive parts specified. The Editor said that he would include the exception in 12.2.0.3.
Action=Editor

30.32   12.2.1.8. Other elements recorded as part of the title proper
a) Type of composition, medium of performance, key, etc.

Barbara Tillett noted that here was a conflict between the second paragraph, which said "In all other cases", and the third paragraph which began with "In case of doubt". Jennifer Bowen suggested that "all" be removed from "all other cases".
Action=Editor

30.33   12.2.1.8. Other elements recorded as part of the title proper
b) Scale

30.33.1   Line 158: reword instruction in A1.1A1 (ALA 16: p. 115)

The Editor said that this line number would be discussed with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

30.34   12.2.1.12. Recording changes in the title proper

30.34.1   Line 191: reword A2.1B12a (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that he had made this change.

30.35   12.2.2.3. Basic instructions on recording parallel titles

30.35.1   Line 194: revise wording of B2.1D1 (LC 2B: p. 21)

Barbara Tillett noted that all responses in the table had agreed. The Editor noted that LC wanted to strike "chief source of information" from the rule. He said that he had not made the change because there was another comment that said that parallel titles should not be limited to those on the same source as the title proper. John Attig said that this was more of a question from ALA. Barbara Tillett said that she was happy with the Editor's rewording to use "source(s) of information".

30.35.2   Line 197: add "if considered to be important" to A1.1D5 (ALA 17, p. 123)

Barbara Tillett said that this was linked to levels of description and was not required.

30.36   12.2.3. Other title information
12.2.3.1. Definition

30.36.1 Line 958: Other title information: use "manifestation" rather than "resource" (ALA 14: p. 105)

Barbara Tillett noted that all responses in the table had agreed. The Editor said that he thought that "resource" was the proper term to use because you could not always assume that a resource was a manifestation. He added that he could change it, but it seemed to be an unnecessary limitation. He said that all other definitions referred to the "resource". Jennifer Bowen said that it would be better not to make an exception. The Chair confirmed that it would be left as "resource". The Editor noted that it had been decided to only retain specific FRBR terms when comparing one entity with another, and that otherwise "resource" would be used.

30.37   12.2.3.3. Basic instructions on recording other title information

30.37.1 Line 201: A2.1E1 and A3.1E1 duplicate rules in A1.1 (ACOC 2A; p. 5)

The Editor said that this had been done.

30.37.2 Line 203: restrict application of A2.1E1 to serials (BL 5: p. 13)

The Chair noted that everyone had agreed except ALA. The Editor said that he had made what was previously the exception, the rule, i.e. to record other title information when considered to be important.

30.37.3 Line 204: divide A2.1E1 into sections for serials and multipart monographs (LC Editorial table)

Judy Kuhagen noted that line 204 was similar to 203. The Editor confirmed that everyone was comfortable with what he had done.

30.37.4 Line 205: make provisions in A2.1E1 for recording other title information optional except for category a) (ALA 5: p. 31)

The Editor noted that this was similar to line 203.

30.37.5 Line 206: question rationale for A3.1E1 c); apply A1.7B1 instead (ALA 6: p. 37)

Jennifer Bowen said that what was being suggested was that a note be made instead. John Attig said that a note was a better way of adding this information, but on the other hand, this instruction had been in the rules for a long time. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think that any change was needed at 12.2.3.3, but that you could make a change at 12.2.3.4. John Attig said that he thought a change at 12.2.3.4 would be contentious, and that what was at 12.2.3.3 was adequate. Barbara Tillett suggested that the caption for

12.2.3.4 be changed from "Additions to other title information" to "Supplying other title information". JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

30.37.6 Line 158: reword instruction in A1.1A1 (ALA 16: p. 115)

The Editor said that this line number would be discussed with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

30.37.7 Line 202: expand A1.1E to provide for the treatment of other title information relating to currency (ACOC 2A; p. 5)

The Chair noted that 12.2.3.3 covered currency.

30.37.8 Line 207: reword third paragraph of A3.1E1 (ALA 6: pp. 37-38)

Barbara Tillett noted that the rule said to record information on currency as a note on frequency. Jennifer Bowen said that the ALA comment was taken care of.

Executive Session 2

31   Communication with other resource description communities

31.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

32   Strategic plan for AACR

32.1   Received and considered the following documents:
4JSC/Chair/79
4JSC/Chair/79/ACOC response
4JSC/Chair/79/BL response
4JSC/Chair/79/CCC response
4JSC/Chair/79/Rev
4JSC/Chair/79/Rev/2
4JSC/Chair/79/Rev/3

32.2   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

Note: included in this Executive Session was a meeting with representatives from the UK book industry, the notes of which have been issued separately.

End of Executive Session 2

33   Draft of RDA chapters 11-16 (continued)

33.1   12.2.3.4. Additions to other title information
b) Moving images

33.1.1   Line 208: add instructions for trailers to B7.1E6 (ALA 17, p. 135)

Jennifer Bowen said that the ALA had requested clarification and more explicit wording. She added that the rule instructing you to add "[trailer]" was already there in AACR2 (7.1E2), but the ALA moving image people were looking for more explanation. The Editor noted that they also wanted to get rid of the word "film". Jennifer Bowen said that ACOC had noted in the response table that such a title was in effect a controlled access point. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that "controlled access point" was not quite the right word. Jennifer Bowen said that it was a constructed title. The Editor noted that this was other title information so it was not actually part of the title proper. Barbara Tillett said that the ALA suggestion that the rule be limited to "commercially released" moving images was too restrictive. Hugh Taylor agreed. Barbara Tillett said that she had no problem with "larger moving image". Jennifer Bowen asked if it should be "larger moving image work". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the term should match what was used elsewhere in the rules. The Editor said that the GMD/SMD Working Group should come up with a term for this type of content, but for now, he would use "moving image".
Action=Editor; GMD/SMD Working Group

33.2   12.2.4.3. Basic instructions on recording variant titles

33.2.1   Line 631: reword A1.7B5 and caption (ALA 13: p. 88)

Jennifer Bowen read from the ALA response: "The heading for A1.7B5 is "Variations in title" and then it describes "titles by which the resource is commonly known," which are not variations in title, but just other titles, generally in a shortened form, by which users have come to call a resource. It would be better if this were actually divided into two sentences as in AACR2 12.7B41. The caption could then be changed to "Other forms of the title proper and other titles". Each case could be covered by separate sentences. ALA notes that if our suggestion for this rule (above, under Generalization of rules on notes) is accepted, the caption of this rule should probably also include "and changes to such titles" as well." Barbara Tillett said that she thought that the changes had been taken care of by the reworking of the rule. The Editor said that under the new structure what had been a note on variations in title was now covered by a rule on variant titles.

33.3   12.2.5.4. Earlier and later variations in the title proper
            a) Resources issued in successive parts

33.3.1   Line 632: combine both parts of A2.7B5.1 (ACOC 2A: p. 6)

Barbara Tillett noted that the section was on "resources issued in successive parts", and asked if serials were included. The Editor replied that "resources issued in successive parts" was the broader category that included both serials and multipart monographs issued successively. Barbara Tillett said that multipart monographs were covered in rule 12.2.1.12, so she thought that this rule would just be to do with serials. The Editor said that 12.2.1.1.2 a) had a reference to 12.2.5.4, and that one rule told you what to do with it, and the other told you how to record it. He said that the references went both ways. Barbara Tillett said that on one page it told you to record the later title as a variation, and on the other page it said to do it if considered to be important. She said that the two rules should be consistent. The Chair asked if "considered to be important" would be added to 12.2.1.12. The Editor agreed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the original ACOC request to

combine both parts of the rule was no longer required as the rule took account of major and minor changes. Barbara Tillett commented that 12.2.5.4 only referred to minor changes. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that for major changes you would create a new description. Barbara Tillett replied that this was not the case for multipart monographs. Judy Kuhagen suggested that 12.2.5.4 a) be broken into two parts for multipart monographs and serials, as in 12.2.1.12. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

33.4   12.2.5.5. Earlier and later parallel titles
         a) Resources issued in successive parts

33.4.1   Line 636: reword rule A2.7B6.1 (ALA 5: p. 33)

The Secretary noted that all responses in the table had agreed, except for LC who had requested discussion on parallel titles with the RDA restructure of ISBD elements. The Editor said that parallel titles were now being treated as such regardless of whether or not they were on the same source as the title proper. He added that this would complicate things in terms of ISBD display, as ISBD had limits as to what went into the title and statement of responsibility area. Margaret Stewart asked if square brackets would be used. The Editor replied that they would not be as long as information came from the resource itself. Margaret Stewart said that this was a problem in terms of identification of the resource, particularly in Canada. The Editor suggested that from the MARC point of view the solution could be to have a code to indicate whether the parallel title came from the same source as the title proper or not. Barbara Tillett suggested that a running list be kept of MARC changes, and suggested that the Secretary maintain this.
Action=Secretary (MARC changes)

Jennifer Bowen read out the ALA comment on p. 33: "The wording of the rule ("changes in parallel title") might be read to imply that a parallel title must be on the first/earliest issue or part in order for the rule to apply, whereas the rule referenced (A2.1D6) talks about parallel titles "added, deleted, or changed." ALA recommends that the first sentence be changed to: "Make notes on parallel titles that are added, deleted, or changed after the first/earliest issue or part if considered to be important (see A2.1D6)"." The Editor said that this was effectively what the rule said. Hugh Taylor asked if the new rule covered the deletion aspect adequately. Judy Kuhagen noted that deletions of parallel titles were covered by the last bullet point in 12.2.8.4. The Editor said that this was because you made a note for deletion of parallel titles. He confirmed that no further changes were required.

33.5   12.2.6.3. Basic instructions on recording key titles

33.5.1   Line 811: at A1.8C1 consider giving the key-title even if no ISSN (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett said that she could not figure out why you would not record the key-title. The Editor said that the restriction was probably because of the ISBD display, where you had to put an equals sign in front of it, which would look strange without an ISSN. Margaret Stewart asked if the situation would ever occur that you would have a key title

without an ISSN. Barbara Tillett said that she doubted it. The Editor said that he would delete the exception to not record a key-title if no ISSN was recorded.
Action=Editor

33.6   12.2.7.3. Basic instructions on recording devised titles

The Editor noted that the line numbers associated with this rule would be covered during the discussion on 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

33.7   12.2.8.3. Source of the title proper

33.7.1   Line 626: reword A1.7B4 (ALA 13: p. 83)

Barbara Tillett said that this was covered by 5JSC/LC/1/Rev

33.7.2   Line 627: add rule at A2.7B4 on source of title proper (ALA 5: p. 33)

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA wanted to reinstate rule 12.7B3 (Source of title proper). She said that the following sentence had been suggested for the rule: "If the description is not based on the first issue or part, include the note on source of title proper with the note on issue or part described." Barbara Tillett said that in rule 12.2.8.3 she did not like the references to "title page, title frame or title card". The Editor suggested that the rule be discussed with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev and 5JSC/Editor/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1.

33.8   12.3.0. Basic instructions on recording statements of responsibility
12.3.0.1. Definition

33.8.1   Line 1007: Statement of responsibility: use "manifestation" instead of "resource" (ALA 14: p. 108)

Jennifer Bowen noted that it had been decided the previous day to use "resource". [Note: see 5JSC/M/30.36.1.]

33.8.2   Line 1008: Statement of responsibility: extend to cover situation provided for by A1.1F14 (CILIP 14: p. 18)

Barbara Tillett said that she thought that the rule covered the exception that CILIP wanted to make. The Editor said that at A1.1F14 there was the instruction to transcribe a statement of responsibility even when no person or body was named. He said that the way the definition was written you did not really need a person or body because it was a "statement relating to the identification and/or function of any persons …"

33.9   12.3.0.3. Persons, families, and corporate bodies playing a major role

33.9.1   Line 213: add option to A1.1F1 allowing recording of "creator" information in a note instead of in statement of responsibility (LC 2A: p. 16)
Line 215: add rule B4.1F1, reinstate from AACR2 (ALA 17, p. 134)

The Secretary noted that LC had made an additional comment at line 213: "or as access point with relator term". Jennifer Bowen said that for graphic materials extra wording was needed to encourage the cataloguer to include more statements of responsibility than might immediately come to mind. She added that the following text had been suggested for the rule: "Record statements of responsibility relating to persons or bodies credited with a major role in creating or participating in the creation or production of a graphic item (e.g. directors, producers, artists, designers, developers, sponsors)." The Editor said that he had made a significant change to record the statement of responsibility as a statement of responsibility (i.e. as a formal element) for persons etc. playing a major role in the creation or realization of the intellectual or artistic content of the resource. Barbara Tillett suggested that there could be an option to do it as an access point instead of a statement. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought that the comment at line 215 was taken care of.

The Editor asked how Barbara Tillett's suggestion related to the levels. Barbara Tillett said that what she wanted was to no longer have to justify an access point in the body of the description. The Editor noted that the minimum level in AACR had said this. He asked if everyone agreed with what was being proposed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there needed to be discussion. The Editor asked if this was the only element that it was proposed be handled this way. Barbara Tillett said that the issue was removing redundancy in the record. Jennifer Bowen asked if relator information would need to be included to indicate the role. Barbara Tillett replied that there could be either a relator or system coding. Jennifer Bowen asked if this would be done just for the primary access point or for all access points. Barbara Tillett said it could be done for any access point. John Attig asked what form this would take, and whether there would be a reference to applying parts II and III. The Editor said that there would be a reference, and asked Barbara Tillett if she had meant an uncontrolled access point. Barbara Tillett said that they would be controlled access points.

Judy Kuhagen noted that the caption for the rule referred to persons etc playing a "major role" but the second paragraph dealt with other roles. The Editor said he would change the caption to "Recording statements of responsibility".
Action=Editor

Barbara Tillett asked if there would be an option not to record the statement of responsibility and have an access point. The Editor said that this was still on the table. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she would like to look at the implications. Barbara Tillett said that this was something that the managers at LC had said they wanted to see so that there was no redundancy in keying of information. Jennifer Bowen asked if there would be issues to do with duplicate detection. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she did not know what people would do if they came across two records for the same thing that had handled this differently. She said that it would make it harder to identify them as the same thing. Hugh Taylor said that this would be a problem with a number of options, and that one issue with introducing options was that you would end up with less consistency. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that most options dealt with the addition of information. The Editor said that there was an overlap with the levels of descriptions, and that if a level said that you had to have a statement of responsibility, how would that work with the option. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that you could have either a statement of responsibility and/or an access point.

She added that she felt differently about this than not having notes to justify added entries. Hugh Taylor said that he was conscious that the argument that Barbara Tillett was putting forward now was different from the original argument in the LC response, which was to do with visual materials and compatibility with other cataloguing codes. The Chair said that there did not seem to be a sense of agreement and suggested that the issue be considered further with the discussion on levels. JSC agreed. [Note: see 5JSC/M/39.8.6 and 5JSC/M/41.9.]

33.10   12.3.0.4. Transcription

33.10.1 Line 212: incorporate instructions on bracketed statements of responsibility into first paragraph of A1.1F1 (BL 2A: p. 6)

The Editor noted that there would be one general instruction on square brackets.

33.10.2 Line 214: revise first sentence of A1.1F1 (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that the LC suggestion was covered by what he had done in the rule.

33.11   12.3.0.5. Statement naming two or more persons, etc.

33.11.1 Line 220: arbitrary 'rule of three' reflected in A1.1F5 (ACOC 2A: p. 5; ALA 1A: p. 4; CCC 2A: p. 2)

Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the "rule of three" was now an option in the rule.

33.11.2 Line 221: delete instruction in A1.1F5 to add "et. al." following mark of omission in statements of responsibility (LC 2A: p. 16)

Barbara Tillett said that LC preferred "and others" to the Latin term. The Editor said that there would need to be a reference to equivalents in other languages or scripts. [Note: see 5JSC/M/38.1.]
Action=Editor

33.11.3 Line 218: revise wording of B6.1F1 (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett said that LC had suggested that the rule be revised to: "... name of the group, etc., do not record the names of the members in this area. If they are considered to be important, record them in the note area." The Editor said that he had partly implemented the LC suggestion, and that he had not used "area".

33.12   12.3.0.9. Noun phrases occurring in conjunction with a statement of responsibility

33.12.1 Line 222: rules A1.1F12 and A1.1F13 too complex for use by metadata providers (ALA 17: p. 124)

Jennifer Bowen said that if there were an option to omit the statement of responsibility it would remove this concern. The Editor said that if people did want to do it, he had broken the instructions into separate paragraphs. Barbara Tillett asked if there was a reason for

making the fine distinction between the first and second bullets as to whether a noun or noun phrase went into the statement of responsibility or other title information. Hugh Taylor said that he thought that the origin of the rule would have been to do with whether things were grammatically linked. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that the distinction was between the role and the nature of the work. Margaret Stewart said that she thought it depended on the presentation of the title page. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she did not think that the distinction needed to be made. The Editor noted that if the instruction were removed cataloguers would have to decide. Barbara Tillett said that the default would be to include it in the statement of responsibility. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she agreed that there needed to be guidance, but that she did not think it mattered where the information went. She added that her preference would be to include it in the statement of responsibility. The Editor said that all the rule was saying was to treat this information as other title information if that was what it was and, as a statement of responsibility if that was what it was. The Chair confirmed that the rule would stay as it was in the draft.

33.13   12.3.0.10. Statement of responsibility transcribed as part of the title proper or other title information

33.13.1 Line 158: reword instruction in A1.1A1 (ALA 16: p. 115)

The Chair noted that it had been agreed to discuss this line number with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

33.13.2 Line 222: rules A1.1F12 and A1.1F13 too complex for use by metadata providers (ALA 17: p. 124)

The Secretary noted that this line number had just been discussed.

33.13.3 Line 223: reword A1.1F13 (ALA 16: p. 115)

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA wanted to break up the long sentence in the rule. Hugh Taylor noted that the ALA comment had been taken care of. The Editor said that a stylistic change that he had made was that if an instruction ran beyond three lines he tried to break it up.

33.14   12.3.0.11. No person, family, or body named in the statement of responsibility

33.14.1 Line 224: revise A1.1F14

The Secretary noted that this line number had a reference in the table to 5JSC/LC/3. Barbara Tillett said that the reference should be to 5JSC/LC/4.

33.15   12.3.2. Change in statement of responsibility
        b) Serials

33.15.1 Line 225: reword A2.1F16 (ALA 5: p. 31)

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had suggested changing the first sentence of the rule to: "If a responsible person or body is added or deleted on a subsequent issue or part and this

change does not require a new description (see XX.XX), record the name of the later person or body in a note or make a note of the deletion (see A2.7B8)." Barbara Tillett noted that this had been done, but that in the response table CCC disagreed. Margaret Stewart said that she thought the change would be fine.

33.16   12.3.2. Change in statement of responsibility
          c) Integrating resources

          Judy Kuhagen said that there appeared to be an error in the first sentence where it said, "record the added or changed statement of responsibility area". She suggested that the rule should say, "revise" instead of "record". The Editor agreed. John Attig noted that the remainder of the sentence would need to be adjusted.
          Action=Editor

33.17   12.3.3.4. Performers of music

33.17.1   Line 218: revise wording of B6.1F1 (LC Editorial table)

          The Secretary noted that line 218 had already been discussed.

33.18   12.3.3.7. Other persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the resource

33.18.1   Line 642: revise second sentence in first paragraph of A1.7B8 (LC Editorial table)

          Barbara Tillett said that the suggested change was to revise the second sentence to "Make notes on statements of responsibility not recorded in the title and statement of responsibility area if considered to be important." The Editor said that he had added, "if considered to be important" to the rule, but there was no longer a second sentence.

33.19   12.3.3.8. Variant forms of names

33.19.1   Line 641: in A1.7B8 delete first and third sentences of first paragraph; and second paragraph and examples as they belong in part III (LC Editorial table)

          John Attig said that sometimes it was important to make notes in the bibliographic description on the forms of names if different from those recorded in the statement of responsibility. The Editor said that this had been retained but it said, "if considered to be important for identification". He said that this was actually inconsistent with the second bullet, which had "considered to be necessary for identification", and that he would make the first bullet match the second.
          Action=Editor

33.20   12.3.3.9. Change in statement of responsibility
          a) Resources issued in successive parts

33.20.1   Line 644: reword rule A2.7B8.2 (ALA 5: p. 34)

          Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had recommended that the first sentence be changed to: "Make notes on changes in statements of responsibility recorded in the statement of

responsibility area that occur after the first/earliest issue or part if considered to be important (see A2.1F16)." The Editor said that he had effectively made the change, but that he had not been able to use "area".

33.21   12.4.0. Basic instructions on recording edition information
          12.4.0.3. Transcription

33.21.1   Line 239: add option for early printed resources at A1.2B1 (ALA 8: pp. 48-49)

The Secretary noted that in the response table LC had indicated that it still preferred that the general rule be to transcribe what you see and make limited exceptions from there. She added that ACOC had requested discussion on whether to add this as only an option. Jennifer Bowen read out the text suggested by ALA: "Optionally, for early printed resources, transcribe an edition statement as it appears on the source of information, without abbreviating." The Editor said that he had not incorporated the option, and the rule directed cataloguers to Appendix D. Barbara Tillett asked what had been agreed about capitalization and abbreviation. The Editor said that a decision had only been made for the rule on notes. Barbara Tillett asked about the option to take data as it was found. The Editor replied that the options in chapter 11 could be applied to the rule. Barbara Tillett noted that the text of the rule referred to Appendix A, and commented that the options were not mentioned. Jennifer Bowen asked if the rule overrode the ability to use your own standard. The Editor said that that it did not. Jennifer Bowen suggested that if you wanted people to be able to use the options the rule would need to be reworded. The Editor said that the general "opt-out" was worded in chapter 11. He added that one issue for discussion in the rule was the instruction to capitalise the first word. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked what Appendix A said about this. The Editor said that he had brought the rule up from Appendix A, and the capitalization was because it was the beginning of an area. Barbara Tillett noted that this was ISBD driven. The Editor said that he would remove the first line of the second bullet, and remove "other" from the following sentence.

John Attig asked if abbreviations would be covered by the local option. He said that ALA would still prefer that there be something about not abbreviating edition statements for early printed resources. The Editor suggested that this could be written into Appendix D. Barbara Tillett asked why there was the instruction to substitute Arabic numerals for numbers expressed as words. John Attig said that he thought it was because it was visually clearer. Barbara Tillett replied that the user still knew what you were talking about. The Editor noted that the text had originally come from the Appendix, and in order to make it optional it would have to be put back in an appendix. Barbara Tillett noted that the first line said to transcribe edition information as it appeared "except as instructed below", which trumped the options. The Editor said that if all exceptions were references to appendices then this would undo the trumping. Barbara Tillett said that she thought this was too convoluted. The Editor said that in that case, you would remove "except as instructed below" and then you might as well forget about the appendices. He said that all he had done was what he had signalled at the April meeting. Barbara Tillett said that throughout the LC response, it suggested to "take what you see" and she was picking up on this. John Attig said that the suggestion to "take what you see" was sort of the transcription principle for rare books, and that if you went in that direction there would not need to be exceptions for these materials. He added that if on the other hand you left it

to local policy there was nothing that told you what to do for rare books. He said that he did not sense consensus on the issue.

The Chair commented that a decision had to be made sometime. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it would be helpful if the constituencies saw the general suggestion, the justification for it and which rules it would affect. The Editor asked if what was meant was a proposal. Margaret Stewart noted that it was a major shift. Barbara Tillett said that LC could prepare a proposal listing the rules that would be impacted by "take what you see". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she would like to see the rationale. Barbara Tillett said that it was to be able to take future metadata directly from others. Margaret Stewart said that she liked the middle ground that the Editor had proposed. The Chair asked if a proposal from LC would help. Margaret Stewart said that she did not want to lose the options for transcription that were there. Barbara Tillett said that the rules were there to make things look consistent, which was important with a book or card catalogue, but was not important now. Jennifer Bowen said that it looked as though they wanted the option not to change what was on the resource, but also the option to change it. She added that it needed to be easy for cataloguers to figure out what to do. Barbara Tillett suggested that the first bullet in 12.4.0.3 could say "Transcribe edition information as it appears on the source of information, optionally apply the instructions below." John Attig said that he thought this was reversing the options in chapter 11. The Editor said that 11.6 said, "When the instructions in chapters 12-16 specify transcription of an element as it appears on the source of information, follow the general guidelines … below." He said that it had always been the case that even though it said, "transcribe" certain transformations were done. He suggested that the solution for 12.4.0.3 could be to make a see reference to 11.6, and at 11.6 there was either the option to follow the RDA rules, or use your own. Barbara Tillett asked where the instructions in the rule would go. The Editor said that they would go into the appendix. The Editor said that this meant that there would only be the one bullet point in the rule. He said that the examples would follow what was in the Appendix.
Action=Editor

33.22   12.4.0.4. Facsimiles and reproductions

33.22.1   The Editor noted that this rule would be covered with 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

33.23   12.4.1.3. Recording edition statements

33.23.1   Line 240: question rationale for instructions in A1.2B2 re symbols in edition statements (CILIP 2A: p. 5)
Line 243: rewrite A1.2B2 to provide instructions on application of A1.0F6 to edition statements (CILIP 2A: p. 5)

The Secretary noted that some responses in the table had suggested that these referred to the same comment. Hugh Taylor read out the comment: "A1.2B2. It is unclear why this rule should be applied in the case of symbols etc. which can be reproduced by the cataloguer as it goes against the principle of transcription set out in A1.2B1. This rule should be rewritten to give specific guidance on the application of A1.0F6 to edition statements." He added that what was suggested was actually a revision to AACR2 instead of a comment on the draft. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that all responses in the table had

agreed accept for ALA, who requested discussion. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought it would be good to talk about it. The Editor suggested that the second bullet could be removed, and a new example with three asterisks added to the first bullet. JSC agreed.

33.24   12.4.1.4. Terms indicating edition

Barbara Tillett said that there was a contradiction between 12.4.1.4 a) and the footnote. She suggested that a) begin with "generally". The Editor noted that this was related to one of the comments on the rule.

33.24.1   Line 241: question value of footnote to rule A1.2B3; need clearer guidance on what is or is not an edition statement (CILIP 2A: p. 5)

Hugh Taylor asked if was valid to include the footnote. Barbara Tillett said that the guidance on printing information was very important for those who were new to cataloguing. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the footnote applied to a) only, especially the second sentence: "A statement detailing the number of copies printed is not an edition statement". Hugh Taylor suggested that the information in the footnote belonged at 12.4.1.1, which defined an edition statement. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed. The Editor said that he would add it as a second bullet 12.4.1.1. He asked Barbara Tillett if this removed the need for "generally". She agreed that it did.
Action=Editor

33.24.2   Line 245: condense A2.2B1, A2.2B3 (LC Editorial table)

The Editor noted that the existing text in the rule had been written by the Consistency Task Force. He added that the LC Editorial Table did not offer a condensation. Barbara Tillett suggested that "a statement indicating" could be removed from the start of each line. The Editor agreed, and suggested that a) be incorporated into the sentence above. Hugh Taylor asked if the parenthetical examples would be retained, as they seemed to be covered by the "real" examples in the rule. JSC agreed to delete the parenthetical examples.
Action=Editor

33.25   12.4.1.5. Terms indicating regular revision or numbering

33.25.1   Line 246: specify that second sentence of A2.2B3 applies only to serials (ALA 5: p. 31)

The Editor said that he had done this, but some responses in the table disagreed. Jennifer Bowen said that perhaps people had disagreed that the sentence was ambiguous. The Editor said that he had done what was agreed at the Chicago meeting.

33.26   12.4.1.7. Supplied edition statement

33.26.1   Line 236: remove instructions re optional use of edition area from A1.2A1; record information about known changes from other editions in a note (LC 2A: p. 17)

Barbara Tillett read from the LC response: "A1.2A1, first paragraph – About the clause "but is known to contain significant changes from other editions": This was much

discussed in the revision of DCRM(B). They decided to put such information in a note (with a citation for a supporting reference source) versus in the edition statement. … The thought being the information may or may not be correct." The Editor noted that there was also an option for digital resources, which was even more specific about the types of things you might supply edition statements for. He asked if the LC comment meant for this to go as well. John Attig said that it seemed to him that the option on digital resources was not limited to supplied edition statements, as it also covered whether to consider statements found on the resource as edition statements. He said that he did not know if the information belonged in this rule. The Editor said that this was not the way the rule was worded, because it began with "if a digital resource lacks an edition statement …". Barbara Tillett said that it might have been that a lot of guidance was required when digital resources were new, but that maybe this was no longer required. The Editor said that he could see why people wanted the extra guidance as the nature of these resources was that they did not provide explicit statements. Barbara Tillett asked why the information could not be given as a note. Judy Kuhagen asked if some of the information could be incorporated into the definition of edition statement. Hugh Taylor agreed that something could be added to 12.4.1.1. The Editor asked if he should move the last paragraph of 12.4.1.7 to 12.4.1.1. He added that he did not think that these were candidates to be treated as statements. Margaret Stewart said that it would look strange to include it in the definition.

The Editor confirmed that he would move 12.4.1.7 to notes on edition information. He asked if just the first bullet would be moved, or everything in the rule including the section on digital resources. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the paragraph concerned with "such minor changes" was not to do with edition statements. The Editor said that in effect you would be making notes on both major and minor changes. The Editor said that he would reword the rule and move it to 12.4.5. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC had long not liked the practice of putting in an edition statement when there was not a statement, just to make it clear that this is something you want to describe in a new record. She said that she was not sure whether she wanted it to be a note on edition at all. The Editor suggested that it could be a note on content, because the rule dealt with significant changes in language and content. He said that he would try to fit it into chapter 14. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

33.27   12.5.1.3. Recording numeric and/or alphabetic designations

33.27.1   Line 255: restore "if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part" at A1.3A1 (ALA 2A: p. 19; CCC 5: p. 7)
Line 257: eliminate redundancy with A1.3A3 in A1.3B1 (ALA 5: p. 30)

The Secretary noted that in the response table at Line 255, LC had referred to 5JSC/LC/1/Rev. JSC decided to discuss both line numbers later.

33.28   12.5.2.3. Recording chronological designations

33.28.1   Line 260: question punctuation separating year from number; add explicit instructions on punctuating levels of enumeration (CILIP 5: p. 10)

Judy Kuhagen commented that the fourth bullet of the rule just covered display. The Editor said that in the examples he had given the numeric and chronological designation as two separate elements, and the rule just said to record both. Judy Kuhagen said that she thought the rule repeated what came earlier. Barbara Tillett said that nothing was added by the rule. She added that that the next bullet, which dealt with hybrids, was important.

33.28.2   Line 261: consider deleting second paragraph of A1.3C4 (LC Editorial table)

Margaret Stewart said that CCC disagreed with deleting this instruction. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that it be retained as it provided a good order for the display. The Editor confirmed that he would delete the first paragraph of the fourth bullet at 12.5.2.3, and the second paragraph would then start with "if" instead of "however".
Action=Editor

33.29   12.5.2.4. Dates not of the Gregorian or Julian calendar

33.29.1   Line 259: add provision in A1.3C2 for preferring Gregorian/Julian date (ALA 5: p. 30)

The Secretary noted that in the response table, ACOC had no opinion; BL and CILIP disagreed; CCC agreed, and LC said, "disagree; should be option - consider Arabic world". Jennifer Bowen said that an option would be OK. The Editor said that he thought that LC wanted to make it an option to add the Gregorian/Julian date, while ALA wanted a separate option to prefer it. Barbara Tillett said that she had a relevant document to distribute from the LC Hebraica Team that covered chronograms. Judy Kuhagen said that this was related to the publication date. Jennifer Bowen suggested that the rule be made an option. [Note: see 5JSC/M/39.9.]
Action=Editor

33.30   12.5.4. Completed serials

33.30.1   Line 266: revise caption at A1.3F to give greater emphasis to multipart monographs (BL 5: p. 12)

The Editor said that there would be no further changes to the rule as numbering only applied to serials.

33.31   12.5.5. New sequence of numbering

33.31.1   Line 267: remove reference to A1.6G1 in second paragraph of A1.3G1 (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that the reference was still there, to 12.2.0.7. He said that the two rules referenced each other, as you would either treat "new series" as numbering or a section title. Hugh Taylor said that it was strange to ask people to "distinguish such wording". The Editor added that the reference to unnumbered monographic series in 12.2.0.7 had been added in response to line 178. Judy Kuhagen said that the problem was that sometimes publishers had "new series" without numbering, so that there was nowhere to put the information. The Editor suggested that the second sentence of the second bullet in 12.5.5 be deleted. JSC agreed.

Action=Editor

33.32   12.5.6. Alternative numbering systems

33.32.1 Line 262: revise A1.3E1 to give preference to volume and number system (ALA 5: p. 30)
Line 263: revise A1.3E1 to give preference to volume and number system only if order presented in the resource cannot be determined (CILIP 5: p. 10)
Line 264: revise A1.3E1 to record deepest scheme; record other schemes in a note (ALA 5: p. 30)

John Attig said that he thought these comments only applied if you were giving a single statement and now each numbering system was given separately. Barbara Tillett confirmed that the wording that was there would be retained.

33.33   12.5.8. Notes on frequency

33.33.1 Line 617: reword A3.7B2 (LC Editorial table)

Judy Kuhagen said that there was a problem in that numbering only applied to serials, but the rule referred to integrating resources. The Editor said that the rule dealt with notes on frequency. Judy Kuhagen asked if all of 12.5 dealt with numbering. The Editor said that 12.5.1.-12.5.6 were what had been in the AACR2 numbering area. Judy Kuhagen said that 12.5.9. (Notes on issue, iteration, or part described) was covered by 12.12. The Editor said that frequency might need to become an element of its own. Judy Kuhagen agreed and said that frequency also applied to multipart monographs and that monograph cataloguers might not read the rules if they were grouped with numbering. The Editor said that he would probably put the rules in 12.5.8 after 12.9. The Chair asked what would happen with 12.5.9. The Editor said that he agreed with Judy Kuhagen that 12.5.9 was covered by 12.12.
Action=Editor

Judy Kuhagen noted that there was a discrepancy in 12.5.7.3 as it referred to the numbering area. The Editor said that he would fix this.
Action=Editor

The Editor asked what the JSC thought of the LC suggestion in line 617 to refer to the "known" frequency. Margaret Stewart noted that CCC had disagreed. The Editor said that he had added "if known" to the end of the sentence. Judy Kuhagen noted that the current rule said to make a note on frequency unless it was already recorded in the title and statement of responsibility area, while 12.5.8 implied that you always made a note. Margaret Stewart asked if this meant that for an annual report, you would always have to give a frequency of "annual". The Editor said that he had removed the provision because of line 612 (from ALA): "remove linkage to title and statement of responsibility from A2.7B2", which everyone had agreed with. Judy Kuhagen said that the note would be useful if you did not understand the language of the title. Barbara Tillett confirmed that 12.5.8 was OK as written, but that it would become a separate element.

33.34   12.6. Place of publication, distribution, etc.

12.7. Publisher, distributor, etc.
12.8. Date of publication, distribution, etc.

The Editor noted that all of these elements would be covered during the discussion on 5JSC/LC/2.

33.35   12.9.0. Basic instructions on recording series information
12.9.0.4. Facsimiles and reproductions

The Editor noted that this rule would be covered during the discussion on 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

33.36   12.9.0.5. Change in series information

33.36.1   Line 579: delete second paragraph of A1.6K1 as covered by previous rule (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that as there was no longer a previous rule, the comment was moot.

33.37   12.9.2.3. Recording parallel titles of series

Barbara Tillett noted that numbering from the previous draft was still in the rule. The Editor said that he would fix this. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she also had a small number of small editorial changes such as this, and that she thought it would be better if these were emailed to the Editor after the meeting. Barbara Tillett agreed.
Action=Editor

33.38   12.9.5.3. Recording the ISSN of a series

33.38.1   Line 570: revise A1.6F1: add "of a monographic series" (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett noted that the LC response said: "Should say "of a monographic series" if only giving ISSN because "series" area can include multipart monograph." The Editor asked if the instruction needed to be limited to monographic series. Jennifer Bowen asked if there was ever a case where you would have an ISSN, but not want to record it. Judy Kuhagen said that the LC comment was about trying to clarify terminology. Margaret Stewart said that she preferred the wording in 12.9.5.3.

33.38.2   Line 571: revise A1.6F1: query re incorrect ISSN/standard number (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett said that the comment was about what to do if the ISSN was incorrect. Judy Kuhagen said that they received queries about this, and that the current rule said simply to transcribe the ISSN, so that was what they told people to do. The Editor said that in general LC supported "transcribing what you see" so the rule should be left as it was. Barbara Tillett suggested that "even if known to be incorrect" be added to the rule. The Editor confirmed that there was agreement in the response table, and said that he would add this to the end of the rule. The Chair asked about 12.10.1.3 (Incorrect standard numbers). The Editor said that 12.9.5.3 was to do with series. Barbara Tillett suggested that there could be a reference to 12.10.1.3. Hugh Taylor said that he preferred that the simple statement be added to 12.9.5.3. JSC agreed.

Action=Editor

Executive Session 3

34   Arrangements for reviewing and editing AACR (continued)

34.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

End of Executive Session 3

35   Levels of description, access, and authority control

35.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/ACOC rep/1
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/CILIP response
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/LC response
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/ACOC response
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/ALA response
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/CCC response
5JSC/ACOC rep/1/BL response

35.2   The Chair suggested that the discussion focus on levels for part I only. JSC agreed. The Chair noted that a response table had been prepared by the Secretary. Deirdre Kiorgaard explained that the paper had come about because a few of the responses to the draft of AACR3 part I had suggested that the levels of description in AACR2 should be revised and expanded in line with other standards, e.g. FRBR. She said that ACOC had been commissioned to do this work, and that the paper was framed in terms of levels of description, levels of access, and levels of authority control. She said that the first thing that should be discussed was the CILIP comment that levels were not required. Hugh Taylor said that CILIP realised that not everyone would agree with this point of view, and that there were suggestions in case levels were included. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that all other responses agreed that the concept should be addressed in some way in the rules. Hugh Taylor said that he did not think providing guidance would do harm to users.

35.3   Barbara Tillett said that even though LC had originally suggested going down the path of levels, the result did not seem to be that helpful. She said that LC thought it would be preferable to combine description and access to have a mandatory list of elements. The Chair said that the BL perspective was in agreement with LC. She said that while BL recognised what CILIP was saying, the LC approach would be better for advocacy to other communities. Barbara Tillett noted that the simplified rules in 5JSC/LC/2 were built on the assumption of a mandatory set of elements. Jennifer Bowen asked how this would work. Barbara Tillett said that you could always add more than what was mandatory. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that as a general comment, having levels would not answer questions people had when applying the rules, e.g. options. Barbara Tillett asked about mandatory elements. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this could be one way of addressing the issue. Margaret Stewart said that she thought that other communities would prefer the concept of mandatory elements. Barbara Tillett said that once the mandatory elements had

been agreed upon they could be highlighted in the Web version, and perhaps they could be a subset that people could use.

35.4   The Editor suggested that the JSC needed to reflect on the discussion the previous day with the representatives of the UK book industry. He said that there had been discussion of the importance of a minimal data set for the purposes of identification. He said that mandatory data sets were normally established within the context of an application (e.g. co-operative cataloguing programs). Deirdre Kiorgaard said that in partial answer to the CILIP comment of "why bother", most applications and institutions would have their own set of guidelines, but that RDA could be a common language across them all. Barbara Tillett said that she disagreed with the Editor about the mandatory sets, as they had been in ISBD and AACR. The Editor noted that application-related sets usually trumped the others. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the statement would have to be made that if certain elements were ignored, you would not be able to satisfy this user task. The Chair noted that just because a standard was imposed within your own community, it did not have to be imposed on other communities, but could become a bridge. Jennifer Bowen said that she agreed with a mandatory minimum set. She added that she did not think that there had been a strong feeling in ALA about having levels, but there had been a lot of concern about maintaining levels and their compatibility with other standards. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if these problems would go away. Jennifer Bowen said that one list was less likely to vary over time. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that list might not vary, but that the table to correlate it with other standards would change. Barbara Tillett said that other standards could be monitored. Jennifer Bowen said that the table could be a tool that was updated regularly. The Editor said that if the JSC was serious about collaboration, then if, for example, the ISTC decided that an element needed to be mandatory for interoperability, the JSC would have to consider it. Barbara Tillett said that both sides would need to discuss it. The Editor said that his point was that the list of elements would not be fixed forever.

35.5   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there was sometimes no direct mapping between standards, and that you had to make decisions and document them. She said that one thing which had come up in the responses was that people wanted to include "extent", but this was not mandatory in FRBR. Hugh Taylor said that he thought that interoperability was a significant argument in favour of a mandatory or minimum set. He said that with this there was a continuing responsibility to look at what others were doing. Barbara Tillett said that the basic principle was to meet identification needs.

35.6   Jennifer Bowen asked Barbara Tillett at what level of detail she saw the list of mandatory elements. Barbara Tillett said that it would be small. Jennifer Bowen said that she could see that people would want to add more and more to the list. Barbara Tillett said that people would be welcome to add what they wanted. The Editor said that it was not as simple as saying what was needed for identification, as for some resources you may need virtually every element to differentiate. He added that in FRBR not all of the elements necessary for identification were listed in the set for the basic record, but only the most important in most cases. He said that the JSC would need to decide if it agreed with what FRBR had said was of high importance for identification of the manifestation. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that even the LC response included extent as a mandatory element when it was not in FRBR, and there could be other changes to be made. Jennifer Bowen said that

the JSC needed to anticipate that the single list of elements might not be easy to agree upon, unless they used a list that was already made. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the FRBR basic list could be used, and the exceptions and reasons noted. The Editor said that what FRBR specified was a basic level record for a national bibliography; it was not a minimal level record applicable to everyone. Barbara Tillett said that she had made the point in the LC response that RDA should be useable by all types of libraries. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that there needed to be a theoretical base.

35.7   Jennifer Bowen asked what the mandatory element set would look like. Barbara Tillett said that the LC response had included a proposed list of mandatory elements. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that as well as a list, you also needed to mark the relevant rules. Hugh Taylor confirmed that what was meant was an explicit indication that would also be seen in the print product. The Editor said that it would also be in the metadata. He commented that that the concise subset would have more in it than the list of mandatory elements.

35.8   Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the LC response had proposed combining the description and access elements and abandoning levels for authority records. The Chair said that the JSC was only going to focus on part I. She asked if there was agreement to go forward with the LC proposal as opposed to levels. Jennifer Bowen said that she did not think that there was a strong feeling in ALA that there must be levels. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC would have comments on the detail but the general direction was fine. The Chair confirmed with Hugh Taylor that he was willing to proceed. Hugh Taylor said that there was the issue of which term to use, "mandatory" or "minimum". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that another option was "essential". The Editor said that he thought that the decision was between "mandatory" and "minimal"/"minimum". Barbara Tillett suggested that "mandatory" be used for now.

35.9   The Chair noted that there was a proposed mandatory element set from LC to be discussed. The Editor said that there was also the 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 minimum level. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the two of these did not match. The Editor asked if when LC said "title" they meant any title. Barbara Tillett said they did, and that it could be a supplied title. The Editor said that under the RDA instructions, a supplied title counted as a title proper, and asked about variant titles. Barbara Tillett said that "title proper" was jargon, and other communities, such as Dublin Core, just used "title". The Editor said that in that case the mandatory element would have to link to the entire title element (12.2). Barbara Tillett said that she thought this was too literal. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there had been agreement that the list be linked to the elements in the text. The Editor said that the title would either have to be linked to 12.2 (which included all types of title) or to 12.2.1 for the title proper. He said that one option was more accommodating, and the other was more precise. Barbara Tillett said that she wanted to be sure that "title proper" included all supplied and devised titles. The Editor said that these were considered the title proper, although the instructions were elsewhere. Barbara Tillett said that she had originally included "title proper" but that the LC managers had not liked this jargon. She said that she would prefer to have "title" but link to "title proper". The Editor said that they needed to be consistent because they would be hyperlinked in the text. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the JSC was trying to do two things, communicate with other communities, and instruct cataloguers, and the two did not match. She added that one of the differences between 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 and the LC list was that the ACOC list had the

larger element and then the specific element. Barbara Tillett said that she did not want multiple levels, and that title was sufficient even if what was meant was title proper. The Editor said that he was outlining the implications of this for linking. Barbara Tillett asked if the JSC wanted what ACOC had under the title heading: "Title proper (including devised title and number/name of part)". The Editor said that the things in parenthesis were covered by the definition for title proper. Deirdre Kiorgaard agreed. Barbara Tillett confirmed that "title proper" was what would be included in the list. The Editor suggested that the LC managers might like the ACOC arrangement. Barbara Tillett said that they had not liked it because it was too wordy and redundant.

35.10   Barbara Tillett suggested that the JSC look at the wording of each element. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that first there had to be a decision on whether to go up or down with the terminology. The Chair said that the issue was whether or not to list the higher level followed by the specific element. Hugh Taylor said that he did not support the way it had been done in the LC response. Barbara Tillett said that she was not sure why you needed the intermediary level. The Editor said that his personal preference would be to present the list as logical attributes followed by specific data elements, which is what had been done in the ACOC rep document. Barbara Tillett said that she was not sure what would be lost by only giving the data elements. The Editor said that you would lose the logical attributes. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that some things in the LC list were the same as the highest level in the ACOC rep list, and some were lower. The Editor said that the ACOC approach put the data elements in context of the logical attributes and the way the rules were organized. Barbara Tillett said that to her it looked redundant, and the caption level added nothing. The Chair asked Barbara Tillett what she would prefer. Barbara Tillett said that she would prefer a simple list, with data element names. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that her understanding was that the lower element level would contain an amount of wording that the LC managers would not like. Barbara Tillett said that this was true, but that it was still shorter than including the captions. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if a short list was better than a list with context. Barbara Tillett asked if it was clear that the captions were captions, and said that to her it was confusing. Jennifer Bowen said that her concern was to give people enough guidance. She said that if what were required were the elements necessary for identification, then the specific element name should be given, e.g. title proper.

35.11   The Editor confirmed that the first mandatory element was the title proper. He said that the next element listed in the LC response was "statement of principal responsibility", but that there was no element with this name. He added that the definition referred to major statements of responsibility, and that you could point to 12.3. Barbara Tillett said that this was at the higher level. The Editor said that you could point to 12.3.0, as this would have the definition and the basic instruction. Barbara Tillett asked if what was meant was what was in the ACOC rep proposal: "Statement of responsibility (principal responsibility)". The Editor said that under 12.3.0.3 only people with major responsibility would be recorded. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the precise wording of the list could not be resolved until all of the rules had captions. The Editor said that there were captions in the draft. He said that you would link to 12.3.0, but this would not limit you to the person or body with principal responsibility. Barbara Tillett asked how the element in the list could be limited to the person or body with principal responsibility. The Editor suggested that you could have "statement of responsibility" with either a footnote, or a parenthetical statement such

as "person, family, or corporate body with principal responsibility". JSC agreed. Jennifer Bowen asked what rule this would link to. The Editor said that the link would be to 12.3.0 (Basic instructions on recording statements of responsibility), and the information in parentheses would limit the application of the instructions.
Action=Editor

35.12   The Editor said that for the next element in the LC list, "Edition statement", the link would be to 12.4.1 (Edition statement). He said that what was meant was the edition statement only, not the related statement of responsibility or secondary statements on the revision of an edition.
Action=Editor

35.13   The Editor said that the next element in the LC list was "Numbering of serials". He said that a decision needed to be made on whether everything should be included, e.g. alternative numbering systems, or just the two things in the ACOC rep list: numeric and/or alphabetic designation; and, chronological designation. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she had interpreted FRBR as there was no direct correlation. The Editor said that either you would link to 12.5 (Numbering) or limit to the two elements. Jennifer Bowen asked if linking to 12.5 meant it would include notes on numbering. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it would probably be better to link to 12.5.1 (Numeric and/or alphabetic designation) and 12.5.2 (Chronological designation) and list the two elements separately. The Editor said that 12.5.3 (No designation on first issue or part) and 12.5.4 (Completed serials) were not elements, but instructions. He said that the real question was to do with alternative numbering systems, but you were instructed to record these earlier.
Action=Editor

35.14   The Chair said that the next element in the LC list was "Coordinates of cartographic materials". Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that this had not been included in the FRBR minimum set, and therefore was not in the ACOC rep list. Barbara Tillett noted that the element was mandatory for the cartographic community, which is why she had included it. The Chair confirmed that the element should be included in the list. John Attig asked where the element was in the draft of part I of RDA. The Editor said that both coordinates and scale were in chapter 14. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wanted to note that this was a conscious decision not to follow FRBR. Margaret Stewart said that it was something that the cartographic community wanted. The Editor said that the reason that these elements were not in the part of FRBR that Deirdre Kiorgaard had been looking in was because they were not attributes of the manifestation, but rather of the work/expression. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that ACOC rep paper referred to the "FRBR user tasks *Find* and *Identify* in relation to Manifestations". The Editor suggested that the covering statement be changed to refer to the "most important for the identification of the manifestation and the work or expression included in the manifestation". JSC agreed. The Chair asked what the link in the text would be for "Coordinates of cartographic materials". The Editor said that the link would be to 14.14 (Coordinates of cartographic content). Jennifer Bowen asked why "Scale of cartographic materials" was after "Coordinates of cartographic materials" when this did not match the rules. Barbara Tillett said that she had taken the order from the cartographic materials mandatory list. The Chair confirmed that the order of the two elements would be swapped. The Editor said that "Scale of cartographic materials" would link to 14.12 (Scale of cartographic content).

Action=Editor

35.15   The Chair said that the next element in the LC list was "First named publisher, distributor, etc.". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there was currently no rule number to link this to. Barbara Tillett noted that it would be in 12.7. (Publisher, distributor, etc.). The Editor said that there would need to be a qualifier, as there was currently no element for the "first named" in the outline. He said that the link would be to the basic instruction. The Chair confirmed that the element would be: "Publisher, distributor, etc. (First named)". The Chair noted that the next element in the LC list was "Date(s) of publication". Barbara Tillett noted that this would link to 12.8. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked why it was plural. Barbara Tillett said that you could have the beginning and ending dates for serials, bulk dates for collections etc. The Editor said that in that case the caption for the element would need to change to "date(s)".
Action=Editor

35.16   The Chair said that the next element for discussion was "Series statement". The Editor said that there was actually no element called "series statement" but there was one for "series". He said that a link to the whole thing would be to 12.9 (Series). John Attig noted that 12.9 included a lot. Hugh Taylor said that what was included in the 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 list was preferable. Barbara Tillett agreed that the three things could be listed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the links would be to 12.9.1 (Title proper of series), 12.9.5 (ISSN of series), and 12.9.6 (Numbering within series). [Note: see 5JSC/M/35.18.]
Action=Editor

35.17   The Editor noted that the next element in the list was "Standard number or alternative resource identifier". The Editor said that currently resource identifiers were in 12.10.1, and other resource identifiers were in 12.10.2. He said that either the two elements should be listed, or there should be a link to 12.0 (Resource identifier). Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this would include notes. The Editor said that it would need to be indicated that what was meant were the structured elements only and not the notes associated with them. Barbara Tillett said that the two separate elements could be listed. The Editor said that then you would miss the general instruction at 12.10.0 (Basic instructions on recording resource identifiers). The Editor said that there was actually no 12.10.3 (Notes on resource identifiers). The Chair said that it was in the table of contents, but not in the rules. She confirmed that in this case the element in the list could be "Resource identifier" and link to 12.10.
Action=Editor

35.18   Jennifer Bowen said that she wanted to return to series, in particular the ISSN of a series. She said that there was a concern in ALA that this should not be included, and also it was not in FRBR. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it would have been in 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 because that was how she interpreted something. The Editor confirmed that "ISSN of series" would be removed from the mandatory element list.
Action=Editor

35.19   The Chair asked if there were any other elements required in the first section of the list under "Identification of the resource". Judy Kuhagen said that she thought that serials

people would say that minor title changes helped with identification, as did the earlier titles of integrating resources. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think this would always be needed. Judy Kuhagen said that one option was to include it in the list for comment. The Chair asked if these would be covered by the link to title. The Editor replied that they were actually covered by the earlier/later title element at 12.2.5. He asked if the JSC wanted to include this. Jennifer Bowen said that the issue was that these would not always be required. Barbara Tillett noted that the LC proposal contained the line: "Other elements or repetitions of an element should be provided as needed to fulfil the *Find* and *Identify* tasks." Judy Kuhagen said that the issue was whether the basic list was issuance and container neutral. Jennifer Bowen asked if the JSC should reconsider the additions made for the cartographic community. The Editor said that all elements would be "as applicable" to the resource. Hugh Taylor asked in what circumstances an earlier or later title would not be required to either find or identify. Judy Kuhagen said that the earlier title was particularly an issue for integrating resources. The Editor said that he did not think that you could say that the list would be content or issuance neutral, the elements would have to apply to the resource. Barbara Tillett asked if there could be a footnote at title proper that referred to earlier titles for integrating resources and multipart monographs. Margaret Stewart said this made sense, but she wondered if it would be confusing. The Editor said that if the JSC seriously thought that the elements were important, they should be listed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it was better to list them as the JSC did not like footnotes, and it would be a long qualification. Barbara Tillett said that she did not want earlier and later titles for serials included. The Editor said that 12.2.5.4 (Earlier and later variations in the title proper) covered minor changes, and this was what should be included. Barbara Tillett asked if it would be included in the list after title proper. The Editor agreed.
Action=Editor

35.20 The Editor said that "Scale of cartographic materials" and "Coordinates of cartographic materials" would come out of the part of the list to do with Identification, and move to a section on Content Description.
Action=Editor

35.21 The Chair suggested that the discussion move to the section of the list on Technical Description. She said that the first element was "Form of carrier". The Editor said that there was currently nothing at 13.2 (Type and from of carrier), and this would have to be looked at further when the GMD/SMD report was received. Barbara Tillett asked about extent. The Editor said that for the moment it would link to 13.3. Margaret Stewart asked if under Content description there needed to be a placeholder for "Type and form of content". The Editor said that this did need to be considered, but he did not think that a placeholder was needed.
Action=Editor

35.22 Barbara Tillett asked if the JSC agreed with the final bullet in the LC response: "Other elements or repetitions of an element should be provided as needed to fulfil the *Find* and *Identify* tasks." She suggested that "Find" not be included as only part I had been looked at. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

35.23   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the LC proposal at 0.X was missing the following from 5JSC/ACOC rep/1: "Cooperative cataloguing programs, union catalogues and shared databases may also specify record level standards." Barbara Tillett said that this had not been included in the LC response because decisions would be made by all sorts of communities, and you did not want to list every possible one. The Editor said that what was currently being discussed was what was to go into the Introduction, and he was not concerned with that at this stage.

35.24   The Editor asked the JSC if it wanted to use what was under 1.4 in 5JSC/ACOC rep/1/LC response, or what was in the original ACOC rep proposal. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought they were pretty much the same, except that the LC response included access. She said that one difference was that the LC response did not have the sentence: "In the case of optional additions, include the optional elements in accordance with the library's policy." Barbara Tillett said that she did not think it was necessary as the previous sentence mentioned the organization's policy and cataloguer's judgement. The Editor noted that "optional addition" was no longer used as a caption. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the concept still had to be dealt with. Jennifer Bowen suggested that because what was being dealt with now was a list of mandatory elements, the sentence was not required. The Editor said that he would follow 5JSC/ACOC rep/1/LC response, but he would avoid use of "rules" and "cataloguing".
Action=Editor

35.25   The Chair asked if there were any other comments. Hugh Taylor said that there had been a comment in the CILIP response asking whether this would apply to archival resources. Barbara Tillett said that the LC archivists thought the mandatory elements were adequate. Barbara Tillett asked if the comparison table would be included as an appendix. The Editor said that in terms of time management there was no intent to send an appendix such as this out for comment. He added that it had the potential to become unwieldy, and even with the Web product it would be a very wide table. He said that if the JSC decided to include the table in an appendix it would have to think about the implications for maintenance and display. Barbara Tillett confirmed that the Editor would edit references to Appendix G.
Action=Editor

36   Rule proposals for musical format information

36.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/LC/4
5JSC/LC/4/CILIP response
5JSC/LC/4/ACOC response
5JSC/LC/4/CCC response
5JSC/LC/4/ALA response
5JSC/LC/4/BL response

36.2   Barbara Tillett explained that experts at the Library of Congress had discovered another way to deal with musical format information. She said that they realised that what they had proposed would be seen as radical. She explained that ISBD area 3 was like a wasteland where different types of information had been dumped over time. She added

that more logically musical presentation information was at the expression level, which had led to the proposal to put a lot of the information in area 2. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought the JSC was moving from "edition" to "edition statement", and that expression-level information would be dealt with in another way. The Editor said that chapter 14 (content description) was at the expression-level. He added that in FRBR the logical attribute was "presentation of musical content" which included both "type of score" and "form of notation". He said that this had been included in the draft as one element, but there could be two separate elements, one for "type of score" and one for "form of notation". Barbara Tillett noted that LC staff had not had the opportunity to see the Editor's latest part I draft. The Editor said that both of these elements were expression-related as LC had said, and that was where FRBR had them. He added that they were not unlike "scale" and "coordinates" as they were to do with the way the content was presented. He said that there was a rule that said that if the scale was an integral part of the title proper, to put it there, and this could be the way to deal with statements on the type of score that were integral parts of statements of responsibility, etc.

36.3   The Editor said that if "type of score" and "form of notation" were given as separate elements it would get away from wording that made it look too much like ISBD. He said that in Appendix E at ISBD area 3 for music it said to go to chapter 14. The Editor said that he agreed that area 3 was a dumping ground. Barbara Tillett said that in the 1980s when it was proposed, a number of people were unhappy. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that no one disagreed that there was a problem, but the issue was the proposed solution. The Editor said that he had provided a structural solution, but that there was the difficulty that everyone had commented on, of how much instruction of a cataloguer needed on what also went into statements of responsibility.

36.4   Barbara Tillett noted that in the responses to 5JSC/LC/4 there had been comments on renaming the elements. The Editor said that in chapter 14 there was currently one big slot at 14.10 for "presentation of musical content", which was taken from FRBR. He added that this could be split into two as he had already outlined. The Editor asked if people liked the term "presentation". Barbara Tillett and Jennifer Bowen said that they did not. The Editor said by having two sections for "type of score" and "form of notation" the word would be avoided. He added that under "type of score" would be the instructions that were there now, plus any further instructions that might be necessary.

36.5   Judy Kuhagen said that two of the main complaints that LC music cataloguers made about the current rules were that the information had to be on the chief source and that statements of responsibility could not be included in area 3. The Editor said that the source could be changed to "any source" and he did not think this would be a problem. He added that in terms of statements of responsibility, you could either create a sub-element under type of score, or for major statements record them in the statement of responsibility, and for others record them in a note. The Editor said that he would prefer recording in the statement of responsibility area or a note to building statements of responsibility into type of score. Barbara Tillett how would you make it clear that the statement of responsibility referred to the type of score. The Editor said that he thought it would either already be in the statement itself, or clarifying information could be added in square brackets.
Action=Editor

36.6   Barbara Tillett asked if this would be distinctive enough in terms of future systems that could pull out groupings by expression-level type information. The Editor said that if important the information would be built into expression citations, and you would not rely on textual recording of statements as they appear. He said that this would also apply to edition statements, as some of them were expression-level. Barbara Tillett said that she was very happy with this solution.

36.7   Jennifer Bowen asked for clarification on statements of responsibility. The Editor said that statements of responsibility would be recorded as per 12.3, either as a formal statement if major, or as note. John Attig asked if there would be a reference from the instructions on type of score to 12.3. The Editor agreed. Jennifer Bowen said it appeared that what was being proposed was essentially the same as current practice, except for the source of information. Hugh Taylor asked where this left those statements such as "Klavierauszug" that did not have an associated statement of responsibility. He said that this was a change in practice, as they would be recorded according to 14.10. Jennifer Bowen agreed that this was a change as these were currently recorded in the statement of responsibility as intellectual effort was implied. The Editor said that there was no reason that you could not treat this like scale, and record it as type of score and in the title. Hugh Taylor said that the practical outcome was that "Vocal score by X" would continue to be recorded in the statement of responsibility, but that others would be recorded according to 14.10. Hugh Taylor said he did not see major problems with this. Jennifer Bowen agreed and said that the existing practice was confusing.

36.8   Hugh Taylor asked whether the Glossary definitions needed to be discussed. The Editor said that there would no longer be a definition for "musical presentation statement" but there would be one for "type of score". Barbara Tillett confirmed that "musical format" would not be used at all. The Editor agreed and said that he did not see the need to introduce "presentation" or "musical format".
Action=Editor

36.9   Hugh Taylor said that in terms of what had just been discussed; his concerns regarding what was proposed by LC had gone. Barbara Tillett said that there was still a lot going into the statement of responsibility element. Jennifer Bowen said that information would no longer go there if there was no statement of responsibility. The Editor said that in order to go into the statement of responsibility, the person would need to have played a major role in the creation or realization of the content. He said that otherwise the person would go into a note on statement of responsibility.

36.10   Judy Kuhagen said that currently because of the prohibition on statements of responsibility in area 3, expression information ended up in different places in the record. She added that the proposed solution seemed to have the same result. The Editor said that if you were doing an ISBD display, the element of type of score would end up in area 3. He added that the JSC was adhering to the agreement to follow the order of ISBD elements and prescribed punctuation via the Appendix. Barbara Tillett said that she thought that expression-level information would be taken care of in the citation. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that elements identifying expressions could be found anywhere in the record. Barbara Tillett said that this was why you would rely on the access point for the citation.

37 **Rule proposals for archival and manuscript resources**

37.1 Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/LC/3
5JSC/LC/3/CILIP response
5JSC/LC/3/ACOC response
5JSC/LC/3/CCC response
5JSC/LC/3/ALA response
5JSC/LC/3/BL response
5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up

37.2 Barbara Tillett explained that archival and manuscript staff at LC had tried to incorporate the comments from the other constituencies in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up. The Chair noted that the document referred to the response table that had been prepared by the Secretary. The Chair suggested that the discussion focus on 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up and refer to the response table when necessary.

37.3 Barbara Tillett said that the first page of 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up included an additional reference to the *IASA cataloguing rules*. She added that references to ISAD(G) and RAD had also been added in response to comments.

37.4 11.2.1 Identifying Archival Resources

37.4.1 Barbara Tillett said that ACOC had suggested that some information be moved to the Glossary, and LC staff had agreed. She added that all suggestions in the document were subject to editorial change to be consistent with the rest of RDA. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wanted to cover all resources in RDA and the phrase "materials that an institution chooses to control archivally" concerned her. She said that she wanted people to be able to describe these resources using RDA regardless of whether they were controlling them archivally. Barbara Tillett said that then they would no longer be archival resources in a literal sense, they would just be a collection of things. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked why "controlled archivally" was used. Barbara Tillett said that they were trying to point out that archival control was different from bibliographic control. Margaret Stewart said that this was an issue. The Editor said that the problem was that LC was saying that the materials were defined by the way they were controlled. He said that the term needed to capture what the treatment was, and not what the resources were. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the second sentence in the paragraph was fine as it described the types of resources. She said that she was questioning the use of "control archivally" as it was not relevant to this standard. Barbara Tillett said that the second paragraph said: "Once a resource has been identified as an archival resource …" and then pointed to other tools. She said that when something was declared as an archival resource, the cataloguer could use the other standards. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there needed to be a paragraph on the type of resources, and then a statement to say that these resources can be controlled archivally, and if you choose to do this, here are the other standards. Barbara Tillett suggested that the Glossary definition could be: "Archival resources are materials that are organically created, accumulated …", and then the paragraph on identifying an resource could be reworded to something such as "Once a resource has been selected to control through archival principles follow …" Margaret Stewart said that there would need to be mention

of DACS and RAD. Barbara Tillett said that the first page of 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up had this information and it could be put anywhere you wanted it.

37.4.2 Jennifer Bowen said that there needed to be a statement to say, if you don't want to use the other standards, use these rules in RDA. Barbara Tillett said that she thought this information would be in the General Introduction. She added that she thought this was linked to the question of "what are you cataloguing". Jennifer Bowen said that she thought the choice needed to be all in one place. John Attig said that if the information was going to be in the General Introduction, it did not need to be in the section on identification. Barbara Tillett agreed. She confirmed that information from the first page of 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up about other standards, as well as information under 11.2.1 could go in the General Introduction. She said that there would also be a general Glossary definition taken from the first paragraph.

37.4.3 Deirdre Kiorgaard said she also had concerns about the sentence: "These resources may also be collections acquired and assembled …" as in the past these were called "assembled collections" and she was not sure they fitted under archival resources. The Editor said that the only reason there would be a Glossary definition of archival resources would be if there was a sub-category used as a caption for rules that only applied to that type of resource. He added that there was a term "collection" which did not currently have a definition, but was the old "aggregate collection" as found at 11.2.1 v): "a collection of two or more units assembled by a private collector, a dealer, a library, etc." Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there needed to be a term for "collection" and also a specific term for archival resources. Jennifer Bowen said that you might just have a bunch of stuff in a box to catalogue, and this would not be an archival collection. The Editor said that collection could be defined clearly as assembled collections. Barbara Tillett confirmed that the Editor would define archival resources. The Editor said that he would define them as "materials that were organically created, accumulated, and/or used by a person ..." The Editor said that he was not sure about the next sentence: "These resources may be aggregations of documents or discrete items." Barbara Tillett said that the sentence did not have to be included in the definition. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there might have to be something in the definition about discrete items.
Action=Editor

37.5 11.2.2 Number of records: Determining archival resource to be described

37.5.1 Barbara Tillett noted that there were a number of comments in the response table. She said that ALA had suggested summarising the need for multilevel description from ISAD(G), and CILIP had noted that ISAD(G) did not allow single-level descriptions. She added that this had been covered in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up, and a suggestion had been made to the Editor to include mention of the exception for archival resources, where "multilevel description" had a different meaning than that for RDA. The Editor said that he did not yet have a definition for "multilevel description", but he had included the following under 11.2.3: "Any resource comprising two or more parts may be described using both a comprehensive description for the whole and analytical descriptions for its parts. For purposes of display, the description of the whole and the descriptions for the parts may be presented *either* a) as separate descriptions *or* b) as a multilevel description in which the

description of the whole and the descriptions of its parts are combined in a single hierarchical display (see appendix E)."

37.5.2   Barbara Tillett asked if this meant that analytical descriptions were not limited to separate records. The Editor said that all "multilevel" meant was that you were describing at two or more levels, and you could choose to do that as separate records or as a combined record. Barbara Tillett said that this was a big change to how analytical description had been described in the past. The Editor said the change had been made in the current draft, and he would include a definition of "multilevel description". He added that the reference to Appendix E was only if you were choosing to do an ISBD multilevel display. Barbara Tillett said that what he had done would not cover archival resources unless it was clear that the separate descriptions had links. The Editor said that he had included the information about links in the past, but he was told to take it out. He added that multilevel description was an approach to description; it was not the end result. He said that it was like "comprehensive description" and "analytical description". Barbara Tillett said that it had to be clear that the definition for an analytical description was being changed to be limited to the description itself, and it did not mean an analytical record. The Editor said that it would be clearer when the definitions had been completed.

37.5.3   Barbara Tillett said that the comments in the response table to do with "elements of description" and "mandatory elements" had already been covered in the discussion on levels.

37.6   Chapter 12
          12.1 Title

37.6.1   Barbara Tillett said that ALA had made the suggestion that "name of creator" be included as an element in chapter 12. She said that in archival rules the name of the creator was given as part of the devised title. Barbara Tillett added that under 12.1 in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up it had: "Supplied titles generally have two parts: 1. A name segment consisting of the name … 2. A term indicating the nature of the resource being described." The Editor said that he thought that the best place for this information was at 12.2.7 (Devised title). He added that there was a section d) at the end of 12.2.7.3 (Basic instructions on recording devised titles) left for archival resources. The Editor said that he thought that some of what LC wanted was already there. Barbara Tillett said that staff at LC did not have the benefit of the Editor's draft when putting together 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up.

37.6.2   The Editor asked if the second bullet under 12.2.7.3 in the draft was explicit enough: "When devising a title for a collection of resources, include the name of the creator, collector, or source, if considered appropriate." Barbara Tillett said that she thought it was. The Chair confirmed that what was in the Editor's draft covered the ALA comment. The Editor said that the other segment of the supplied title on the nature of the resource was covered by the first bullet of 12.2.7.3. Barbara Tillett noted that LC had offered some additional examples.

37.6.3   The Editor asked about the following sentence added by LC: "Supplied titles at subordinate levels in a multi-level description should not repeat information inherited from higher levels." Barbara Tillett said that this was in response to a comment from CCC.

Margaret Stewart said that she was not sure that it fitted. The Editor said that a devised title could be for the whole or its parts, and no judgements were being made on how the records might be related to each other. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that when using the rules in RDA, repetition of information in the supplied title of a part did not occur, and this was only an issue for archival control.

37.6.4   The Editor said that this related to the ALA question of to what extent archival rules could be grafted on to the rules in RDA. Barbara Tillett said that the proposal came about because AACR2 chapter 4 was obsolete. The Editor said that chapter 4 did not cover archival control. Barbara Tillett agreed, and said that the LC proposal was an attempt from that community to suggest what might go in its place. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the JSC wanted the rules to be as compatible as possible. The Editor said that it was one thing to bring those things that were dealt with in chapter 4 up to date, and another to change the scope and breath of what was there. Barbara Tillett said that LC was trying not to do this. The Editor said that some things had slipped over the line, including the extra sentence added by LC. Jennifer Bowen said that the idea was to borrow some of the practices, but in a bibliographic context. Barbara Tillett said that the sentence added from CCC would be removed. Margaret Stewart said that she agreed it was out of scope.
Action=Editor

37.6.5   The Editor said that in terms of the instruction in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up not to enclose supplied titles for archival resources in square brackets, the option at 12.1.5 would apply; "If the resource is of a type that does not normally carry identification information (e.g., a photograph, or a naturally occurring object), the square brackets may be omitted." He added that this option would apply to everyone, not just archivists. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed. Jennifer Bowen asked if archival resources should be added to the parenthetical statement. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she was not sure about including photographs, as many of these had captions. The Editor said that he had put "not normally". He suggested that he could add "archival collection." He confirmed that no further changes were required to what he had in the draft. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked about the two new examples added to 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up, e.g. "Articles, addresses, reviews *Series* in the G. Bilson fonds". Judy Kuhagen said that these examples had been added to go with the sentence from CCC, and could now be removed. The Editor said that they were not incompatible. The Chair suggested that this was something for the Examples Group to look at.
Action=Editor; Examples Group

37.6.6   The Editor confirmed that the current Editor's draft covered what was in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up under 12.2. Margaret Stewart queried the use of "may" in "square brackets may be omitted" in 12.1.5, as for archival resources they were always omitted. The Editor said that any option could be ruled on at an individual or institutional or community level. Barbara Tillett said that the "may" should be changed to "will", because otherwise it looked as if sometimes you did it and sometimes you did not. The Editor said that he would change it to "omit the square brackets".
Action=Editor

37.7   12.7 Date of publication, distribution, etc.

37.7.1   Barbara Tillett said that LC had made changes in response to the CCC comment regarding date of record-keeping activity. She added that ACOC had preferred revision to rules for recording dates for resources in an unpublished form, and would welcome inclusion of provision for inclusive, bulk and single dates into general rules for unpublished resources. Barbara Tillett said that the JSC had yet to have the discussion on published vs. unpublished resources. The Editor suggested that the JSC discuss everything under 12.7 with 5JSC/LC/2.

37.8   12.9 Resource identifier

37.8.1   Barbara Tillett said that the MARC coded example was a "hot-button" in the responses, and that she was not sure why as there were other formatted examples. The Editor said that there were no formatted examples in the current draft. Barbara Tillett said that there were some ISBD formatted examples. The Editor replied that this would need to be addressed. John Attig said that there was the issue of whether encoding was only a presentation issue. Margaret Stewart said that CCC agreed that the reference code was not a descriptive element. Barbara Tillett said that for the archival community the reference code was an identifier and it was a combination of the three elements that were coded in the MARC format. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the reference code was created by the cataloguer at the time of cataloguing, or whether it existed already. Barbara Tillett said that it was not locally created. The Editor said that it was item-specific. Jennifer Bowen asked whether DACS told you to code it this way. Margaret Stewart asked if it was in ISAD(G). The Editor asked if whether as item-specific information it should go into chapter 16. He suggested that it was like a call number. Barbara Tillett said that it was very different from a call number. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it was different because it would be cited by others. Barbara Tillett read out the definition for resource identifier from DACS. The Editor said that it was like telling people all of the elements in an ISBN. He said that he could see it being included under "other resource identifiers", but that all sorts of people had rules for creating resource identifiers, but RDA would only tell you how to record them. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it fitted under "other resource identifiers" but that the guidelines for creating them were something different. Barbara Tillett agreed.

37.8.2   Hugh Taylor said that he wanted to return to presentation of examples. He said that while this was ultimately an issue for the Examples Group, he did not think that anything in their charge directly related to the ability of the user to interpret the examples. He said that where possible the construction of examples should be self-evident. Hugh Taylor said that the example for reference code in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up only made sense if you understood the MARC format. He said that intelligibility was the issue.

37.8.3   Barbara Tillett asked if the reference code was covered by the text for other resource identifiers (12.10.2.1). Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there might need to be a slight change, or an example added. Judy Kuhagen said that one aspect of the reference code was item-specific. The Editor said that they were being treated as resource-identifiers. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC had brought up the issue of what was item-specific as opposed to shareable. She added that she hoped that there would be a principle that for items that were unique everything could go into the bibliographic record and did not have to be treated as item-specific information. The Editor said that the distinction between bibliographic records and holding records was out of scope for RDA. He asked if Deirdre

Kiorgaard was suggesting that chapter 16 be rewritten. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that what she was suggesting was that if item-specific information is covered by another chapter, for a unique item it could stay with that chapter. The Editor said that this would be included in an introductory note to chapter 16.

37.8.4   Barbara Tillett summarized that the reference code would be considered as an "other resource identifier". The Editor said that a neutral example could be added. The Chair suggested that the Examples Group be asked to look for an example. The Editor said that he would remove the slot that he had left at 12.10.2.4 for reference codes for archival resources.
Action=Editor; Examples Group

37.9   13.2 Extent

37.9.1   Barbara Tillett said that ACOC had preferred revision of rules on extent for all types of collections, and that BL wanted to state the material type rather than just the number of items. Barbara Tillett said that sometimes it was more concise to count the number of items, rather than list each material type. The Chair said that this was a difference in practice in the UK. Barbara Tillett said that if you could make a listing that was fine, but if you had 5000 items, it was easier just to count the items. Hugh Taylor said that it seemed to be the encouragement to be more precise that was lacking. The Editor asked if what he had at 13.3.0.6 (Comprehensive description of a collection) was adequate. He added that it was taken from AACR2 4.5B2. Barbara Tillett said that the "45 linear feet" example from 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up needed to be added. The Editor said that the second bullet dealt with collections occupying more than one linear foot. He said that there had been a comment in the response table for part I from ALA (Line 484) that said that linear feet were not appropriate for cartographic resources. Barbara Tillett suggested that there needed to be another bullet for storage in cubic feet. The Editor asked if there was a way to generalise the instruction. He added that there would be digital collections where the storage would be in terms of data bytes. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed with generalising the rule. The Editor said that he would rewrite the rule in terms of optionally recording the extent in terms of storage space.
Action=Editor

37.9.2   The Editor said that if linear feet were meant in the examples, "linear" should be added in those cases. Hugh Taylor asked if it should be made clear that you could be specific about what you were recording. The Editor said that he would remove the restriction from the first bullet on occupying one linear foot or less. He said that some examples would have the specific material types, and others would have just the number of items. He asked if the parenthetical "(the number of bound and unbound items separately expressed)" was required. Barbara Tillett said that it was not.
Action=Editor

37.9.3   Barbara Tillett asked about the proposed LC text on multiple statements of extent. The Editor said that this was covered by 13.1.4 (Resources comprising two or more media). He added that you did not need to specify that they were separate media, and three ways of recording separate statements of extent were outlined: record the extent of each part or group of parts; record separate technical descriptions for each part or group of parts; and,

record extent in general terms. Barbara Tillett said that this was fine. The Editor said that when the relevant line numbers in the table were discussed, a decision would have to be made on whether or not to broaden the rule.

37.10   13.3 Dimensions

37.10.1 Barbara Tillett noted that ACOC had preferred revision to the general rule on dimensions; ALA had suggested that wording be added to clarify that in archival practice dimensions are typically recorded under the extent element; BL had thought that dimensions of containers was an interesting addition; and, CILIP had suggested that lower-case "x" be used, which had been done. The Editor suggested that the JSC look at the general rule on recording dimensions (13.4.0.3). Barbara Tillett said that she thought 13.4.0.3 covered what was in the LC proposal. The Editor noted that 13.4.0.5 dealt with multipart resources and collections. Barbara Tillett suggested that the following example from 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up be added: "various sizes, 8 x 10 in. and smaller in container, 22 x 20 16 cm". The Editor asked if this meant broadening the exception that was currently in the rule for cartographic resources. Deirdre Kiorgaard agreed that it was feasible to generalize the exception. The Editor said that he would make it an option that was not limited to cartographic resources. Barbara Tillett confirmed that non-map examples would be added to 13.4.0.5. She added that a note could be added to the LC example to explain the type of material. The Editor suggested that they were probably photographs.
Action=Editor

37.11   13.6 Alternative formats

37.11.1 Barbara Tillett said that in response to the CILIP comment, LC had moved instructions on the availability of originals and copies from 15.1 to 13.6. The Editor suggested that the JSC look at 13.7.0.3 (Describing other formats) to see if anything needed to be added. Barbara Tillett noted that it was an option. The Editor said that use of "issued" in the rule could be problematic. John Attig asked if it would be possible to substitute the text at 13.6 in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up for what was at 13.7.0.3. The Editor said that "copies" was different from other formats. He added that information on copies was the "flip-side" to what was in the originals note, which he did not think was in AACR2, but was in MARC. He suggested that information on reproductions needed to go elsewhere as reproductions could be in the same format. The Editor suggested that the JSC look at 14.9 (Related content). He noted that there were instructions at 14.9.2 for the original of a facsimile or reproduction. He suggested that 14.9.3 be added for information on reproductions of the thing being described, as opposed to the original of the thing being described.

37.11.2 Deirdre Kiorgaard said that some of the examples in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up, such as "Also available on videocassette" referred to alternative formats and were appropriate for 13.7.0.3. She asked if the example "Diaries available on microfilm for use in repository alone" would go at the new 14.9.3. The Editor said that this example combined a "restrictions on access and use" note with an "other formats available" note. He said that the example would be best under 13.7.0.3, with an explanation to say that it was a combined note. He suggested that the example that began with "Digital reproductions of …" would go at the new 14.9.3.
Action=Editor

37.11.3   Barbara Tillett asked what would go at 14.9.2.2 (Availability of archival originals). The Editor said that this would contain instructions on the existence and location of originals from 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up. He said that 14.9.3 would contain instructions on recording the existence and location of copies. He added that the first two examples from this section in the LC proposal were actually not required at 13.7.0.3 (as previously discussed) as there were already plenty of examples at that rule.
Action=Editor

37.12   14.2 Nature, scope, etc.

37.12.1   Barbara Tillett said that 14.2 had been reworked, and she hoped that some of it could be included in the Introduction with other information on archival practice. She added that the archival practice was to combine the "Nature, scope, etc." note and the "Summary" note. The Editor said that there were general instructions on combining notes in chapter 11, and asked if this was sufficient. Barbara Tillett said that the archival community always combined these two notes. The Editor said that there were other notes that were frequently combined, but that this was not explicitly mentioned. Barbara Tillett asked if the Editor wanted to use any of the examples from 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up. The Editor said that the first example would be best under the summary note (14.6.0.3) as the preponderance of it was a summary. Hugh Taylor said that the Examples Group could look at the examples. The Editor noted that there would be nothing from the Examples Group in the draft that went out for constituency review, and it was important to show that comments had been taken into account.
Action=Editor

37.13   14.3 Language and script

37.13.1   Barbara Tillett said that LC had noted the CILIP comment that information on language and script was not obligatory in ISAD(G), but that this was required by archival description. She added that ACOC had questioned the mention of codes for machine processing, and so this had been removed. The Editor said that in the General Introduction it would say that wherever instructions talked about recording a piece of data, if an agency had a controlled list, it could be recorded that way. John Attig said that what was in 14.3 was covered by the general rule in the Editor's draft. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the second LC example, "Collection is predominantly in Vietnamese; materials in English are indicated at file level" be included at the general rule. The Editor said that he would include it under 14.4.0.3.
Action=Editor

37.13.2   Barbara Tillett said that the LC proposal referred to symbol systems and this was not covered. The Editor said that he could change the caption for 14.4 to "Language, script, etc. of the content" and add a definition of "symbol system" to 14.4.0.1. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

37.14   14.6 Contents - System of arrangement

37.14.1   Barbara Tillett said that ACOC had suggested that this be an option, which had been done. The Editor asked if the instructions could be included under 14.7 (Contents list). He said

that the examples in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up were not contents lists and would have to go elsewhere, possibly between the sections for contents and indexes and finding aids. Deirdre Kiorgaard agreed that it would fit between 14.7 and 14.8. The Editor agreed and noted that there were similar fields in the MARC format that covered how data files were arranged. He asked if the rule should be broadened. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

37.14.2   Barbara Tillett noted that the JSC had not decided what to put at 14.3.1 (Describing the Nature and Scope of Archival Collections). The Editor asked if there was anything at 14.2 in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up that was not covered by 14.6.0.3. Barbara Tillett said that the only thing that was different was that for archival resources it was always combined with a summary note. The Editor said that it had been agreed that this was covered in chapter 11. The Editor added that 14.3.1 would be removed from the draft.
Action=Editor

37.15   14.7 Related content - Related materials

37.15.1   Barbara Tillett said that in response to the ACOC comment the rule had been made optional. The Editor said that the 14.9.0.3 contained instructions on describing related content: "Make notes on the bibliographic history of the resource being described and its relationships to the content of other resources." He suggested that he could change "and" to "and/or". Barbara Tillett said that she thought some of what was in the LC proposal had been lost. The Editor asked if there were any other changes that needed to be made. Jennifer Bowen asked if a second bullet could be added for the LC option. Barbara Tillett read out the LC option: "Optionally, indicate the existence and location of archival resources that are closely related to the resource being described by provenance, sphere of activity, or subject matter, either in the same repository, or in other repositories, or elsewhere." The Editor said that he did not think that the instruction needed to be optional, as none of the notes were mandatory. He noted that the LC proposed rule mentioned provenance, but this was covered elsewhere. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she did not think that the LC paragraph was covered by the general rule as the rule did not mention location or describe the relationship. Hugh Taylor said that the LC proposal looked at things the other way around from 14.9.0.3 as it dealt with other resources and their relationship to the resource being catalogued. The Editor said that the definition at 14.9.0.1 was "Related content is content related to the content in the resource being described." Barbara Tillett said that she agreed that 14.9.0 was the right location. The Editor said that he could add another bullet to 14.9.0.3. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the existing rule covered bibliographic items that had a relationship through their history, but the archival rule covered a different type of relationship. The Editor noted that the instruction did not specify the type of relationship. Jennifer Bowen said that you would not want to generalize the LC proposed rule beyond archival resources. Barbara Tillett said that the subject relationship for other materials would be handled by subject headings. The Secretary confirmed that 14.7 in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up would become an additional bullet under 14.9.0.3, and that the examples would be included. The Editor said that it would not say "optionally".
Action=Editor

37.16   14.10 Administrative/Biographical note

37.16.1   Barbara Tillett said that CCC had said that information about the creator did not fit in part I. The Editor said that what LC had proposed would fit under a similar caption in part III. He noted that an individual organization could display the information where it wanted. He added that it was an FRAR element as opposed to FRBR element. Jennifer Bowen said that it seemed that this was one DACS convention that did not fit with RDA. The Editor said that it did fit with RDA, but in part III. Barbara Tillett said that the archival community put this information in both the bibliographic record and the authority record. Jennifer Bowen said that it was the convention of putting this information in the bibliographic description that did not fit with RDA. JSC agreed.

37.17   15.1 Terms of availability - Availability of archival originals, when not held by the repository

37.17.1   Barbara Tillett noted that this had already been discussed.

37.18   15.1 Terms of availability - Name and Location of Repository

37.18.1   Barbara Tillett noted that ACOC had questioned the inclusion of name and location of repository as a "required" element, and asked if removing "required" was the solution. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the issue was that normally a holdings record would tell you where to find something. The Editor said that normally this type of information would be considered to be "item-specific", although terms of availability was covered in chapter 15. He added that he had left a space for contact information at 15.3. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that terms of availability of a unique item should be able to be in chapter 15 rather than be considered item-specific. Barbara Tillett suggested that the name and location of repository be limited to archival resources and be placed as a subset of 15.3. JSC agreed.
          Action=Editor

37.19   16.2 Provenance [and custodial history]

37.19.1   Barbara Tillett explained that the caption for the rule had been changed to remove "provenance" because the important aspects were immediate source of acquisition and custodial history. She added that the rule had been made optional in response to a comment from ACOC. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this comment could be ignored. The Editor said that in the draft "provenance" was defined as: "a record of previous ownership or custodianship of an item." He suggested that "immediate source of acquisition" could be included under 16.3.1 as it was still provenance. He added that he would change the existing caption "recording provenance of archival resources" to "immediate source of acquisition or transfer of archival resources". Barbara Tillett asked about "custodial history". The Editor suggested that this was covered by the rule on recording provenance, and that he could add custodians to 16.3.0.3 wherever he referred to owners. JSC agreed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wanted to record that she was uncomfortable with the placement of item-specific information for a unique resource in chapter 16, but that she had no alternative to offer.
          Action=Editor

37.20   16.3 Restrictions on access and use

37.20.1   Barbara Tillett explained that there were two separate elements in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up, "restrictions on access" and "restrictions on use". The Editor said that these were combined in the draft, and he had left a slot at 16.4.1 for archival resources. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there might as well be two separate elements for everyone. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed, and that the LC proposal had been generalized. The Editor said that the only thing which might be problematic was the second bullet under 16.4.0.3 which covered literary rights. John Attig said that it would fall under "restrictions on use".
Action=Editor

37.21   16.4 Appraisal and accrual

37.21.1   Barbara Tillett said that the rule had been broadened so that it was not limited to archival materials. John Attig noted that there was a slot for these instructions at 16.5. The Editor confirmed that the JSC was happy for the text at 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up 16.4 to go at 16.5. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC only supported the inclusion of this information if there was a bearing on the interpretation and use of the resource, and that the rule as written was OK.
Action=Editor

37.22   Finding aids element

37.22.1   The Editor suggested that the JSC look at 14.8 (Indexes and finding aids) to see if it covered the LC proposal. He said that he had taken definitions for indexes and finding aids from the ALA Glossary. Barbara Tillett said that the finding aid definition was much broader than the use in the archival community. Margaret Stewart said that there were problems with the definition of the term in the archival world. The Editor said that he would use the definition from DACS. Barbara Tillett asked if copyright permission would be obtained from DACS. The Editor noted that this was also an issue with definitions from FRBR and ISBD.
Action=Editor

37.23   Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance Manuscripts (AACR2, 4.7B23)

37.23.1   Barbara Tillett said that there needed to be included in RDA a reference to AMREMM, but she wasn't sure where it should go. She noted that the BL and CILIP responses had agreed the reference was a good idea. The Editor said that all he had done to date was what had been agreed to in Chicago, i.e. not brought forward any rules from chapter 4. The Chair read out from AACR2 rule 4.7B23: "In addition to the notes specified above, give the following notes for ancient, medieval, and Renaissance Manuscripts." She added that the subheadings were: style of writing, illustrative matter, collation, other physical details, and opening words. The Editor said that in the December 2004 draft of AACR3 part I the rule was at C1.7B13.4, and had been treated as a note on technical description. He added that the rule would come up with chapter 13, but that so far he had only done the general rules. The Editor made a note to include a reference to AMREMM in the General Introduction.
Action=Editor

37.24   Crosswalk

37.24.1   Barbara Tillett said that the separately issued crosswalk had been updated to include ISAD(G). She added that the question was what to do with it. Hugh Taylor said that he could see the beginning of a technical document series for supporting documentation such as the crosswalk and the levels of description table. Barbara Tillett suggested that this was something the co-publishers could maintain with content supplied by the JSC. Hugh Taylor suggested that they could be freely available on the Web site. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the issue was to do with mapping to standards of other description communities.

37.24.2   Barbara Tillett said that she would send the JSC the revised crosswalk.
          Action=Barbara Tillett

38   Draft of RDA chapters 11-16 (continued)

38.1   12.3.0.5. Statement naming two or more persons, etc.

          Barbara Tillett said that during the previous discussion of 12.3.0.5 (5JSC/M/33.11.2) it had been agreed to use "and others" as opposed to "et al". She said that during informal discussions it had been agreed to use the marks of omission instead. She added that in no other element did it say what was omitted.
          Action=Editor

38.2   12.5.0. Basic instructions on recording numbering
          12.5.0.3. Transcription

38.2.1   Line 256: add instructions at A1.3A4 for recording spans of numbers/dates (ALA 5: p. 30)

          The Editor said that he had been informed that line 256 had been omitted in the previous discussions. Jennifer Bowen read from the 5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA response: "We suggest including instructions here for recording spans of numbers/dates, as follows: "In a numeric and/or alphabetic designation for a span of numbers, replace a hyphen with a forward slash (e.g., give "no. 1-2" as "no. 1/2")" (This would require the modification of some examples, most notably the last one under A1.3C4.) Such instructions would improve the clarity of the display of such spans of numbers in an online display: "1995/1996-1996/1997" is much easier to read than "1995-1996-1996-1997."" Barbara Tillett said that if you took what you saw this would not be appropriate. The Editor suggested that the issue be discussed with 5JSC/Sec/4.

38.3   12.9.6.3. Recording numbering within series

38.3.1   Line 572: consider deleting second paragraph of A1.6G1 (LC Editorial table)

          Barbara Tillett said that the comment in the Editorial table was: "If general principle of transcribing what is seen is affirmed, consider deleting this paragraph (would need to consult with other serial communities)". The Editor noted that this issue had been discussed with 12.5.2.3. John Attig noted that the second paragraph had been retained in 12.5.2.3. [Note: see 5JSC/M/33.28.2.] The Editor said that to keep the two rules in synch, there would be no change to 12.9.6.3.

38.3.2   Line 575: rewrite A1.6G1 to restore "in the terms given in the item" and to take out normalization in second paragraph (ALA 17, p. 127)

Barbara Tillett said that this was similar to the previous item and there was no change.

38.4   12.9.6.7. Separately numbered issues or parts
b) Serials

38.4.1   Line 574: make provisions in A2.6G1 that apply to serials optional; specify that option applies only to serial analytics (CILIP 5: p. 12)

Hugh Taylor said that the CILIP comment was in response to a CONSER recommendation, which CILIP did not support. Judy Kuhagen said that the CONSER comment did not come through into a response. John Attig said that no change was required. Judy Kuhagen noted that both sentences of the rule seemed to be saying the same thing. The Editor said that the first sentence told you what to do, and the second made it clear what not to do. JSC decided to remove the second sentence. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that there was a superfluous "in" after "within" in the first sentence.
Action=Editor

38.5   12.9.7.5. "New series," "second series," etc.

38.5.1   Line 576: reconsider instructions re "new series", etc., in A1.6H3 (CILIP 2A: p. 6)

Hugh Taylor read from 5JSC/AACR3/I/CILIP response: "Whilst understanding that this rule has its basis in the rules for continuing resources, we remain concerned that the diametrically opposed ways of handling phrases such as "new series" – dependent entirely on whether or not the series is numbered – is unhelpful and confusing to both cataloguers and, because of the different ways in which such data is likely to be indexed, to users of our catalogues. We would urge that some consideration be given to providing consistency in the way in which such series information is recorded."

John Attig said that the only way to be consistent would be to always treat the information as a subseries. Judy Kuhagen said that she agreed with John Attig, and always including "new series" in the numbering would not work. John Attig said that inclusion of "new series" would mean a new title proper. Barbara Tillett said that this was not desirable. Judy Kuhagen said that if you accepted that the instructions were different for numbered and unnumbered series, there was not a problem.

Barbara Tillett said it looked as though there was a contradiction with 12.9.7.7 (Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of subseries). Judy Kuhagen said that the examples at 12.9.7.7 needed to include more information to make it clear what was happening. The Editor said that the examples only included the element. Barbara Tillett said that this was why it looked as though there was a contradiction. She suggested that the "6th series" example be removed from 12.9.7.7. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

38.6   12.9.7.9. ISSN of subseries

38.6.1   Line 577: revise A1.6H7: add "of a monographic series" (LC Editorial table)

Judy Kuhagen said that there had been the same discussion with ISSN of a series, and it had been decided not to add the phrase. [Note: see 5JSC/M/33.38.1.]

38.6.2   Line 578: revise A1.6H7: query re incorrect ISSN/standard number (LC Editorial table)

Judy Kuhagen noted that "even if it is known to be incorrect" had been added to 12.9.5.3 [Note: see 5JSC/M/33.38.2.] The Editor said that he would add the phrase to 12.9.7.9.
Action=Editor

38.7   12.9.9.5. Details of numbering within series

38.7.1   Line 714: add "For serials" to A2.7B17.1 (LC Editorial table)

Judy Kuhagen said that this rule had survived the revision of chapter 12, but that it was unlikely for people to maintain notes about series numbering for serial analytics. Jennifer Bowen confirmed that all that was required was a clarification. Judy Kuhagen said that this provision only applied to serial analytics, as for any other level of analytic this level of detail would have been recorded in the series numbering. Barbara Tillett asked if the exception should continue to be allowed. Judy Kuhagen said that she had never in her experience given such a note. JSC decided to delete 12.9.9.5.
Action=Editor

38.7.2   Line 715: delete A3.7B17.1 (LC Editorial table)

John Attig said that the rule had just been deleted. Judy Kuhagen said that the instruction was not appropriate for integrating resources.

38.8   12.9.9.6. Change in series information
          a) Resource issued in successive parts

38.8.1   Line 716: add wording to A2.7B17.2 (ALA 5: p. 35)
          Line 717: add wording to A2.7B17.2 (LC Editorial table)

The Secretary said that both ALA and LC had suggested wording for A2.7B17.2, and that everyone had agreed with the LC proposal. John Attig noted that the LC proposal had been followed in the draft.

39   AACR3 Area 4 Example of Simplified Rules

39.1   Received and considered the following documents:
               5JSC/LC/2
               5JSC/LC/2/ACOC response
               5JSC/LC/2/CCC response
               5JSC/LC/2/ALA response
               5JSC/LC/2/CILIP response
               5JSC/LC/2/BL response

               5JSC/LC rep/1

39.2   Barbara Tillett said that 5JSC/LC/2 was interlinked with the discussion paper that she had
               prepared on self-describing vs. not self-describing items (5JSC/LC rep/1). She said that
               this issue applied to all elements that were transcribed. She explained that the paper was
               designed to start discussion. Hugh Taylor said that on the surface this approach seemed to
               be a solution to the issue of determining what was published. The Editor said that he
               thought it was a useful distinction, as the real focus of AACR had been on self-describing
               materials. He added that the concept could be worked into the General Introduction and at
               specific elements. He noted that not all problems would be solved, as even self-describing
               resources tended not to be fully self-describing. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she supported
               being able to express the place and date associated with an item that was not published.
               She added that other metadata standards did not make this distinction. The Editor said that
               in earlier versions of the RDA outline he had built in "date of production" and other kinds
               of date under the date element. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the issue was the date and
               place associated with the creation of any resource.

39.3   Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if another paper was required, or whether the Editor could use
               the idea. The Editor said that he would see how the idea played out for the next draft.
               Hugh Taylor said that he was slightly anxious about terminology and definitions, in
               particular "not self-describing". He added that "self-describing" was probably OK.
               Barbara Tillett suggested that there could be a search and replace for "published" and
               "unpublished". The Editor replied that those terms were not in the current draft. Barbara
               Tillett replied that they were in 5JSC/LC/2. Barbara Tillett said that she understood that
               the "self-describing" idea would be incorporated where possible.
               Action=Editor

39.4   General comments on 5JSC/LC/2

39.4.1   Barbara Tillett suggested that the discussion follow the response table for 5JSC/LC/2. She
               said that the general comments indicated that simplification was welcomed, but it had
               gone too far. The Editor noted that the JSC needed to have a broad discussion on
               simplification, but it would be more useful to work through 5JSC/LC/2 first. [Note: see
               5JSC/M/58.]

39.5   A1.4. Publication area
               A1.4A and A1.4B

39.5.1   Barbara Tillett said that the comments on these rules in 5JSC/LC/2 referred to the need to distinguish between published and unpublished materials, and this idea was being moved away from. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the "self-describing" concept removed the need to know if something was published or unpublished. Barbara Tillett said that she hoped it removed the need to know. Hugh Taylor noted that this had yet to be tested in detail.

39.6   A1.4B. General rule

39.6.1   Barbara Tillett noted that ACOC had said that there was a conflict with A1.4C, A1.4D and A1.4E which implied that only the place/name/date information appearing in the resource were to be recorded. She added that the rule in 5JSC/LC/2 did say to "provide information found in the resource or in other sources". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that A1.4C, A1.4D and A1.4E just said "as appear on the resource" Barbara Tillett said that there needed to be another line to say that a publisher's name can be supplied. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if there should be discussion of the broader point that instructions in 5JSC/LC/2 were too stripped down. She said that either you worked up from the rules in 5JSC/LC/2 or down from the existing rules. The Editor suggested that the JSC discuss the other rules and then see if the conflict was still there.

39.6.2   Barbara Tillett said that the reference to published resources should be changed to self-describing, and that something should be added for not self-describing resources. The Editor said that in the context of the current draft of RDA there was no general rule for the publication area. He added that "purpose and scope" had been included for each chapter, and not for each element as had been discussed at a previous meeting. Barbara Tillett noted that the other instructions in 5JSC/LC/2 would be moved to the respective data elements in chapter 12.

39.7   A1.4C. Place of publication

39.7.1   Barbara Tillett noted that there needed to be extra instructions on supplying a place of publication. She added that it could be the place of creation. The Editor said that the current caption in the draft referred to "Place of publication, distribution, etc.", and in the outline there was an element for "place of production". Barbara Tillett said that manuscript and visual arts cataloguers specifically wanted "place of creation". Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the ALA response had mentioned a number of related standards, and perhaps these had wording that could be used. The Editor said that in the outline in 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1 he had included "Place of production" and "Name of producer". He added that under "Date of publication, distribution, etc." there were a number of different types of dates. Barbara Tillett said that "creation" was important for visual resources people. The Editor asked if it should be "creation" or "production". Barbara Tillett said that "creation" was the term that was used. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the problem with "production" was that it implied an activity towards publication, and "creation" did not. The Editor asked if everything should be moved to "creation". Barbara Tillett said that she did not think so. The Editor said that his difficulty with "creation" was that up until now the term had been used in terms of the content of a work or manifestation, and he did not want to overuse it. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought it could be used in terms of creation of the manifestation. The Editor said that in FRBR what was referred to was the "production of the manifestation". The Editor said that if it ended

up that there was a separate element for place of creation, he would need to define it. He added that he was trying to get a sense of whether it encompassed production. Barbara Tillett said that production was a separate element. The Editor said that he was trying to see the line between the two. Barbara Tillett said that creation was for visual resources and non self-describing resources.

39.7.2   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wanted to confirm that if there were multiple dates associated with a resource, e.g. creation, production, publication, distribution, that there would be the option for people to record all of them. Barbara Tillett agreed.

39.7.3   Barbara Tillett asked if for place of publication (or whatever it was named) there needed to be instructions on what to do if it was supplied rather than transcribed. She said that the Editor's distinctions between the "first named" and "second or subsequently named" could not be used as they might not be named. Jennifer Bowen suggested that an additional line be added to A1.4C for visual resources and non self-describing resources. The Editor said that "place of publication" would be a separate element for published items, and that there would be another element for "place of creation". Barbara Tillett said that you could just have the one rule, and that you did not need to repeat it under each element. The Editor said that there would be basic instructions, but there could also be specific instructions for place of publication, place of creation, etc. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think there would be specific instructions. The Editor said that this would emerge when looking at what the constituencies had asked to be added. Barbara Tillett said that for place the only things that had been requested were additional instructions for the larger jurisdiction and reinstating "province", adding guidance for two or more places, and preferring that the actual place not be optional.

39.7.4   The Editor said that the definition of "place" would need to cover "place of publication", "place of creation", "place of production" and "place of distribution". He said that if there was one element for all of these things, he wasn't sure it would cover everything that was requested in the responses to 5JSC/LC/2. Barbara Tillett said that she thought it would. The Editor said that he was thinking of what was done in the film community where only the country was recorded. He asked if this needed to be an exception. Barbara Tillett said that she would not introduce this as it had not been done in AACR2. The Editor said that he was following up on the general comments on being more inclusive, and he knew that the film people did things differently. Barbara Tillett said that she would prefer to see the different types of places defined in the Glossary rather than how it was in the draft. She added that in the Web version there could be hyperlinks to Glossary terminology. The Editor said that you also had to think about the print version. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wanted to see how many exceptions there actually were, and that she thought that for place and date you would be able to use the same rules. Jennifer Bowen said that for film it was not clear that the date was at the manifestation level.

39.7.5   The Editor confirmed that what was being discussed was one element for place, covering the different types of place, with one set of instructions. He added that 5JSC/LC/2 would be the starting point. Barbara Tillett said that there also needed to be instructions on how to supply the place when the resource was not self-describing. She added that there would be the same categories as when you were transcribing.

39.7.6   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that 5JSC/LC/2 removed a number of revisions that had been added over time, but other proposals, such as that for archival materials, were adding new things to RDA. She said that rules for traditional publication were also important. Barbara Tillett asked if agreement that a simplified approach was preferred was enough for the Editor to work with. The Editor said that he thought that his comments and Deirdre Kiorgaard's were getting at the same thing. He added that this rule was originally written to do with place of publication, but now it was going to cover other types of places. He added that his suggestion was that these different types of places be treated as sub-elements under place. He said that the JSC would have to look to see if you would follow the same rules for place of production and creation. Barbara Tillett said that she thought the rules would be the same. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that it would be possible to generalise the rules. The Editor suggested that the rules in 5JSC/LC/2 be read in terms of "place associated with the resource" to see if everyone was happy with what was there. Barbara Tillett said that an instruction was missing for supplying the place when the resource was not self-describing, and this would apply to the other types of resources. The Editor confirmed that the instructions for "Local place not in resource but certain" would apply to everything e.g. manuscripts, original oil paintings, films etc. Jennifer Bowen said that she liked the concept of "place associated with the resource".

39.7.7   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she was concerned about the incongruity of 5JSC/LC/2 omitting the instructions for recording the full address, but that something very similar for archival resources had been added the previous day. The Editor said that he had room for what had been omitted under "contact information". JSC agreed.
          Action=Editor

39.7.8   The Editor summarized that the general rule for place would say: "Transcribe the place (local city/town) and its larger jurisdiction (if any) as they appear on the resource. If the place is uncertain or unknown choose the appropriate option as follows: …" Barbara Tillett asked if "or does not appear" should be added. The Editor suggested that if the place was uncertain or unknown this meant that it did not appear. Barbara Tillett said that you could know it, but it did not appear on the resource. Deirdre Kiorgaard said the issue was that the place was known, but did not appear. The Editor said that this was covered by the first condition. Judy Kuhagen said that the problem was the preceding sentence.

39.7.9   The Editor noted that in terms of the final option to supply "[place unknown]" when no place was known or probable, it had been suggested that there be an exception. He asked what the scope of application of the exception would be. Judy Kuhagen said that she knew that 5JSC/LC/1/Rev had not yet been discussed, but if there was a general instruction about anything not taken from the resource appearing in square brackets, then square brackets would have to be mentioned here. The Editor said that he had not repeated the general instruction in other places. Judy Kuhagen said that certain communities did not use square brackets. The Editor said that he could remove the instruction on square brackets, but the question was to do with adding "place unknown" for things that did not usually have places associated with them. John Attig noted that the introductory wording for A1.4C referred to options, but he thought that they were actually alternatives. The Editor said that he would list them as conditions a)-d). He added that there could be an option for resources that typically did not carry identifying information relating to place, to put nothing. Margaret Stewart asked if it really would be an option, as it wasn't

applicable. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there was the question of why something wasn't there in a record – because you did not bother to look, or because you looked and did not find. The Editor said that the basic rule would be to use "place unknown", but it was known that there were communities that did not want to do this for certain types of material. The Chair asked if it needed to be an option. The Editor said that there were options that took away from the basic rule. Margaret Stewart noted that "exception" had been used for other rules. The Editor said that it would be an "exception" if you could name the types of resources to which it applied. Jennifer Bowen suggested that it could be an exception for not self-describing resources. She added that for options libraries needed to make policy decisions, while this was more case by case. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that "typically did not carry identifying information" was better than "not self-describing". The Editor said that he would label the instruction as an exception, and he would word it in a similar way to 12.1.5. Jennifer Bowen noted that at 12.1.5 it was an option. Margaret Stewart suggested that it be changed to an exception. The Editor agreed.
Action=Editor

39.7.10   The Editor noted that some responses to 5JSC/LC/2 had suggested that guidance be added for when two or more places appeared on the item. Jennifer Bowen said that there needed to be something. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that in the past it was limited to two or more places to do with publication, but now it would be two or more places associated with the resource. She added that guidance was required. Barbara Tillett asked if it would be an option to include more than the first. Hugh Taylor said that selection was also an issue. Barbara Tillett said that in terms of consistency you would always take the first. The Editor noted that the rule did not say to take the first, and in other cases you would transcribe as many as you saw. Barbara Tillett said that this was what LC intended. Jennifer Bowen said that not saying anything would cause a problem. Barbara Tillett noted that according to the mandatory elements it was the first one. The Editor commented that there was no mandatory element for place. He added that in other cases where there were repetitions, the instructions said that when there was more than one to record them in the order in which they appeared in the resource. Barbara Tillett said that it did not tell you how to choose the "one". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that if there were a variety of activities under publication, there could be different places associated with these. The Editor said that there were going to be issues for MARC and that he had tried to ameliorate the situation for other elements by instructing to record them separately, e.g., at 12.2.2.3 (Basic instructions on recording parallel titles). He added that the 246 field was repeatable in MARC, and these could be taken in the order they appeared and slotted into an ISBD display. He said that in terms of place and date, because the ISBD became more complicated there was less chance of reproducing what was there.
Action=Secretary (MARC changes)

39.7.11   The Editor said that in response to Deirdre Kiorgaard's comment he was wondering if it was necessary to distinguish the different kinds of dates so that they did not interfile. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if rather than repeating the same instructions over and over there was a way to give general guidance. The Editor said that there could be basic instructions with simple instructions for each sub-element. He added that what was in 5JSC/LC/2 would become the basic instructions. Barbara Tillett confirmed that the wording for multiples would be based on 12.2.2.3. Jennifer Bowen said that there needed to do something about associating dates with places. The Editor said that you needed to

distinguish between different types of places and dates, and keep multiples of a type together.
Action=Editor

39.7.12   Barbara Tillett said that ALA had preferred that the paragraph on supplying the actual place not be optional. Jennifer Bowen said that her understanding was that currently this paragraph was not optional. Hugh Taylor agreed that it was currently not optional. Barbara Tillett said that LC would like it to be optional. The Editor commented that this paragraph would be an option under the first part of the rule as there was something on the item. The Chair said that the question was whether or not it would be an option. Hugh Taylor commented that this was a change to an AACR2 rule. Barbara Tillett said that LC would tell its cataloguers not to include it. Hugh Taylor asked if this was saving typing time at the expense of user convenience. Barbara Tillett said that individual libraries could choose to do it. The Chair noted that the alternative view was that the actual place should always be added. Jennifer Bowen said that if you knew that a place was fictitious you might have an idea what the real place was. She said that some people in ALA felt strongly about the issue. John Attig commented that fictitious places were only one aspect of the rule, which was a combination of three separate AACR2 rules. He suggested that it could be clearer to have them as separate rules. The Editor said that in the format he used the paragraph would be broken into a list. Jennifer Bowen asked if a library could pick and choose between the different options. The Editor said that it would be their choice. Jennifer Bowen said that this could be a middle ground. The Editor said that he would put the option with the first paragraph of the rule as they related to when you did have something.
Action=Editor

39.7.13   John Attig noted that in 5JSC/LC/2 all of the instructions on changes to publication information were in A1.4F. He noted that these would have to be split up as there was no general rule for publication information in RDA.
Action=Editor

39.7.14   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she had a couple of changes to "local place unknown but larger jurisdiction probable." She suggested that it should be "larger jurisdiction known or probable" and "province" should be added to the list of probable jurisdictions. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

39.8   A1.4D. Name of publisher

39.8.1   Barbara Tillett said that that there needed to be an addition made to A1.4D supply the name when it did not appear on the resource. The Editor noted that the first option was: "No publisher on resource but a distributor is named. Transcribe the name of the distributor as it appears on the resource. In so doing, transcribe its associated place in accordance with A1.4C." The Chair asked if the final sentence would be covered by the general instruction to link associated places and names. The Editor said that they would be separate elements. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this instruction needed to be somewhere. The Editor said that the first step was to identify what kind of place, date, and body you were recording first.

39.8.2   Judy Kuhagen suggested that associated bodies be looked at first, i.e. identify the activity first and then give its associated place and date. She added that in training beginning cataloguers, they were told to look for the publisher etc. first, and then find the place that went with it. The Editor said that ideally the role should be identified first. Judy Kuhagen said that she thought that the place was incidental, and in any event there were provisions for recording the contact address. The Editor said that the place could be different from the contact address, and he thought that there was justification for having elements for both place and contact address. He suggested that as the publisher was a mandatory element it could be listed first and the place was really just a qualifier. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought this was a good idea. She added that in A1.4D in 5JSC/LC/2 there was an order of precedence: publisher, distributor, manufacturer; but what had been discussed was recording multiple roles. She said that there needed to be a decision on whether there would be a decision-making process. Barbara Tillett said that she thought this was taken care of with the mandatory elements, i.e. you always used the first named. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the rule did need rewording so that you did not always have to go through the process of choosing.   Judy Kuhagen suggested that the rule could be generalized to cover the "person or body associated with the realization of the resource" as then it would encompass all of the named roles. The Editor said that the issue was the pecking order, i.e. what to record if there was no publisher. Judy Kuhagen said that the intent of the people who helped to draft 5JSC/LC/2 was that "publisher" would be a place-holder term. Barbara Tillett said that it was not a literal term.

39.8.3   The Chair asked for a summary of what had been decided. The Editor said that publisher would be dealt with first, and that there would still be three separate elements of place, body and date. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the idea of recording the publisher first was that other elements could be associated with this. The Editor said that the important thing was to get all of the data in, and then look at issues of display. He added that you could argue that the ISBD display was not self-evident. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that one thing that was omitted from 5JSC/LC/2 was the statement of function. The Editor said that this should at least be an option for all types of roles.
          Action=Editor

39.8.4   He added that in terms of the instruction to only record the manufacturer, if there was no publisher or distributor, he did not think that you should prevent people recording the manufacturer if they wanted to. He said that there would be a pecking order. Barbara Tillett said that LC would have to issue a rule interpretation telling people not to do it.
          Action=Editor

39.8.5   John Attig noted that at the beginning of the discussion it had been suggested that if the publisher was known but not stated it should be supplied in square brackets. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that the same model should be followed as for place. The JSC agreed.
          Action=Editor

39.8.6   The Editor asked if the instructions in 5JSC/LC/2 for early printed resources would become an exception. John Attig asked if there was any way to transcribe the exact statement as found on the item, as the roles were often ill-defined. The Editor said that others were suggesting that elements should be treated as potential access points. Jennifer

Bowen said that some people did want the publisher as an access point, and she suggested that there needed to be a discussion on whether there should be a provision for transcribing the publisher as you see it, or making it an access point. John Attig said that this would be like what was suggested for the statement of responsibility. The Editor said that he had something in the draft that you could transcribe a title, but also designate it an access point. He asked what had been decided regarding statements of responsibility. John Attig said that it had come up with the discussion of the mandatory elements list. The Editor said that he had nothing indicated as a change of text in the statement of responsibility element. Jennifer Bowen said that a section would need to be added on having a publisher as an access point. John Attig said that what he thought had been discussed was that a mandatory element could be an access point instead of a descriptive statement. He said that he did not think this is what people meant when they wanted the publisher as an access point. Hugh Taylor said that in 5JSC/LC/2 a number of things that people had criticized regarding publisher statements in AACR2 had been removed, e.g. the shortest form of name. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this was a good direction, even though it wasn't as far as some people would like. Hugh Taylor said that it should be possible to retrieve based on an accurate citation. The Editor suggested that the instruction be given to record any or all of the names associated with the resource, e.g. creator, producer, publisher, manufacturer. Barbara Tillett said that it needed to be clear that what was meant was the manifestation. The Editor said that the different names would be recorded as repetitions, with possibly functions added. He said that there would be an option that where such names are integrally related to record the whole statement. He added that he did not think this needed to be limited to early printed resources. Hugh Taylor said that he had assumed that the intent behind 5JSC/LC/2 was that the statement would be recorded as the publisher name. The Editor said that to satisfy Deirdre Kiorgaard's request there would be instructions to separate by function. He added that there would be an option to record the statement. Margaret Stewart asked if "Published by X" would be transcribed. The Editor said that this would be an option. John Attig said that this raised the issue of what you were transcribing – the name or the statement. The Editor said that generally you would record the name, and by exception you would record the statement. He added that he thought that the ISBD element was "name of publisher". He said that others might want to apply the exception to record the statement of function as it appears. [Note: see 5JSC/M/41.9.]
Action=Editor

39.8.7   The Editor noted that according to the response table ACOC had suggested that the AACR2 instruction at A1.4D2 to record the publisher's name in the shortest form be incorporated in broad terms. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she wasn't sure that there was strong agreement on this within ACOC.

39.8.8   The Editor said that ACOC and CCC had both suggested that there be guidance on phrases indicating function (A1.4D3). He said that this was covered by the option to record the statement as it appears. Margaret Stewart said that CCC wanted it to be clear that you just recorded the name of the publisher, and this was clear.

39.8.9   The Editor said that there had been a request in the responses for there to be guidance on when there were two or more publishers. He said that he would model this on what had

been done for other elements, i.e. record in the order suggested by the order of information on the source.
Action=Editor

39.8.10   The Editor noted that ACOC had suggested that guidance was required on subsidiaries and trade names (A1.4D5). He added that this rule had undergone expansion through the work of the Consistency Task Force. He asked if this should be built into the draft text in 5JSC/LC/2. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that title pages were becoming more confusing with a number of names associated with a company appearing on them, and people weren't sure what to do. She added that there was also overlap with the series title, and the current instruction was: "If a trade name appears to be the name of a series rather than of a publishing subdivision, record it as a series title." She added that the same issue came up with the imprint. The Chair said that she thought that guidance would be helpful. Judy Kuhagen asked if details could be included in the definition. The Editor said that this wouldn't cover everything in A1.4D5. He said that the in case of doubt provision in the rule had come about through the work of the Consistency Task Force. He added that the general trend over the last few years had been to provide more guidance in this area, but that it had all been removed with the LC proposal. The Editor said that he could put the guidance after the basic instructions so that it was not included with the mandatory element, but would provide assistance for complicated situations. Barbara Tillett said that there was the general principle of whether the additional guidance should be provided. The Editor said that this was what he had meant earlier in the meeting when he had brought up the issue of comprehensiveness. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that in terms of published resources this was a very common situation. Margaret Stewart said that she would be concerned about what people would do if they were given no guidance. The Editor said that he thought that inclusion of trade names on title pages was becoming more common. Jennifer Bowen said that in the ALA response there were a number of requests for "in case of doubt" clauses. She suggested that more guidance could be given on mandatory elements. John Attig noted that the mandatory element was the "first named" and this could be an arbitrary way of dealing with the problem. He added that this could lead to inconsistencies, but it was a simpler rule. The Editor said that people would still wonder whether the first named was the company or the subdivision. Margaret Stewart noted that some might have more knowledge about the publisher. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there were two issues, and for identification if you took the first name it did give you consistency, but there might be issues if you wanted to use this information to order the item. Barbara Tillett said that no matter what you put you would have to search for more information for ordering. The Chair asked if there had been a decision. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there would be no doubt if you always used the first. The Editor confirmed that A1.4D5 would not be included. Deirdre Kiorgaard agreed, and that if you always reduced it to the first named this was always something you could use. The Editor said that the first named was only to do with the mandatory element, while the instruction said to transcribe the names. He said that this meant that you would end up transcribing both the publisher and the subdivision. Deirdre Kiorgaard commented that it did not cover whether or not it was a series. The Editor said that he could try to clarify the definition.

Jennifer Bowen said that she did not think that ALA would be comfortable leaving out the instructions. She added that this was something that would have to be addressed in the PR. The Chair noted that this came back to the whole discussion on simplification. Jennifer

Bowen said that rules had been added in the past because people thought they were needed. Hugh Taylor asked if the real question was, "What is a publisher?" He added that this was something that could be addressed in the Glossary. Jennifer Bowen said that she had concerns about removing the guidance. Barbara Tillett asked if she wanted an "in case of doubt" provision. The Editor said that the "in case of doubt" provision of A1.4D5 was only part of the rule and did not make sense on its own. Jennifer Bowen asked whether the rule could be that if you were not sure whether the name was that of a publisher, or a subdivision, to give the first name. The Editor said that the first paragraph of the rule dealt with when you did know. He said that he thought at least the first part of A1.4D5 should be retained, i.e. if you have both the name of the company and the name of the subdivision; use the name of the subdivision. Judy Kuhagen said that another aspect was the hierarchy, e.g. for a government document, the department and the ministry could both be named. She added that she did not see why commercial publications should be different. Barbara Tillett noted that what was being suggested was to give all names. Hugh Taylor confirmed that it would be given all as one name rather than two. The Editor asked if there needed to be instruction to this effect. Margaret Stewart said that she did not think this would be intuitive, and there needed to be an example or something. Barbara Tillett summarized that if there seemed to be a hierarchy you would transcribe them all. Margaret Stewart noted this was a change to current practice. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that if it was all there, then the next person who came across the resource would be able to tell that they had the same thing. She added that in terms of series she took Judy Kuhagen's point that the issue was more widespread. The Editor said that there would be an instruction that said if the name appeared to consist of names in a hierarchy to give the whole thing.
Action=Editor

39.8.11 The Chair said that the next suggestion in the response table was from ALA, that instruction should be added for when no publisher appears but the name is known. The Editor said that this had already been dealt with. He added that the next line dealt with the statement of function, and this would be treated as an option.

39.9 A1.4E. Date

39.9.1 A1.4E a) Published resources

Barbara Tillett noted that ALA had suggested that there be an option for early printed resources to transcribe the entire date. She added that she was assuming that as discussed it would be identified which date went with each publisher. She said that the text in 5JSC/LC/2 A1.4E would need to be changed to remove "published resources" and there would need to be a condition not to put a supplied date in square brackets. The Editor asked if the ALA comment was new or was referring to something that existed already. Jennifer Bowen said that this would be comparable to taking something as you saw it. Barbara Tillett said that there was some wording in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up at 12.7. The Chair asked if there was text for early printed resources. Barbara Tillett said that there was nothing about early printed resources, but manuscripts and archives. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the same principles would apply. John Attig asked if what was being suggested was a replacement for A1.4E b) in 5JSC/LC/2. Barbara Tillett said that "b) For unpublished resources or assembled collections, record the date of production or assembly" would need to be expanded by instructions on inclusive dates, bulk dates,

single dates, and undated. John Attig said that ALA was asking for comparable rule for single dates for published material. Barbara Tillett said that they had tried to word the instructions so that they could be used beyond unpublished or archival materials. The Editor asked if the wording in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up for single dates covered what ALA wanted for early printed resources. Deirdre Kiorgaard confirmed that it would not be specified how the date was to appear. Barbara Tillett said that LC had included a note about varying practice for the order of date element. The Editor said that he would generalise the note.
Action=Editor

39.9.2   A1.4E a) i) Date not in Western-style Arabic numerals

Barbara Tillett noted that ACOC had suggested that "comprehensibility" be replaced with "comprehension", and that she thought this was fine. She added that ALA had suggested that "such numerals" be revised. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA wanted more clarity. Barbara Tillett noted that the caption said, "Date not in Western-style Arabic numerals". Hugh Taylor suggested that "such numerals" be removed from the instruction. The Editor confirmed that the date to be added was in Western-style Arabic numerals. He suggested that this be included in the rule. Barbara Tillett proposed that the rule would say: "Add the Western-style year(s) in square brackets as needed for comprehension." The Editor asked if there were numerals that were not Western-style, e.g. in reading from right to left. Barbara Tillett said that there were other kinds of Arabic numerals, e.g. Arabic numerals in Arabic. The Editor said that this was an issue for other instructions, and that the appendix on numerals only referred to Arabic numerals. The Chair said that this was related to the internationalization issue. The Editor noted that previously "arabic" with a small initial letter had been used, which could be a solution. Barbara Tillett suggested that this could be an editorial fix once a decision had been made on what to use.

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had suggested that guidance in the rule needed to be appropriate for when supplying a romanized transcription. She read from 5JSC/LC/2/ALA response: "The Association of Jewish Libraries (AJL) and the ALA Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials (CC:AAM) have both noted their concern that the guidance in this rule be appropriate when providing a romanized transcription. It will be important that the general rules for "Language and Script of the Description" be compatible with the wording of this rule to prevent confusion among catalogers who are providing romanized transcriptions. In general, AJL and CCAAM are concerned that options be available not only for romanizing dates according to approved romanization tables, but also for recording dates using Arabic numerals in romanized transcriptions in situations where it would simply be too difficult to provide a transcription for original script numerals. In either case both groups see a need to avoid applying the provisions of A1.4E as written in these situations."

Barbara Tillett noted that she had handled out a sheet with a proposed revision to A1.4E from Lenore Bell at the Library of Congress. She added that this contained proposed wording that could solve the problem: "i) If the date is not in Western-style Arabic numerals, transcribe the date as it appears on the resource in nonroman transcriptions. In romanized transcriptions, transcribe the date according to the practise prescribed in the appropriate romanization table." Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if this needed to include the

instruction to add Western-style years. The Editor said that his understanding was that if you were doing a non-romanized transcription you would take what you saw, and for a romanized transcription you would follow romanization practice. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought that AJL and CC:AAM wanted more than this, i.e. to be able to record an Arabic numeral in a romanized transcription. John Attig noted that in some cases romanizing did not give you an Arabic number. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA wanted an easier option. John Attig asked how romanization was being handled in RDA. The Editor said that in part I he had carried over text from AACR2 and 11.5 contained instructions on the language and script of the description. He added that romanization was included in the following option: "If any of the elements listed above cannot be recorded in the script used on the source from which it is taken, record it in a transliterated form." Jennifer Bowen said that this did not cover adding a date in Arabic numerals. John Attig asked when transliteration would not give a date. Jennifer Bowen said that she would go back to AJL and CC:AAM and ask for example of what was required. [Note: see next paragraph.]

Judy Kuhagen said that at 12.5.2.4 there was a rule for dates not of the Gregorian or Julian calendar, but there was not anything about dates not in Western-style Arabic numerals. The Chair agreed that this was an inconsistency. The Editor asked if what was at A1.4E a) i) on the supplementary sheet would go at both A1.4E (12.8 in RDA) and 12.5. Barbara Tillett asked if the provision to put the date in a different script should be an option. She added that this was an exception to the general rule to take what was on the resource. The Editor asked what was proposed. Barbara Tillett said that the option would read something like: "If the date is not in Western-style Arabic numerals, transcribe in romanized transcription according to the practice prescribed in the appropriate romanization table. The Editor said that he did not think this added anything more than was in 11.5. Judy Kuhagen said that the text should either be added for chronological designations, or not included for dates. The Editor said that it would depend on what was heard back from ALA. Jennifer Bowen said that she would see if 11.5 solved the ALA concerns. Barbara Tillett said that A1.4E a) i) in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up needed to be an option. The Editor agreed and confirmed that A1.4E a) i) from the supplementary sheet would not be used. He added that chronograms were linked to A1.4E a) i) on the supplementary sheet, and would need to be discussed. Barbara Tillett said that she thought this was just another option that could be included.
Action=Editor

39.9.3   A1.4E a) ii) Date not of the Gregorian or Julian calendar

Barbara Tillett said that the proposed wording from the supplementary sheet was: "Optionally, if the date is not of the Gregorian or Julian calendar, follow it with the equivalent year(s) of the Gregorian or Julian calendar in square brackets if needed for comprehension. Note: Such additions need not be included in non-roman transcriptions, when provided in roman parallel fields." The Editor said that RDA would not go into record structures, so he did not think that the note was appropriate. Barbara Tillett suggested that this was a repeatable data element that was given in one form and then another. She added that the prefixes "nonroman field" and "roman field" could be removed from the examples. The Editor said that the parallel fields terminology was not appropriate, and that instead of "follow" in the rule you would use "add". The Chair confirmed that this would be an option. Barbara Tillett said that the note would need to be

moved to an LCRI, but that she thought the example could be used without the captions. The Editor noted that the example was also illustrating the footnote on chronograms. John Attig said that he was puzzled by the footnote, as chronograms were not restricted to non-roman materials. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed and she would like to see it expanded. John Attig said that they were also not necessarily non-Gregorian. Barbara Tillett said that this was why the footnote had originally been linked to A1.4E a) i).

The Editor said that his understanding was that you would transcribe the chronogram, and that if you could turn this into a date you would do so. Barbara Tillett said that there needed to be an option to add the date, but that it needed to be clear which date. The Editor noted that some chronograms would have an equivalent Gregorian date and some would have an equivalent non-Gregorian date. He suggested that this could be generalized to: transcribe the chronogram as is, give the equivalent date in the relevant calendar, and then if you still do not have a Gregorian or Julian date, add that too. Hugh Taylor confirmed that these would all be options. Barbara Tillett noted that "transcribe as is" would be the general rule. John Attig commented that some chronograms were very long and went on for lines and lines. Judy Kuhagen noted that the LC supplementary proposal distinguished between simple and complex chronograms. John Attig said that in the rare books rules you did not transcribe the chronogram as it appeared, you only gave the interpretation. He said that an example you could have a sentence with certain letters capitalized to provide the numbers. The Editor said that essentially the option would have an option within it.
Action=Editor

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she had a general point to clarify. She explained that in the past when data was corrected, this was included in the same element, and asked if this was still the case. The Editor said that according to RDA it would be treated as a single element, even if record storage separated roman and non-roman forms. He added that implicitly you were adding to an element, as opposed to creating another instance of the element.

The Chair asked the Editor if he had enough to work with on this instruction. The Editor said that he did.

39.9.4   A1.4E a) iii) No publication date on the resource

Barbara Tillett asked for an explanation of the ALA comment that the rule did not provide sufficient guidance for recording dates for serials and integrating resources when the first issue/iteration is not available. Margaret Stewart said that the provision in 5JSC/LC/2 A1.4E a) iii) to record an approximate date was different from CONSER practice. She explained that in Canada an approximate date was supplied. The Chair said that this was also BL practice. Judy Kuhagen said that it was related to the basis of description, and that if you were not cataloguing from the first issue you did not give a date. Margaret Stewart said that in Canada even if they did not have the first issue they would supply something in the 260. Judy Kuhagen said that they would add it in the 008. Barbara Tillett commented that what was in 5JSC/LC/2 fitted with Canadian practice. She asked if this would be a problem for CONSER. Judy Kuhagen replied that you had to be confident of when the resource started. Margaret Stewart said that you could usually work this out and

the date would be supplied in square brackets. Judy Kuhagen said that one problem with counting backwards from the issue in hand was that you wouldn't know if there had been a title change. The Chair said that the cataloguer had to make a judgement. Margaret Stewart commented that A1.4E a) iii) was no different from current AACR2 practice. Jennifer Bowen asked if there had always been a CONSER exception. Margaret Stewart agreed that this was the case.

The Editor asked if question marks were included with the approximate date. Margaret Stewart confirmed that they were. The Editor noted that A1.4E a) iii) did not say this, and asked if the existing rule did. Jennifer Bowen said that it did not. The Editor commented that in A1.4F7 some of the examples had question marks. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this was a general problem with A1.4F7 and that ACOC had suggested that the examples be simplified and incorporated into the rule. The Editor said that he agreed that rules were implicit in the examples in A1.4F7. He added that A1.4E a) iii) could be expanded. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if A1.4E a) iii) would still contain an order of preference. Barbara Tillett said that was the LC intention. The Editor said that he would break up A1.4E a) iii) with indentations to reflect the ways of supplying approximate dates.
Action=Editor

Judy Kuhagen asked about spans of dates for multipart and serials. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that ALA had suggested that A1.4E b) be revised to allow a range of dates for assembled collections. Barbara Tillett said that she understood that the provisions in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up for inclusive dates would be generalized. She added that "bulk dates" were specific to archives and manuscripts. The Editor said that the instructions for inclusive dates would be generalized, with the instructions for bulk dates applying to archival collections. He added that it had already been agreed that the instructions on single dates would be generalized at 12.8. He asked about the paragraph in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up on "undated" which overlapped with what had just been discussed. Barbara Tillett asked if this could be used instead of the detailed examples. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the LC wording of "or other interval as precisely as possible" was an improvement on the current wording. The Chair noted that 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up had introduced the following: "When it may be misleading to record an estimated date, use "undated"." Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that this was similar to a place of publication that could not be guessed at. The Chair said that this would mean using "date unknown". Jennifer Bowen said that she preferred "date unknown". The Editor said that he would need to massage the text. [Note: see 5JSC/M/39.14.7.]

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that one example in A1.4F7 that she did not think should be carried forward into the new rule was "[between 1906 and 1912] use only for dates fewer than 20 years apart". She added that if you knew the date was between 1850 and 1950, you should be able to put that. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

39.9.5   A1.4E b) Unpublished resources or assembled collections

The Editor noted that this had been superseded by the instructions from 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up on bulk and inclusive dates. Barbara Tillett said that ACOC had noted that incorrect dates were covered by A1.0F8. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC was happy

for A1.4F2 to be deleted. Barbara Tillett said that ACOC had suggested that the examples in A1.4F7 be simplified and incorporated into the rule. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this had just been agreed. Barbara Tillett said that ACOC had suggested that other dates (A1.4F9) be incorporated in broad terms. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this had also been done.

39.10   A1.4F. Changes in publication information

39.10.1 The Editor said that he would put instructions on changes with each element. Judy Kuhagen asked if there would be separate data elements for the earlier and later place, etc. The Editor said that he would do things in the same way as he had for changes in the title proper. He confirmed that there were no changes to the existing rules on changes in publication information.
Action=Editor

39.11   The Editor said that the JSC needed to discuss the line numbers from 5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev listed under 12.6-12.8 in 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 12.

39.12   12.6. Place of publication, distribution, etc.

39.12.1 Line 281: restore distinction between published and unpublished material (ACOC 11: p. 12; ALA p. 2, 11: pp. 60-62; BL 11: p. 18; CCC 11: p. 10; CILIP 11: p. 15; LC 11: p. 34)

The Editor noted that this had already been covered.

39.12.2 Line 282: introduce concept of self-describing resources (LC)

The Editor said that 5JSC/LC rep/1 had been discussed.

39.12.3 Line 283: allow for English language equivalent [to s.l. and s.n.] (ACOC 11: p. 12; CCC 11: p. 10)

The Editor said that this had been agreed.

39.12.4 Line 291: suggest new second sentence for A1.4A1 to allow repetition of data in area 4 that has already been recorded in other areas (ALA 11: p. 56)

Jennifer Bowen said that she would need to take the issue back to ALA as according to the response table only ACOC had agreed.
Action=Jennifer Bowen

39.12.5 Line 292: remove reference to "other preliminaries" in A1.4A1 (ALA 11: p. 56)

Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this was moot.

39.12.6 Line 293: query exclusion of colophon in A1.4A1 (ALA 11: p. 56)

Barbara Tillett said that this was moot.

39.12.7   Line 296: query exclusion of "Consider all remote access electronic resources to be published" at A1.4B (ALA 11: p. 56)

The Editor said that this was no longer an issue.

39.12.8   Line 297: add option for early printed resources at A1.4B3 (ALA 8: p. 49; 11: p. 56)

The Editor said that this had been generalized.

39.12.9   Line 300: query re inconsistency between A1.4C4 allowing for completion of the place of publication, but the name is not completed in the statement of responsibility area for unpublished materials (ACOC 11: p. 12)

The Editor said that there was now no completion of the place of publication.

39.12.10 Line 301: delete third sentence from A1.4C5; revise examples; add option for early printed resources (ALA 8: pp. 49-50; 11: p. 57)

Jennifer Bowen said that this had been covered.

39.12.11 Line 302: add an option to A1.4C6 to allow the cataloguer to supply the place of publication in the same language and script as the name of the publisher (ALA 11: p. 57)

The Editor said that there was a general guideline on interpolations under 11.5 (Language and script of the description): "Record interpolations into the elements listed above [which includes the publication elements] in the language and script of the other data in the element unless the instructions for a specific element indicate otherwise." He said that this would satisfy the ALA request.

39.12.12 Line 303: delete last sentence in A1.4C7 (ALA 11: p. 57)

The Editor said that the final sentence read: "Do not record the full address for major trade publishers." Barbara Tillett noted that you could record the address in the contact information element.

39.12.13 Line 304: flag exception for unpublished in A1.4C8 and A1.4D9 at the beginning of A1.4C and A1.4D (CILIP 7: p. 13)

Barbara Tillett said that this was moot.

39.12.14 Line 305: apply A1.4C8 to all collections; delete "assembled" (LC 4: p. 28)

Barbara Tillett noted that this had been done.

39.12.15 Line 306: include place of creation/production under A1.4C8 (ACOC 4: p. 8; ALA 4: p. 28)

Jennifer Bowen said that this had been done.

39.12.16 Line 307: clarify reference in second paragraph of A1.4C8 (ALA: 4: p. 28)

Jennifer Bowen read out the comment: "The reference in the second paragraph reads as if the place in which an unpublished resource was produced is always given in a note, whereas the rule referred to actually says to do this only under certain conditions. Is there a better way to word references such as this?" Barbara Tillett said that the reference was no longer in the rule.

39.12.17 Line 332: remove "optionally" from instructions re early printed resources in A1.4G1 (LC 8: p. 32)

Barbara Tillett said that this was a moot point.

39.12.18 Line 333: incorporate A1.4G4 into A1.4G1; delete A1.4G4 (ALA 8: pp. 42-43; 11, pp. 59-60)

Jennifer Bowen said this had been dealt with.

39.13   12.7. Publisher, distributor, etc.

39.13.1 Line 311: remove "optionally" from instructions re early printed resources in A1.4D1; delete reference to A1.4D (LC 8: pp. 31-32)

Barbara Tillett said that the comment was superseded.

39.13.2 Line 312: clarify "see" reference in A1.4D1 at end of option for early printed resources (ALA 11: p. 57)

Barbara Tillett noted that this had just been discussed.

39.13.3 Line 313: replace first sentence in A1.4D2 or make optional provision for early printed resources (ALA 11: p. 57-58)

Jennifer Bowen said that this comment had been covered.

39.13.4 Line 314: delete subparagraph d) in A1.4D4 (ALA 8: p. 42; 11: p. 58)

Jennifer Bowen said that this comment had been covered.

39.13.5 Line 315: add option for early printed resources in A1.4D4 (ALA 8: p. 42; 11: p. 58)

Jennifer Bowen said that this comment had been covered.

39.13.6 Line 316: revise A1.4D5 to use the word "imprint" and simplify wording (ACOC 11: p. 12)

Barbara Tillett noted that this would not be done.

39.13.7 Line 317: apply A1.4D9 to all collections; delete "assembled" (LC 4: p. 28)

Barbara Tillett said this had been done.

39.14   12.8. Date of Publication, distribution, etc.

39.14.1   Line 320: add option for early printed resources at A1.4F1 (ALA 8: p. 50; 11: p. 58-59)

Jennifer Bowen noted that it had been agreed to take what you saw.

39.14.2   Line 321: add instructions to A2.4F1 on recording multiple dates that are not Gregorian/Julian (ALA 5: p. 31)

Barbara Tillett said that this was covered by the instructions on inclusive dates, and what to do if a date was not Gregorian/Julian.

39.14.3   Line 322: add instructions to A2.4F1 on recording dates for digitized back runs of issues (BL 5: p. 13)

Barbara Tillett said that there needed to be something for dates of reproductions in general. The Editor suggested that this be discussed with reproductions and 5JSC/LC/1Rev, in particular whether there was one instruction, or the instructions were included with each element. Barbara Tillett said that in addition to where the instructions went in RDA, the general principle needed to be discussed. The Chair read from 5JSC/AACR3/I/BL response: "One reviewer requests guidance for dealing with back runs of issues that are digitized and published after the current issues." Barbara Tillett suggested that instead of this case law approach, there could be instructions for reproductions in general. Barbara Tillett said that her personal view would be that you should record the dates for the original and the reproduction. She added that the traditional practice was that the date was the date of the resource being catalogued, i.e. the date of digitization, with the original date in a note. The Editor said that this was what was in 5JSC/LC/1Rev and 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1, with an exception for serials. Judy Kuhagen said that the issue also came with serials numbering. The Editor suggested that the issue be discussed with 5JSC/LC/1Rev. [Note: see 5JSC/M/47.27.]

39.14.4   Line 323: reword A1.4F2 to allow for when the correct date is unknown (ALA 11, p. 59)

Jennifer Bowen said that this was for cases when the cataloguer knew that the date was incorrect, but did not know the correct date. The Editor noted that there were instructions for notes on dates. Jennifer Bowen said that the following wording had been suggested: "If a date is known to be incorrect, add the correct date if known or an approximate correct date." The Editor said that under the current instructions you only supplied an approximate date if there was no date on the resource. Judy Kuhagen noted that it was a similar situation to the fictional place. Hugh Taylor asked if 11.6.9 could be made more general to include fictional imprints etc. The Editor said that instructions on inaccuracies came under transcription. Barbara Tillett asked if the Editor would expand the options for fictitious places to publishers and dates. The Editor agreed.
Action=Editor

39.14.5   Line 324: revise A1.4F7 to allow use of "between … and …" for other ranges of dates (ALA 8: p. 42; 11: p. 59)

The Chair noted that this had been done.

39.14.6   Line 325: add option to A1.4F7 to use 4-digit dates for decades, centuries, etc. (LC 2A: p. 17)

John Attig noted that this suggestion had not been included in 5JSC/LC/2. Barbara Tillett said that the relevant rule had not been included in 5JSC/LC/2. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the provisions of the rule had just been added back in. Hugh Taylor read from 5JSC/AACR3/I/LC response: "Allow an option to use 4-digit years in expressing all dates, instead of using a hyphen to replace zeroes. The hyphen technique is less clear for users then expressions such as "1970s" (instead of "197-") and "1800s" (instead of "18-"). The first decade of century could be described as "between 1800 and 1810". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that all responses in the table had agreed with the suggestion except CILIP. Hugh Taylor said that it could go forward. The Editor said that he would implement the LC suggestion in the draft.
Action=Editor

39.14.7   Line 326: eliminate instruction in A1.4F8 not to record date for naturally occurring object (LC 2A: p. 17)

Judy Kuhagen asked if there had been a decision to use "date unknown". Barbara Tillett said that this was incorrect as these resources were "undated". She added that this was what was suggested in 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up. The Editor asked if date should be handled in the same way as place, with an exception not to record a date. Barbara Tillett said that "undated" had a very specific meaning and both had to be provided for. She added that her personal preference was not to give a date if one was not present, but that others disagreed. The Editor said that he would look at this further.
Action=Editor

39.14.8   Line 327: apply A1.4F8 to all collections; delete "assembled" (LC 4: p. 28)

Barbara Tillett said that this had been done.

39.14.9   Line 328: change reference in B1.4F8 to refer to A1.7B9 (ALA 4: p. 29)

Barbara Tillett said that this was moot.

39.14.10 Line 329: expand A1.4F9 to cover B6.4F1 and B7.4F1 (ACOC 2B: p.5)

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC had suggested that any other useful dates be recorded in a note. The Editor said that there would be instructions on notes on dates.

39.15   The Chair asked if discussion of 5JSC/LC/2 was complete. The Editor said that it was, but there still needed to be a general discussion on simplification. [Note: see 5JSC/M/58.]

Executive Session 4

40   Communication with other resource description communities (continued)

40.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

End of Executive Session 4

41   A0 rules for what is being described, number of records, basis of description, sources; changes to A1.0 and A1.1B

41.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/LC/1
5JSC/LC/1/Rev
5JSC/LC/1/Rev/ALA response
5JSC/LC/1/Rev/ACOC response
5JSC/LC/1/Rev/CILIP response
5JSC/LC/1/Rev/BL response

5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1
5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ACOC response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ALA response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/CCC response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/CILIP response
5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/BL response

41.2   The Chair suggested that the discussion follow the response table for 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up and 5JSC/LC/1/Rev prepared by the Secretary.

41.3   General comments

41.3.1   The Chair noted that both ACOC and ALA generally supported the approach in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev, BL and CILIP thought that it was difficult to separate some of the issues from the publication models for RDA and were concerned that paring down of rules might result in lack of clarity, and CCC thought that 5JSC/LC/1/Rev was too stripped down.

41.4   Specific requests for feedback: 1. Adequacy and clarity of the guidelines for "setting up the description" under 1.2

41.4.1   The Editor said that in his drafts of RDA chapters 11 and 12 he had tried to incorporate comments from the responses to 5JSC/LC/1/Rev and 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1 where there seemed to be consensus or some agreement. He added that he had incorporated the following comments from 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/ACOC response: avoid use of long lists; add a paragraph addressing change in a resource; divide information about relationships into analytical descriptions and comprehensive descriptions. He noted that he had followed these suggestions from 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/CCC response: combine information from 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 on what aspect of

the resource to emphasize and what type of description to provide; and, simplify use of "produced and/or disseminated". The Editor said that in response to the CILIP comment that there needed to be a numbering structure to facilitate reference to particular parts of rules, he had changed the style to use a), b), and c) and made precise references. He added that also in response to 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/CILIP response he had expunged the use of "set".

41.5   Specific requests for feedback: 2. Feasibility of simplifying and "homogenizing" the specifications for preferred and alternative sources set out in the table and footnotes under 2.0.2.2

41.5.1   The Editor said that the responses to this were mixed in their support of his approach and 5JSC/LC/1/Rev, so he had done nothing. He added that the full version of the specification was only ever intended as a working tool for those in the constituency responses who had wanted the rules put back to how they were.

41.6   Specific requests for feedback: 3. Placement of instructions on preferred sources of information (at 2.0.2.2 or under 2.1.1.2)

41.6.1   The Editor said that again there had been a mixed response, and he had left the rules where they were.

41.7   Specific requests for feedback: 4. Changes affecting current practices for bracketing information in the description

41.7.1   The Editor said that everyone was in agreement with the LC suggestion that square brackets should be limited to information supplied from outside the resource, so he had written this in.

41.8   Specific requests for feedback: 5. Order of preference for sources of info. for edition, numbering, publication, distribution, etc., information, and series statements

41.8.1   The Editor said that there had been some agreement regarding series statements, so he had implemented this.

41.9   Additional numbered comments from LC: 6. Missing component of the rules - use as access points

41.9.1   The Editor said that he had included text on using descriptive elements as access points in the draft of chapter 12. He explained that the first occurrence was in the final paragraph of 12.0 (Purpose and scope): "Certain of the elements covered in this chapter (e.g., titles) may be used not only for descriptive purposes, but to support access as well. For those elements, this chapter provides guidelines and instructions on recording the data in a manner that will meet the requirements of both description and access, thereby minimizing redundancy in the recording of data." He explained that this paragraph set the stage. He added that there was also text at 12.2.0.8 (Titles used as access points), which applied to all titles: "If a title recorded as a descriptive element (e.g., title proper, parallel title) is to be used as an access point as well, a content designator (e.g., an indicator in a MARC record) may be used to generate the access point directly from the descriptive data." The

Editor explained that in this first bullet point of the rule there was no way not to refer to a content designator. He then read out the second bullet point: "If the data recorded for descriptive purposes includes information indicating the source of the title, etc. (see 12.2.4), that information must be differentiated from the title *per se* by means of content designation (e.g., a subfield code in a MARC record) in order to enable the generation of an access point for the title directly from the descriptive data."

41.9.2   The Editor said that in his initial sample text for the Prospectus had included this instruction, and LC had commented that he had not done what was expected. He asked what LC had expected. Barbara Tillett said that she was expecting to see under each data element that it could be recorded as a statement, as a note, and as an access point. The Editor said that this was basically what he was following, with a general statement at 12.0, and instructions like 12.2.0.8 for top-level elements. He added that there did not seem to be any point in repeating the instructions under each sub-element. John Attig asked if this had been done for statements of responsibility. The Editor said that he hadn't because what had been discussed was not generating an access point from the statement, but giving the access point as an alternative to the statement. Barbara Tillett said that her understanding was that additionally it could be an access point. She added that the Editor was being too literal about how this would be done by mentioning the content designator. The Editor said that if you wanted an element to do double-duty, there needed to be some sort of signal. Barbara Tillett suggested that it could say "may also be provided as an access point." The Editor replied that this implied that you were going to create an access point.

41.9.3   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she was confused about what was meant, an access point as transcribed in the element, or an access point as constructed. Barbara Tillett said that she would also like to see this clarified. She added that it could be as transcribed or as a controlled element. The Editor said that part II would cover the controlled element. Barbara Tillett said that part I also covered access and part II was relationships. The Editor said that part I was description, but included descriptive elements that could be used as access points. Barbara Tillett said that for a title it could either be transcribed and used as a descriptive element or turned into a controlled access point. The Editor said that he did not want to include the controlled aspect in part I, as this would be covered in part III, "Access point control". Barbara Tillett said that this meant that part I could only be uncontrolled. The Editor agreed to the extent that it dealt with access points. Jennifer Bowen noted that you could not control and transcribe at the same time. The Editor said that he had given indications on how to generate an uncontrolled access point from a descriptive element, as opposed to using a controlled access point in place of a descriptive element. He added that for statements of responsibility it had been discussed that there would be an instruction that the statement of responsibility was mandatory, but it could be left out and replaced with a controlled access point.

41.9.4   John Attig said that he thought that the distinction between controlled and uncontrolled should be much higher than part I, in the General Introduction. He added that the use of uncontrolled transcribed data elements as access points applied to any data element (e.g. notes), and he did not think it needed to be repeated. He suggested that there could just be a very general statement at 12.0. The Editor said that he had done this. John Attig said that there were also instructions under some elements and he did not think these added

anything to the general statement. The Editor said that he had instructions at the individual elements because he thought that was what LC wanted. Barbara Tillett said that there had been a misunderstanding.

41.9.5 The Editor said that he would move the general statement on descriptive elements used as access points at 12.0 to chapter 11, and that he would delete the relevant instructions under the elements, e.g. at 12.2.0.8 and 12.9.1.5. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that in terms of the paragraph in 12.0 referred to access, and it needed to be made clear that this was not controlled access. The Editor suggested that the paragraph could read: "Certain of the elements covered in part I (e.g., titles) may be used not only for descriptive purposes, but to support access as well. For those elements, part I provides guidelines and instructions on recording the data element in a manner that will meet the requirements of description thereby minimizing redundancy in the recording of data." Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the second sentence was actually required. The Editor said that you would lose the rationale of minimizing redundancy. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the use of a controlled access point instead of a descriptive element could be mentioned. Jennifer Bowen suggested that the two different options be presented in the paragraph. The Editor said that he would try to do this.
Action=Editor

41.9.6 Jennifer Bowen noted that there were a number of cases where you could not use a controlled access point in lieu of a descriptive element. The Editor said that he would include that this could only be done in some cases. Barbara Tillett asked if there would be something at the specific elements to say this. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it would be good to have something at the specific elements, but not what was currently there (e.g. at 12.2.0.8). Barbara Tillett agreed and said that there needed to be instructions at the specific elements that there could be a controlled access point in lieu of a descriptive element. The Editor said that he understood that the instructions on generating an access point would only occur once, in chapter 11. JSC agreed. Margaret Stewart asked if 12.2.0.8 would be removed. The Editor confirmed that it would be. Barbara Tillett said that going through the draft of chapter 12, the statement of responsibility was the first time that you could do a controlled access point instead of a descriptive element. The Editor said that he would add something to 12.3.0, probably after 12.3.0.2 (Sources of information). Barbara Tillett noted that the instruction did not apply to edition, or numbering, or place of publication, but it did apply to publisher (12.7) and series (12.9). Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she was becoming increasingly uncomfortable with what was being proposed. Margaret Stewart asked if what was being suggested was that for these elements you did not need to transcribe, you could just have an access point. Hugh Taylor asked how this fitted in with the list of mandatory data elements. Barbara Tillett said that for the publisher there could be an access point in addition to the element. The Editor said that all that would be covered in part I were access points in lieu of the descriptive elements. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the instructions would be better in chapter 11 with the mandatory elements. Jennifer Bowen said that this could be a good middle ground. John Attig said that in order for this to work, there needed to be appropriate rules in part III on constructing the controlled access point, and this actually limited you to very few data elements. Jennifer Bowen asked what would be included with the mandatory element list. The Editor said that "statement of responsibility" would have a footnote to say that it could be omitted if there was a controlled access point. John Attig asked if this alternative

would be offered for series. Judy Kuhagen noted that some libraries just wanted to give the 8XX tag and not the 4XX. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that a general statement would be better. Barbara Tillett said that she wanted it to be explicitly mentioned for statement of responsibility and series. Hugh Taylor confirmed that publisher name was so crucial for identification that it would be transcribed and not substituted. The Editor said that in the mandatory element list he would indicate by means of footnotes that an access point could be given in lieu of the statement of responsibility and the series title and numbering. Barbara Tillett said that she thought it needed to be clear that it was a controlled access point. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

41.10   Additional numbered comments from LC: 7. Setting up the description, p. 2

41.10.1   The Editor said that 1.2 Setting up the Description was now 11.2 Type of Description. He explained that "type of description" came from the ALA response. He said that it did not cover what you were cataloguing, but the type of description you could use. The Editor explained that there were three options: comprehensive description (the resource as a whole); analytical description (a part of a larger resource); and, multilevel description (both a comprehensive description and an analytical description). Barbara Tillett said that LC had called this section "What is being described", and the starting point was what the cataloguer had in front of them. She added that they could be describing the resource itself, a component part of the resource, or the aggregate resource. The Editor noted that someone had pointed out that there was an awful lot of weight on the word "resource". He said that he thought that the emphasis should be on the type of description you were trying to create.

41.10.2   Barbara Tillett commented that 11.2 c) did not use the term "multilevel description" even though that was the term used in 11.2.3. The Editor said that he would make it consistent. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought the section was clear, and that she liked the parenthetical examples. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed that they were helpful, but they did make for long rules. The Chair said that this was one area where CILIP and BL had seen a lot of words, but had concluded that repetition could be needed for the online product. Deirdre Kiorgaard commented that you would not need to read the extra detail every time.
Action=Editor

41.11   The Editor noted that the LC numbered comments 7-17 were actually to do with the cover letter for 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1 and did not need to be discussed.

41.12   Additional numbered comments from LC: 14. Outline, Introduction to Part I, Relationship to other guides for resource description, p. 8

41.12.1   The Editor said that he had followed the LC suggestion to use the term "standards" rather than "guides".

41.13   Additional numbered comments from LC: 18. 1.2.1 and 1.2.2

41.13.1   The Editor said that 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 in 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1 had been collapsed into 11.2 in 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 11.

41.14   Additional numbered comments from LC: 19. 1.2.3 Reflecting relationships between the whole and its parts, p. 13-14

41.14.1   The Editor said that LC had suggested that instead of this section there be pointers to the relevant rules. He added that this was what he had done in the final bullet at 11.2.1.

41.15   Additional numbered comments from LC: 20. Sources of Information

41.15.1   John Attig noted that there were specific comments on this later in the table.

41.16   Additional numbered comments from LC: 21. Chapter 2

41.16.1   The Editor noted that the LC comment that this chapter was missing the aspect of access points had just been dealt with.

41.17   Additional numbered comments from LC: 22. 2.0.2.1 General guidelines, p. 17-18

41.17.1   The Editor explained that 12.1.1 was essentially LC's "basis of description." He added that in AACR2 and the LC proposal the instructions were really to do with a comprehensive description, and he had added instructions on analytical descriptions. The Editor said that all of the essentials from the LC proposal were under 12.1.1.1, but they were not in table form. Barbara Tillett said that she would like to see something very simple, e.g. for a resource issued in a single unit use the whole, for a resource issued in two or more parts simultaneously use the whole, for a serial use the earliest issue, for an integrating resource use the latest issue, for a collection use the whole. The Editor said that the instructions were not currently that simple. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that for most resources the basis of description was the resource as a whole. She suggested that this could be put up front so that it did not have to be repeated. Judy Kuhagen said that for some data elements for serials and multipart monographs you actually used a different basis of description, e.g. for the ending date of publication. She added that one of the nice things about the table in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev was that you could see these details quickly. The Editor said that the difficulty that he had with this was that the second LC column had what was reflected in the description, not the source of information, e.g. "all issues or parts" for the mathematical data. Judy Kuhagen explained that if a cataloguer had three volumes of a serial in front of them with slightly different titles, they needed to know to take the title from the first volume. The Editor said that this was in 12.1.1.1. Judy Kuhagen said that for subsequent numbering systems and the ending date it was not logical to use the first volume. The Editor asked if this could be taken care of later in the rules, e.g. with the date element. He added that he did not think that the table was as closely related to sources of information as it could be. Judy Kuhagen said that source of information was different from basis of description, because the basis told you which part to use, but you had to go to the element to find out the source of information in that part.

41.17.2   The Editor said that he had included all of the instructions from 1.0A2 (Basis of the description), but not the detail of the table. He added that if the only thing that was taken

from another part was the ending date, this could be indicated by a footnote or similar. Judy Kuhagen noted that there were also subsequent designation systems. Jennifer Bowen asked if a condensed version of the table could be added before 12.1.1.1 to bring out the exceptions. The Editor said that he was trying to deal with basis of description separately to source of information. John Attig commented that it was all part of the same decision making process. The Editor said that the first step was to decide what to base the description on, and the instructions in 12.1.1.1 told you how to do this. Jennifer Bowen said that there seemed to be something missing. The Editor explained that this told you where to start, and that you would have to go other places for other pieces of information. Judy Kuhagen said that she thought it would be faster to use a table.

41.17.3   Jennifer Bowen asked where under 12.1.1.1 it told her to take the series from all of the issues and not just the first. The Editor explained that 12.1.1.1 was the starting point for the description and that under sources of information for series it gave more information. Hugh Taylor said that he could see the fundamental difference of approach, the Editor started with the single part which was the basis from which to proceed (with more to follow), while the LC table gathered up all of the things you were likely to need in order to complete the description. Jennifer Bowen noted that the table was an overview of the whole thing, while the Editor provided what you needed to know at that point. The Editor said that he had taken this approach because the JSC had said that it wanted rules written as a decision trees. John Attig suggested that if 12.1.1.1 was a starting point and there were details at the elements, the section could be written more concisely to provide content for the next section on the preferred sources of information. Jennifer Bowen said that there needed to be text to say that there were further instructions later, and to explain the organization. Judy Kuhagen said that each data element would need details on the basis of description. The Editor replied that he did have sources of information for each element. Judy Kuhagen replied that this was the source in the part, not the part. The Editor said that the basis of description had already been decided - it was the first issue. He added that it was only for a few elements that you had to look at other issues or parts.

41.17.4   The Editor said that in the decision tree, the first decision was whether to do a comprehensive or analytical description. He added that in the case of a comprehensive description, the next decision was the basis for description. The Editor said that it appeared that LC (in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev) had dispensed with provisions in 1.0A2, but he had carried the provisions across because he was assuming that people needed the guidance. Barbara Tillett said that LC was trying to simplify the rule and shorten it. The Editor said that he had made the rule shorter by eliminating the table.

41.17.5   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that a general statement could be made about using the resource as a whole, and then list the exceptions. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this was a way forward. The Editor said that he thought that three out of the five categories were exceptions. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the following sections in 12.1.1.1 could be brought together: a) Resource issued in a single part; b) Resources issued in two or more parts simultaneously; d) Integrating resource; and, e) Collection. She added that the exceptions were for resources issued in two or more parts simultaneously when there was no separate source identifying the resource as a whole, and resources in successive parts. The Editor asked about integrating resources. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought something could be written into the general instruction.

Margaret Stewart said that she thought that there needed to be a heading for integrating resources.

41.17.6   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that the general principle should be brought out, i.e. when creating a comprehensive description for a resource, choose a source of information identifying the resource (or the current iteration of the resource) as a whole. She added that most people would need only this. The Chair said that she agreed. The Editor said that he would put the general statement first. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that then there could be bold headings for those types of resources that were different. The Editor said that this meant eliminating the separate instructions for a) d) and e). He noted that there was an exception for b) when there was no separate source for the resource as a whole. John Attig said that he was concerned that this was the first place the different types of resources were mentioned and defined. The Editor replied that the section on terminology in chapter 11 would contain definitions for "resource" and the different categories of resource. Margaret Stewart commented that in the Web version 12.1.1.1 could have hyperlinks to the definitions. The Editor said that there still had to be a decision as to whether the "mouse-overs" would be every time a term occurred in an instruction. Barbara Tillett said that she thought it would be every time, because the document was not linear.

41.17.7   Barbara Tillett said that her understanding was that there would be a general principle at the beginning of 12.1.1.1, then instructions for when there was no separate source under a), b), and e), and then something to explain c) and d). The Editor said that in terms of organization he could not go down another indentation. Barbara Tillett suggested that "Basis for identification" be moved to 12.1, with "Sources of information" at 12.2. The Editor said that he would try this.
            Action=Editor

41.17.8   The Editor asked how much would be retained from 12.1.1.1 b) Resource issued in two or more parts simultaneously (which was based on AACR2). He said that it appeared that 5JSC/LC/1/Rev did not include anything on what to use when there was no source of information identifying the resource as a whole. Judy Kuhagen said that this was at A1.1B3. Title lacking. The Editor said that there had been comments in the responses that it was not just the title lacking, but the source of information lacking. He added that this was why 12.1.1. b) was longer than what LC had proposed. Margaret Stewart said that she would hate to lose this information as people needed guidance. The Editor said that the question was not whether to delete the instructions at 12.1.1.1 b) i)-iii) but where to put them. He confirmed that the instructions would remain where they were. Barbara Tillett summarized that the section on the basis for identification for a comprehensive description would start with the general principle to use the resource as a whole, with instructions for a resource in successive parts to use the earliest part, and for an integrating resource to use the latest. She added that there would be exceptions for when there was no source of information identifying the resource as a whole for a) resources issued in a single unit, b) resources issued in two or more parts simultaneously, and d) integrating resources. The Editor asked about the tables in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev. JSC decided that these were not required. Judy Kuhagen confirmed that under the instructions for resources issued in successive parts it would be made clear that for numbering and date of publication the source of information was the last issue or part.

Action=Editor

41.18   Additional numbered comments from LC: 23. Tables, p. 19-21

41.18.1   The Editor explained that while 5JSC/AACR3/1/Editor follow-up/1 had detailed tables on preferred sources of information, this section had been left as "to be added" in 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part I/Chapter 2. He said that this was because the responses (ALA in particular) had said that they would like to see something between the Editor approach and the LC approach. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA did not have a specific suggestion to offer. Barbara Tillett said that LC still preferred the categorization in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev (p. 9). The Chair noted that there was a very brief table in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev and a very detailed table in 5JSC/AACR3/1/Editor follow-up/1, and that the JSC needed to find a middle ground.

41.18.2   Jennifer Bowen said that main problem was with the category for "other resources" and that people wanted more guidance. Barbara Tillett said that LC had been trying to simplify. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it was not clear why there were only four categories: "resource comprising pages, leaves, etc."; "single manuscripts"; "microforms"; and, "other resources". She added that ACOC members had asked why "X" or "Y" wasn't there. Barbara Tillett said that they would be covered by "other resources". The Editor said that he recalled from the responses to AACR3 part I that people had wanted specific sources of information for each type of material. He explained that this was the reason for the detail in 5JSC/AACR3/1/Editor follow-up/1, to show people what this would look like. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that "other resources" could be listed first, with the other three as exceptions. The Editor commented that this instruction was to do with preferred sources of information, and it was less than helpful to say that this was the "resource itself".

41.18.3   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that later in the response table there were detailed comments from ACOC, ALA and CILIP under the heading "2.1.1.2 Sources of information – More than one form and/or source of title [LC]". The Chair noted that there were two ways of approaching the issue, start with the LC list and adjust it, or start with the list in the Editor follow-up and reduce it. Judy Kuhagen explained that in terms of principles, LC had tried to look at what the containers were like. She added that they had considered including manuscripts with resources comprising pages, leaves, etc., but had been told that the colophon had to be put higher in the priority order of sources. Judy Kuhagen said that the emphasis had been on looking for like characteristics. She said that they had realised that under the "other resources" category there were adjustments to current practice. The Editor said that currently in AACR2 there were differences in the preferred order of sources for books, early printed books and printed serials, which had disappeared. Jennifer Bowen noted that there was currently a different order for music. Barbara Tillett said that they had confirmed with the LC music people that what was in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev would work for them. The Editor asked about the current preferred source for serials, the "analytical title page". Judy Kuhagen said that they had understood this to be the title page for the serial.

41.18.4   Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the separately listed categories in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev had remained because of the nature of the resource, or the willingness of the cataloguers of that resource to accept a change. Barbara Tillett replied that it was both. Jennifer Bowen

said that she wished that ALA had received more of a response from specialised communities. She suggested that the JSC proceed with the LC table and obtain comments on that. She added that one problem was that people had not understood the principles behind the LC categories, in particular for "other resources". Judy Kuhagen said that it was resources without a unitary source. Jennifer Bowen said that this seemed to be related to the self-describing issue, and some resources did not have the tradition of a title-page equivalent. The Editor noted that sound recordings and films had the equivalent of a title page. He said that his concern was that so many things were included in "other" that for these resources, people could choose different sources in the resource itself. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought it would be good to return to the generalization done in the December 2004 draft of AACR3 part I to use "formal presentation", but this had not been supported. The Editor noted that the responses had complained that it was too general, but the LC approach was even more general.

41.18.5 The Chair suggested that the JSC discuss Jennifer Bowen's proposal to use the LC table in the draft. Barbara Tillett said that there would be an explanation of the principles on which it was based at the beginning. Jennifer Bowen said that people needed to understand why things were the way they were. John Attig asked if the explanation of the principles would be part of the rules. Barbara Tillett said that she wouldn't mind if it was in the rules as then it could help those cataloguing new types of materials. The Editor asked for the principles to be articulated. Barbara Tillett said that you were looking at the carrier and trying to find where the title was appearing. Judy Kuhagen said that it was the characteristics of the physical media. The Editor asked where a MP3 file would fit. Barbara Tillett said that it would fall under the category of "other resources".

41.18.6 Jennifer Bowen noted that the first category of "resources comprising pages, leaves, etc." traditionally described themselves with a formal title page. She suggested that the first category were those resources that self-described in a predictable place, and the second were those that self-described in a not predictable place. Barbara Tillett asked about not self-describing resources. Jennifer Bowen said that these could be the third category. She added that there could be examples for each category. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that this categorization would not help with the differences in the LC table in the placement of the colophon in the priority order of sources. Judy Kuhagen suggested that this exception could be removed as it did not follow the principles. The Editor asked about the separate category for microforms. Barbara Tillett said that it depended on what was on the microform. Jennifer Bowen suggested that the starting point be the general principles. The Editor noted that any table would also have to be congruent with what the GMD/SMD Working Group came up with.

41.18.7 Jennifer Bowen suggested that there were three categories: 1. Self-describing resources which traditionally have a predictable single source of information; 2. Self-describing resources without one predictable source; 3. Not self-describing resources. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that under category 1, there could be an entry for "resources comprising pages" and then the list of sources. Jennifer Bowen agreed that there could be sub-categories. The Editor said that what was being talked about was too complex to be expressed in a table. He added that another way of saying the predictable source was that there was a norm. He explained that in 12.2.8.3 Source of title proper, it instructed to give a note if the source was other than the norm for that type of resource (i.e. title page, title

frame, or title card). Jennifer Bowen said that she thought there would still be exceptions, but at least now there was a framework.

41.18.8 Barbara Tillett asked if there would still be a priority order of sources, as it seemed as though that would be lost with what had just been discussed. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that this could be given as examples under the different categories. Jennifer Bowen said that the framework needed to be filled in. The Chair said that there still needed to be agreement on the priority order of sources, so that this could be included in the draft. The Editor asked when the work would be done. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the JSC needed to look at the draft of this section first. Margaret Stewart suggested that this section could be taken out of the draft and treated separately as a way to accelerate responses. Barbara Tillett said that there needed to be an alternative proposal. The Editor said that he did not think that there was time for the constituencies to agree before the release of the draft of part I in the second week of December. The Chair suggested that just the JSC members could try to reach agreement, so that something was in the draft. Jennifer Bowen volunteered to prepare a document to start the discussion. The Chair confirmed that if the JSC could agree on what had been proposed it would go in the draft. Barbara Tillett asked where in the draft it would go. Jennifer Bowen replied at 12.1.2. Preferred source of information. Judy Kuhagen confirmed that Jennifer Bowen would also work on priority sources of information. Jennifer Bowen asked if the other JSC members wanted her to use the term "self-describing". Barbara Tillett suggested that she could use instead "Resources that have a single predictable source of identifying information".
Action=Jennifer Bowen; JSC

41.19 Additional numbered comments from LC: 24. 2.0.2.4 Other sources of information, p. 22-23

41.19.1 The Editor noted that this was 12.1.4 in the draft. Barbara Tillett said it appeared that the instruction was moving away from a priority order as it referred to the preferred source. The Editor said that although there was a priority order, there would still be a preferred source. He added that 12.1.4 was for when the list of preferred sources was exhausted and you still did not have the information you required for an element. Barbara Tillett said that she thought that "a) another source within the resource itself (including any container or accompanying material)" was not required as it would be covered by the priority order of sources. Margaret Stewart suggested that a decision on this would have to wait until after Jennifer Bowen had done her work. The Chair confirmed that the JSC agreed with 12.1.4, with the exception of a) for which there was a query.

41.20 Additional numbered comments from LC: 25. 2.0.2.5 Information taken from sources outside the resource itself, p. 23

41.20.1 The Editor said that he thought that 12.1.5 was what everyone had agreed on. He noted that the rule had already been discussed. Margaret Stewart said that it needed to be clear whether containers were considered part of the resource itself. The Editor noted that this would come out of the work that Jennifer Bowen did. He said that it came down to an issue of how few square brackets you wanted. The Chair commented that everyone had seemed to want less. Margaret Stewart noted that accompanying material and containers could disappear, which was an issue for identification of the resource. The Editor said that

there needed to be a rethink of the definition for "accompanying material". Judy Kuhagen noted that you could create a separate description for accompanying material, and for that reason it couldn't be considered part of the resource itself. Barbara Tillett said that this meant that containers and accompanying material would be removed from the priority order, and stay at 12.1.4.

41.21   Additional numbered comments from LC: 26. 2.1 Title, p. 23

41.21.1   The Editor said that this had been taken care of in the definition of title (12.2.0.1), in the third bullet: "A resource may also have one or more titles associated with it through reference sources, through assignment by a registration agency (e.g., a key title), or by an agency preparing a description of the resource (e.g., a cataloguer's translation of the title)." He added that the term "assigned title" had been removed in response to the LC comment.

41.22   Additional numbered comments from LC: 27. 2.1.1.2 Sources of information, p. 24

41.22.1   The Editor said that the rule was now 12.2.1.2. He added that this rule would refer back to whatever was agreed for preferred sources of information.

41.23   Additional numbered comments from LC: 28. 2.1.6 Devised title, p. 25:

41.23.1   The Editor noted that LC had objected to the term "devised title". John Attig noted that the first use of the term in the draft was at 12.2.1.10 (Resource with no title). Margaret Stewart asked if LC had proposed an alternative. Barbara Tillett said that there were people at LC who did not like the term. The Chair confirmed that "devised title" would continue to be used.

41.24   Additional numbered comments from LC: 29. 2.2.0.2, Statement of responsibility, Sources of information, p. 25

41.24.1   The Editor said that this rule was numbered as 12.3.0.2 in the draft. John Attig noted that the rule no longer used "prominent", which had been the LC concern.

41.25   Additional numbered comments from LC: 30. 2.4.0.2 - 2.8.0.2, Sources of information, (in order of preference), p. 26-28

41.25.1   The Editor said that 2.4.0.2 contained the sources of information for numbering information, and was now at 12.5.0.2. Barbara Tillett suggested that information on the sources for the first and last number could be added here. The Editor confirmed that numbering information would be taken from the same source as the title proper, and if it did not appear there it would be taken from another source within the resource, and failing that from one of the other sources of information.

41.25.2   The Editor noted that there had been differing opinions on the sources of information for series (now at 12.9.1.2). He said that he had changed the instruction to be to take the title proper of the series from the series title page, and if this was not present from the preferred source of information, and if it wasn't there, from one of the other sources of information.

41.26   Additional numbered comments from LC: 31. 2.9.0, Basic instructions

41.26.1   The Editor said that the LC comment was that the caption should be: "Basic instructions for recording resource identifiers". He added that he had fixed this, but now all element names were given in the singular.

41.27   Additional numbered comments from LC: 32. Overall style comments

41.27.1   The Editor said that LC had objected to his use of "may" in the instructions. Barbara Tillett noted that an occurrence of this had been fixed earlier in the meeting. The Editor said that he thought that he had been careful about this.

41.27.2   The Editor said that LC had commented that the lack of subrule numbers made it difficult to direct someone to a specific part of the rule. He noted that subrule numbers had been added throughout the draft.

Executive Session 5

42   Next meeting

42.1   Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Policy/6

42.2   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

43   Statement of policy and procedures for JSC

43.1   Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Policy/4

43.2   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

44   Next Chair of JSC

44.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

45   Communication with other resource description communities (continued)

45.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

46   Formal recognition of individuals and groups contributing to the development of AACR

46.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/23-61.]

End of Executive Session 5

47   A0 rules for what is being described, number of records, basis of description, sources; changes to A1.0 and A1.1B (continued)

47.1   The Chair suggested that the discussion resume by looking at the comments by rule number as summarized in the response table.

47.2   1.2 Setting up the description

47.2.1   The Editor explained that this section was now captioned "Type of description". He noted that ALA had not liked "discrete units of content", and that this phrase had been eliminated.

47.3   1.2.1. Aspect of the resource to be described [LC]

47.3.1   The Chair noted that the comments in the response table referred to the LC proposal. Barbara Tillett said that the first comment was from ACOC, that the footnotes at A0.1A were too lengthy. Judy Kuhagen said that in the Editor's version in the footnotes were included in the wording of the rule.

47.3.2   Jennifer Bowen noted that there had already been discussion around ALA's query about when a resource encompassed accompanying material. She added that her understanding was that for what she was drafting, accompanying material was not part of the resource. The Editor said that he thought that in terms of describing the resource as a whole, accompanying material should be included; but with sources of information it moved to the second level of preference. Barbara Tillett said that because accompanying information and containers could be lost, information from these sources should be put in square brackets. Jennifer Bowen said that this was the way she would draft the text.

47.3.3   The Chair noted that ALA had commented that treatment of components in footnote 1 was confusing. She added that there were no longer footnotes in the rule.

47.3.4   The Chair said that ALA had not liked the Editor's use of "physical units". Barbara Tillett noted that this term was no longer included.

47.3.5   The Chair confirmed that no further action was required on the CILIP suggestion that "resource" required clear definition.

47.4   1.2.2. Number of records [LC]

47.4.1   The Editor noted that in the draft of chapter 11 he had two sections: one on comprehensive vs. analytic descriptions; and, one on changes requiring a new description.

47.4.2   Judy Kuhagen noted that in the NLM comments on the Prospectus, they had raised the issue of using one record for multiple manifestations. She added that in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev there had been a paragraph about this practice. Jennifer Bowen commented that the issue was also raised in the ALA response to the draft of AACR3 part I. She added that she thought that someone had suggested that this be moved to an appendix, but she did not think that was what the constituencies wanted. The Editor noted that there was nothing

about this practice in the December 2004 draft. Barbara Tillett said that there had been comments asking for instructions to be included. She asked if an optional instruction could go at 11.2.1 (Comprehensive description). Margaret Stewart noted that this came back to what you were describing, and what were proposed were multiple manifestations. Hugh Taylor said that CILIP was concerned about the "ripple-effect" of introducing this practice to the rules. The Editor said that he thought the Format Variation Working Group had decided that this was expression-level cataloguing. Jennifer Bowen said that this was what the FVWG had thought, but they had decided that for the community as a whole it was not realistic to change the level of cataloguing that was done.

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the principle behind RDA was that there was one manifestation per record. She added that the practice of multiple manifestations included on a record could be mentioned, but the ramifications would have to be made clear. The Editor suggested that it could be mentioned in the General Introduction. He added that the solution was in database structures rather than the rules themselves. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that it needed to be made clear that if manifestations were bundled, they could not be unbundled. Judy Kuhagen said that if the General Introduction was not going out with the draft of part I, then it would be helpful to mention in the cover letter for part I the practice of multiple manifestations on one record. Deirdre Kiorgaard commented that the previous day reproduction notes had been discussed, and that there was some potential confusion with noting the existence of other formats and describing multiple manifestations. Judy Kuhagen said that the existing CONSER practise of the print version pointing to the electronic version was confusing for some people.

Jennifer Bowen said that the related ALA comment was on p. 132-133 of 5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA response: "ALA recommends that the General Introduction include a statement on the use of the "single record technique", modelled after the wording in the ISBD(G) at the end of Section 0.1.3 (Scope, Purpose, and Use)." The Chair confirmed that information on this practice would be included in the General Introduction only. Hugh Taylor suggested that something be included in the Meeting Outcomes. JSC agreed. **Action=Editor; Secretary**

47.4.3   The Chair said that the next comments in the response table were to do with the phrase "by national bibliographies and those cataloguing agencies". The Editor said that he had removed this restriction, and anyone could use a multilevel description.

47.5   1.2.3. Basis of description [LC]

47.5.1   The Chair noted that ACOC had said that there was a need to decide on the appropriateness of incorporating definitions in the text. Barbara Tillett noted that this had already been discussed.

47.5.2   The Chair said that ALA had suggested a rewording for the paragraph in 5JSC/AACR3/I/Editor follow-up/1/LC response on reproductions/facsimiles of integrating resources. The Editor commented that 1.2.3 had disappeared from the current draft, and all that remained were short references at 11.2.1 and 11.2.2. Jennifer Bowen said that the ALA comment was no longer relevant. John Attig said that at some point RDA would need to deal with reproductions of successively issued resources and integrating resources.

47.6   1.2.4 Sources of information for the data elements [LC]

47.6.1   The Chair said that all comments in the response table under 1.2.4 were moot.

47.7   1.3. Sources of information [Editor]

47.7.1   The Chair noted that CCC had suggested that "element" be used instead of "segment". The Editor said that there were no longer any occurrences of "segment."

47.8   2.0.2. Sources of information [Editor]

47.8.1   The Chair said that CCC had said that there needed to be a section on "Elements required for identification of a resource". The Editor said that this was covered by the mandatory elements.

47.9   2.0.2.1 Sources of information - General guidelines [Editor]

47.9.1   The Editor noted that the paragraph on which ALA and CCC had made comments had been deleted.

47.10   2.0.2.1 etc [Editor]

47.10.1 The Chair noted that the ALA comment that it was unclear whether or not accompanying material and containers were considered part of the resource itself had already been discussed.

47.11   2.0.2.1. Resources issued as a single unit [Editor]

47.11.1 The Editor said that the CCC suggestion to use captions such as "comprehensive description" and "analytical description" had been done in his reorganization of the section.

47.12   2.0.2.1. Resource issued in successive units ii) [Editor]

47.12.1 The Chair said that CCC had commented that there was a need to address in the rule units that are not sequentially numbered. The Editor said that this was now at 12.1.1.1 c) ii), which read: "a source of information identifying the earliest issue or part (i.e., the issue or part with the earliest date of publication, distribution, etc.), if the issues or parts are unnumbered." The Editor asked if he could change the end of the sentence to "not sequentially numbered" to cover unnumbered, and numbered but not sequentially. Margaret Stewart asked if this would be clear enough. The Editor suggested that it be changed to "unnumbered or not sequentially numbered". JSC agreed.
            Action=Editor

47.13   2.0.2.2. Preferred sources of information

47.13.1 The Editor noted that this rule would be covered by the text drafted by Jennifer Bowen on preferred sources of information.

47.14   2.1.0.2. Title - Sources of information

47.14.1 The Editor explained that this rule was now at 12.2.0.2. He said that what he was trying to do was to give some general direction on sources for titles. He added that this broad section could be something that was sold to other communities who did not want to make the distinction between the title proper and other types of titles. He noted that one of the comments said that this text repeated what followed. The Editor said that his rationale was that some communities might not go beyond these instructions.

47.15   2.1.1.2 Sources of information - More than one form and/or source of title [LC]

47.15.1 The Chair noted that ACOC had suggested a rewording of the rule. The Editor said that this was a rewording of what was in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev. Barbara Tillett said that the paragraph was not in the latest draft of chapter 12.

47.15.2 The Chair said that the next set of comments referred to the preferred source of information. The Editor said that Jennifer Bowen would need to take these comments into account.

47.16   2.1.1.2 Sources of information - Title lacking [LC]

47.16.1 The Chair noted that ACOC had a query regarding the definition of "part" used in these rules. Barbara Tillett said that the relevant section was not in the current Editor's draft.

47.16.2 The Editor said that these instructions were now at 12.2.1.9 (Resource lacking a collective title) and 12.2.1.10 (Resource with no title). He asked the JSC to note that LC had simplified the instructions, but he had restored what was in the December 2004 draft. He added that there needed to be a discussion on whether there was now too much detail. Barbara Tillett asked about using the text at A1.1B3 (Title lacking) in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev. The Editor said that he had not included this text because there was a mixed response to the LC proposal. He said that A1.1B3 a) and b) were covered by 12.2.1.9. The Editor said that the question was whether A1.1B3 a) and b) were sufficient to replace 12.2.1.9. He said that it precluded you treating the title of the predominant part as the title of the whole thing. Margaret Stewart asked if this meant predominance wouldn't be needed. Barbara Tillett said that they were trying to get away from it. Margaret Stewart asked how someone would deal with this situation, would they record all titles. Barbara Tillett agreed. Margaret Stewart noted that this was a major change. The Editor said that the decision that accompanying material was not part of the resource was important in relation to resources in more than one part. Jennifer Bowen noted that this would take away one decision that the cataloguer had to make. The Editor confirmed that the text at 12.2.1.9 would be stripped down.
         Action=Editor

47.16.3 The Editor said that 5JSC/LC/1/Rev A1.1B3 c) and d) were covered by 12.2.1.10. He said that what he had was even more short-hand than what was in the LC proposal. Barbara Tillett said that she agreed with what the Editor had done.

47.17   The Editor said that the next group of comments in the response table (for 2.1.4.2-2.1.7.2) were to do with how to word things when the source of information could be any source. He added that there were variations in the wording used in the draft. He suggested that "May be taken from any source" could be used in all cases. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

47.18   2.2.0.2 Statement of responsibility - Sources of information

47.18.1 The Chair said that this rule was at 12.3.0.2 in the draft of chapter 12. Jennifer Bowen read out the ALA comment: "According to both the Editor's text and the LC response, a statement of responsibility taken from a source other than the chief source that is a part of the resource itself would not be bracketed. This "mixing and matching of sources" that has been introduced into Chapter 9 of AACR2 is already causing some amount of confusion. As described above under LC bulleted point 4, we have some concerns that identification of the resource will be more difficult as a result." Barbara Tillett said that she thought this was solved by the priority order of sources.

47.18.2 Judy Kuhagen said that according to 12.3.0.1 the statement of responsibility could occur in conjunction with more than the title proper, but 12.30.2 a) it referred only to the title proper. The Editor said that he would change it to "the same source as the associated title". Judy Kuhagen said that there was the issue of edition statements. The Editor suggested "the same source as the associated title, etc." JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

47.19   2.5.0.2 Publication, Distribution, etc. - Sources of Information [LC]

47.19.1 The Chair noted that the ALA comment had been dealt with.

47.20   The Editor noted that there were some line numbers from 5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev to be discussed.

47.21   11.2.2. Analytical description
         11.2.3. Multilevel description

47.21.1 Line 151: reconsider placement of rules A1.0G-A1.0L (ACOC 2 , p.4; BL 3, p.11)
         Line 152: overlap with focus of the description, A1.0G (ACOC 2, p.4; ALA 2, p. 15; BL 3, p.11)

         The Editor said that these comments were moot with the reorganization.

47.22   11.4. Levels of detail in the description

47.22.1 Line 142: eliminate references from rules A1.0D1 and A1.0D2 to specific rules for elements of description (ALA 2A: p. 15)
         Line 143: multiplicity of references from a single rule (e.g., at A1.0D2) defeat goal of simplicity (LC 2A: p. 14)

         The Editor said that in the previous draft there had been a string of references. He added that now there were individual references to each element.

47.22.2   Line 195: revise A1.1D2 : In a second-level description always give the first parallel title and optionally, the other parallel titles without regard to whether title proper and first parallel title are in a nonroman script (LC 2A: p. 16)
Line 196: revise A1.1D3: Record the parallel title as a parallel title even when there is no text in the language of the parallel title (LC 2A: p. 16)

The Editor said that these comments were moot as the parallel title was not one of the mandatory elements.

47.23   11.6.9. Inaccuracies

47.23.1   Line 148: regularize convention for correcting inaccuracies in A1.0F8 (ACOC 2A: p. 4)

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that this related to "sic" and "i.e.". The Editor said that he thought that these were different ways of dealing with different things. Barbara Tillett said that you could "take what you see" and explain if necessary. The Editor asked if this meant not correcting the text. Barbara Tillett agreed. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC would prefer to get rid of "sic" because it was not useful. She added that you needed information in an element that you could retrieve on, and something like "Will[i]am" was not useful. Barbara Tillett said that you would use a controlled access point for retrieval. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the JSC wanted to get rid of "sic". Hugh Taylor said that either you transcribed what you saw and made it clear elsewhere that it represented what was on the resource, or you identified at that point that there was an error. John Attig said that once you interpolated you compromised the use of the element. The Editor confirmed that the JSC wanted to transcribe inaccuracies as they appeared on the source with no correction. Barbara Tillett said that extra access would be provided as appropriate.

Judy Kuhagen asked if there needed to be a reference forward to 12.2.1.7 to show the exception for titles for resources issued in successive parts. Barbara Tillett said that the serials community wanted the title to be corrected. The Editor noted that the exception only applied to the title proper. The Editor said that rather than making a specific reference he had noted from a previous discussion to use "except where instructed otherwise" in 11.6.9. Barbara Tillett said that under 12.2.0.3 (Transcription), the last bullet currently said "Correct inaccuracies as instructed in 11.6.9." but that it had already been agreed that the correction was for serials only. The Editor said that he had noted that it should read: "Transcribe inaccuracies as instructed in 11.6.9, except as instructed in [rule reference]."
Action=Editor

47.24   12.2.7.3. Basic instructions on recording devised titles

47.24.1   Line 187: reverse order of options in B1.1B11 (ALA 4: p. 29; 7: p. 40)

The Editor explained that B1.B11 came from chapter 4, and had not been incorporated into the current draft because he had thought there would be an LC substitute in the archival proposal. He added that nothing had been suggested by LC, so now he wanted to know if the instructions would be dropped. Barbara Tillett said that people would be sent to another tool. The Editor said that a general reference would be made.

47.24.2   Line 181: propose revision of A1.1B11 (LC)
Line 182: reword A1.1B11 to apply to resources lacking a title proper rather than resources lacking a chief source of information (BL 2A: p. 6)

The Editor said that both of these comments were moot.

47.24.3   Line 186: additional instructions needed in A1.1B11 to ensure devised title is sufficiently distinctive; alternatively add instructions in section B (CILIP 2A: p. 5)

The Editor noted that this had been discussed with the LC archival proposal. [Note: see 5JSC/M/37.6.] He noted that there was no requirement for a title proper to be distinctive.

47.24.4   Line 184: provide instruction in A1.1B11 for making a note such as "title [supplied/devised] by cataloguer" (ALA 4: p. 28)

Barbara Tillett noted that this had been done in the draft of chapter 12.

47.25   12.2.7.3. Basic instructions on recording devised titles
d) Archival and manuscript resources

47.25.1   Line 633: add "or devised" to C1.7B5.1 (ALA 13: p. 94)

The Editor noted that there would not be a separate rule for archival and manuscript resources, and so the comment was moot.

47.26   12.2.8.3. Source of the title proper

47.26.1   Line 626: reword A1.7B4 (ALA 13: p. 83)

The Editor commented that this instruction was tied to what Jennifer Bowen was going to draft on preferred sources of information. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA wanted the cataloguer to make a note if the source of the title proper was other than the chief source of information, or if it was considered to be important. The Editor suggested that once the rules were revised on the preferred source of information, if the title was taken from the "normal" place there would be no need for a note on the source.

47.26.2   Line 627: add rule at A2.7B4 on source of title proper (ALA 5: p. 33)

The Editor asked if the exception to always record the source of the title proper for digital resources would remain. Barbara Tillett asked if this was still needed. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought it depended on the instruction before. The Editor said that if the digital resource were a PDF file of a resource with a title page, he would query the need to make a note.

47.27   12.4.0. Basic instructions on recording edition information
12.4.0.4. Facsimiles and reproductions

47.27.1   Line 151: reconsider placement of rules A1.0G-A1.0L (ACOC 2 , p.4; BL 3, p.11)

Line 152: overlap with focus of the description, A1.0G (ACOC 2, p.4; ALA 2, p. 15; BL 3, p.11)

The Editor noted that reference to these line numbers appeared under a number of elements. The Editor said that LC (in 5JSC/LC/1/Rev) had given instructions on facsimiles and reproductions only once, at A0.2D, while he had had repeated the instructions under the different elements. He added that that there were three issues: what you used as the basis of description; which source was chosen as the preferred source; and then if information on the reproduction and the original were on the same source, what was the pecking order.

Judy Kuhagen said that the JSC needed to decide whether numbering information should be taken from the original or the reproduction. The Editor noted that 12.1.3 c) read: "Preferred sources of information for the reproduction and the original. If a resource is a reproduction of an original resource, and it contains a preferred source of information for the reproduction as well as a preferred source of information for the original, use the source for the reproduction as the preferred source of information. Judy Kuhagen said that there was a contradiction with 12.5.0.4: "When describing a facsimile or other reprint, record the numbering of the original." She added that LC had proposed a change to existing practise because sometimes the source of numbering on the original was not reproduced. She noted that some people had problems when there was not correlation between the numbering and the extent. The Editor suggested that the JSC look at the other line numbers under 12.5.04 before making a decision.

47.28   12.5.0. Basic instructions on recording numbering
        12.5.0.4. Facsimiles and reproductions

47.28.1 Line 154: regularize use of terms "facsimile(s)" and "reproduction(s)" in A1.0J and elsewhere (ALA 17, p. 121)

        The Editor said that this had been done.

47.28.2 Line 155: question scope and placement (prominence) of rules for reproductions A1.0J, A1.2A3, A1.3A3, A1.4A2, A1.5A4, A1.6A2, A1.8A2 (ALA 17, p. 122)

        The Editor said that this was what he had continued to do. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA wanted a general rule in a prominent place. The Editor replied that there was one.

47.28.3 Line 252: delete A1.3A3 (LC)

        The Editor said that this was LC's suggestion to delete the exception for numbering, which had yet to be decided on.

47.28.4 Line 258: revise A1.3B1 (LC)

        The Secretary noted that there were no comments in the table because there was a reference to 5JSC/LC/1/Rev.

47.28.5 Line 268: delete conflicting instructions re numbering for facsimiles at A1 (ALA 17, p.126)

John Attig commented that this was the same as line 252. The Editor asked if there was agreement to remove the exception for numbering. Margaret Stewart asked what would happen if there was no numbering information for the reproduction. Judy Kuhagen said that if there was numbering for both the reproduction and the original, the numbering for the reproduction would be preferred. She added that if there were no numbering for the reproduction, the numbering for the original would be recorded. JSC agreed.

John Attig asked now that the only exception to 12.1.3 had been removed, whether the instructions needed to be repeated. The Editor said that in this particular case there was an additional instruction. Judy Kuhagen suggested that it could only be listed at 12.5. The Editor said that he would remove the instructions under the elements except where there was a specific instruction.
Action=Editor

47.29 12.3.0.10. Statement of responsibility transcribed as part of the title proper or other title information

47.29.1 Line 158: reword instruction in A1.1A1 (ALA 16: p. 115)

Jennifer Bowen read from the ALA response: "Change "as they appear on the source of information, however, if case …" and rest of sentence to "as they appear on the source of information unless case endings are affected, the grammatical construction of the data would be disturbed, or if one element is inseparably linked to another." The instruction as whole would read better as "Record the elements of data in the order of the sequence of the following rules, even if this means transposing data. However, if case endings are affected, if the grammatical construction of the data would be disturbed, or if one element is inseparably linked to another, transcribe the data as they appear on the source of information."" JSC decided not to make the change.

47.30 12.5.1.3. Recording numeric and/or alphabetic designations

47.30.1 Line 255: restore "if cataloguing from the first and/or last issue or part" at A1.3A1 (ALA 2A: p. 19; CCC 5: p. 7)

Barbara Tillett noted that this had been done in the current draft.

47.30.2 Line 257: eliminate redundancy with A1.3A3 in A1.3B1 (ALA 5: p. 30)

Jennifer Bowen read from 5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA response: "The second to last sentence of the first paragraph: "In describing a facsimile …" is redundant, repeating A1.3A3." She noted that this was now moot.

47.31 12.9.0. Basic instructions on recording series information
12.9.0.4. Facsimiles and reproductions

47.31.1 Line 567: delete A1.6A2 (LC)

John Attig said that he thought this was the suggestion that the rule be deleted because it repeated the general rule.

48   Draft of RDA chapters 11-16 (continued)

48.1   The Editor noted that he had dealt with the typographical errors noted in the constituency responses, although these had not been marked in the draft. He asked the JSC members to email him if they found any others.

48.2   12.10. Resource identifier
        12.10.1.1. Recording standard numbers

48.2.1   Line 802: add instructions at A1.8B1 re ISSN for electronic serials (CILIP 2A: p. 6)

The Secretary noted the LC comment in the response table: "query, isn't this a matter for the ISSN community to resolve giving an ISSN for electronic versions?" Margaret Stewart said that she thought this was an ISSN issue, as RDA just dealt with recording ISSNs.

48.2.2   Line 803: clarify relationship between guidelines for assigning ISSNs and rules requiring a new description (CILIP 2A: p. 6)

The Editor said that this was the same issue as line 802. Barbara Tillett said that cataloguers just transcribed what was provided. John Attig suggested that it could be appropriate in the General Introduction to mention the harmonization work on major title changes. Judy Kuhagen noted that CONSER had made a comment that in the ISSN community a new ISSN meant a new record. The Editor said that the need for a new description would be decided according to RDA, and the appropriate ISSN added.

48.2.3   Line 804: revise A1.8B1 to include persistent identifiers in line with ISBD(ER) (ACOC 2A: p. 6)

The Editor said that he was assuming that they were not standard numbers, so they would be covered by the instructions on other resource identifiers. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked what wording or examples covered persistent identifiers. The Editor read out the definition at 12.10.0.1: "A resource identifier is number or code uniquely associated with the resource that serves to differentiate that resource from other resources." He said that the words "persistent identifier" could be worked into the definition. Barbara Tillett noted that the definition was so general it could be read as including call numbers. The Editor replied that the emphasis was on the "resource".

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC had been discussing the issue, and handed out a paper on "URLS and persistent identifiers in RDA". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she agreed that persistent identifiers were covered by resource identifiers. She asked if they should actually be considered as standard numbers. The Editor noted that there was not a definition for standard numbers. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC had proposed the following wording fro A1.8B1: "Give the international standard number or other unique, persistent identifier assigned to a resource from an internationally recognized system." The Editor asked where the line would be drawn between standard number and other

resource identifier. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that one factor was who assigned the number. The Editor said that in 12.10.0.1 it did say "international standard number". Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC did not mind whether persistent identifiers were considered a standard number, or an other resource identifier, but they did want them to be explicitly mentioned. The Editor said that he would prefer to include them in 12.10.2 (Other resource identifiers). He asked if there should be reference to persistent identifiers, or examples added, or both. John Attig suggested that the wording at 12.10.2.1 could be changed. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that it could read: "Record resource identifiers (e.g. persistent identifiers) …" The Editor said that he would include other examples of resource identifiers in the parenthetical statement. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that the Examples Group could be asked to find appropriate examples. The Editor agreed, but said that he wanted an example to include in the draft for constituency review. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she would provide examples for use in the draft. She noted that the ISBD Review Group would need to be informed of the decision to include persistent identifiers with other resource identifiers as opposed to a type of standard number.
Action=Editor; Examples Group; Deirdre Kiorgaard

Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the discussion paper also asked whether there needed to be encouragement to record persistent identifiers in preference to URLs. The Editor said that the wording that had just been discussed for the draft would help. Margaret Stewart said that it would be useful to define persistent identifiers so that they were not confused with URLs. The Editor said that if there was a definition he could add it to the Glossary.
Action=Editor

Barbara Tillett said that there was an issue with preceding the identifier with the name of the agency, as the cataloguer would not always know this. The Editor said that he would add "if readily ascertainable".
Action=Editor

48.2.4   Line 805: reword A1.8B1 to include "any internationally recognized standard number" (LC 2A: p. 19)

The Editor said that the current wording in the rule was "any other international standard number". Barbara Tillett asked if there would be a definition of "standard number". The Editor said that he thought there was one in the Glossary. John Attig suggested that the definition also be included at 12.10.0.1. The Editor agreed. He noted that the current definition did not limit standard numbers to ISO numbers, and he thought that it should. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

48.3   Line 808: revise A1.8B1: include examples of other standard numbers e.g. ISRC, ISMN (ACOC 2A: p. 6; LC Editorial table)
Line 809: add examples of a 13-digit ISBN in area 8 (ACOC 2A: p. 6; CILIP 2A: p. 6)

JSC agreed to refer both suggestions to the Examples Group.
Action=Examples Group

48.4   12.10.1.4. Qualification

48.4.1   Line 812: question rationale for A3.8E1 (ALA 6: p. 39)

Jennifer Bowen read the comment from 5JSC/AACR3/1/ALA response: "Does this rule apply to both ISSN and ISBN? Integrating resources are eligible to have both. It seems highly unlikely that there would ever be two ISSN or two ISBN in a single record (one for loose-leaf, one for non-loose-leaf) since these would be described in separate records. What is the purpose of adding (loose-leaf) as a qualifier for an integrating resource if there would not be multiple ISBN/ISSN in the record?" The Editor said that the line above in 12.10.1.4 had been added in response to 4JSC/BL/8: "If the resource has only one standard number, add the type of binding if considered to be important." He said that "loose-leaf" was now on the same footing as other types of binding. JSC decided not to make any change to the rule.

48.5   12.10.2.1. Recording other resource identifiers

48.5.1   Line 758: expand A1.7B24 to include recording of abbreviations, etc., preceding the number (ACOC 13: p. 17)

The Editor noted that it had already been agreed to add "if readily ascertainable" to the instruction. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC was asking for the abbreviations for music and sound to be included. The Editor said that this was at 12.10.2.3 (Music publishers' numbers and plate numbers). Barbara Tillett said that LC would prefer that the abbreviation "Pl." for "Plate" was not used, as people would not know what it meant. JSC agreed to use "Plate no." in the instruction and examples.
Action=Editor

48.5.2   Line 759: expand A1.7B24 to cover provisions in B2.7B24 and B6.7B24 (ACOC 13: pp. 17-18)

Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that this had been done.

48.6   12.10.2.2. Two or more resource identifiers

48.6.1   Line 757: delete second sentence in second paragraph of A1.7B24; give precedence to practice used for sound recordings as general rule (CCC 2A: p. 3)

The Editor said that this related to the last sentence of the option in A1.7B24: "Record letters preceding a number before the first number, letters following a number after the last number, but letters preceding and following numbers in conjunction with each number." He noted that this applied when there was a run of numbers with the same letters in front of them. Margaret Stewart read from 5JSC/AACR3/I/CCC response: "Delete this sentence as this practice, that is applicable only to music in AACR2, would not work well with sound recording numbers. By deleting this sentence, the practice followed in AACR2 for sound recordings would be extended to music instead of the other way around. This would work better as a general rule applicable to all formats and would make the rule easier to follow." The Editor noted that the examples under 12.10.2.3 were mixed.

The Editor confirmed that the final sentence under 2.1.2.2.2 would be deleted, and the examples under 2.12.2.3 would be adjusted, e.g. "B. & H. 8797-8806" would change to

"B. & H. 8797-B. & H. 8806". The Editor said that it would be helpful to have examples to include under 12.10.2.2.
Action=Editor; Examples Group

48.7   12.10.2.3. Music publishers' numbers and plate numbers

48.7.1 Line 761: reword second paragraph of B2.7B24 (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett read the comments from 5JSC/AACR3/I/LC response: "1) Replace text with: "If the plate number or publisher's number is not that of the publisher of the resource being described, mention that in a note."; 2) Change first word of example to "Printed"; 3) LC will also supply a parenthetical explanation for the example." Hugh Taylor said that he disagreed with the first LC suggestion, as he thought it was important to record the number that was there. He added that sometimes the lineage was so complicated it was difficult to tell if it was the same publisher or not. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought that the LC suggestion would make it more complicated for the cataloguer. The Editor noted that the example mentioned in the LC response was not included in the draft because it was a note, and 12.10.2.3 was the instruction for recording the number. Barbara Tillett asked why the rule was limited to reprints. The Editor said that he would replace "reprint" with "facsimile or reproduction".
Action=Editor

48.8   12.10.2.4. Reference codes for archival resources

48.8.1 Barbara Tillett noted that the decision had been made to remove 12.10.2.4

48.9   12.12.1. Issue or part used as the basis for the description of a serial or multipart monograph

48.9.1 Line 776: revise caption for A2.7B27 to remove "iteration" (ALA 5: pp. 35-36; 16: p. 118; CILIP 5: p. 12)

The Editor noted that iterations were now covered in 12.2.2.

48.9.2 Line 773: revise A1.7B27 first paragraph to reflect terms at A1.0A1 (CCC 13: p. 12)

Margaret Stewart said that she thought this comment was moot.

48.9.3 Line 775: correct wording of A1.7B27 (LC Editorial table)

The Editor said that everyone in the response table had agreed, but because he had split the rule up, the change was not necessary.

48.10   12.12.1 a) Numbered serials

48.10.1 Line 777: revise instructions in A2.7B27.1 re combining notes (ALA 5: pp. 35-36; CILIP 5: p. 12)

Barbara Tillett said that she thought that the comment was covered.

48.11   12.12.1 b) Unnumbered serials

48.11.1 Line 778: reword A2.7B27.1b and c (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett read from 5JSC/AACR3/I/LC response: "In b), delete "and the latest issue or part can be identified" In c), reword as "If more than one part has been consulted, also make ..." JSC agreed to shorten 12.12.1 b).
Action=Editor

48.12   12.12.1 c) Multipart monographs

The Editor said that he would add "also" to 12.12.1 c) as per line 778.
Action=Editor

48.12.1 Line 774: remove reference to multipart monographs from A1.7B27 (already covered) (BL 13: p. 21)

The Editor said that this comment was moot.

48.12.2 Line 779: revise A2.7B27.1c (BL 5: p. 13)

Barbara Tillett said that the new structure made this unnecessary.

48.13   12.12.2. Iteration used as the basis for the description of an integrating resource

48.13.1 Line 781: question need for A3.7B27.1 (CCC 6: p. 7)

Barbara Tillett said that this comment did not apply because of the changed structure.

48.14   The Editor suggested that chapter 13 not be discussed, and outstanding issues be handled by email after the meeting. JSC agreed.

48.15   14.2. Type and form of content

The Editor said that the first line reference in chapter 14 (Line 601) was unable to be discussed until the GMD/SMD Working Group report was received.

48.16   14.3.1. Describing the nature and scope of archival collections

The Editor noted that it had already been decided to delete 14.3.1.

48.17   14.4.0.3. Recording language and script of the content

48.17.1 Line 621: move to A1.7B3 notes related to closed captions (ALA 13: p. 85)

The Secretary noted that ACOC had requested discussion in relation to how best to serve needs of the physically impaired. Jennifer Bowen read the comment from

5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA response: "ALA recommends that notes related to closed captions should be moved to A1.7B3." Barbara Tillett noted that closed captioning was covered by A1.5C2 in the December 2004 draft of AACR3 part I. John Attig said that ALA was suggesting that it be covered in a note rather than treated as an other technical detail. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that moving the information to a note meant that it was less likely to appear in a display. Jennifer Bowen said that her understanding was that OLAC thought that details about the closed captioning needed to be recorded, and this would be unwieldy in area 5. The Editor said that closed captioning had only ever been recorded in a note, but that he had introduced it to area 5, to treat it on a similar footing with braille, etc. He added that having a place in the technical description did not rule out also having a note if you needed to say more. Barbara Tillett noted that the rule was in chapter 13 at 13.5.1.3.

John Attig said that he thought you could make a point that part of the information was to do with disability, and part was to do with language. He added that this information could be split, but this would not be the preferred solution for that community. Judy Kuhagen noted that there was also a language element in the case of braille. The Editor said that there could be a language note for a closed caption, and that he would add an example to 14.4.0.2 if he could find one in AACR2. He suggested that the place of closed captioning in chapter 13 rule be discussed later. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that closed captions could be in a different language to the resource. The Editor said that this was covered by the text of the rule, which said to make a note unless the language was "apparent from the rest of the description".
Action=Editor

Barbara Tillett asked about signing in a moving image. The Editor replied that this was also legitimate as a language note, as it was the language of the content.

Barbara Tillett asked if the language of the accompanying material (14.4.1) should be merged in with 14.4.0.3. The Editor noted that it had been decided to have a separate instruction at the Cambridge meeting.

Barbara Tillett noted that to include symbol systems the caption should change to "language, script, etc." as had been discussed previously. The Editor agreed.
Action=Editor

48.17.2   Line 623: restore 6.7B2 as B6.7B3 (ALA 13: p. 92)

Jennifer Bowen read the comment from 5JSC/AACR3/I/ALA response: "AACR2 rule 6.7B2 was omitted from AACR3: "Give the language(s) of the spoken or sung content of a recording unless this is apparent from the rest of the description." A1.7B3 doesn't specifically address this issue, where some, but not all, of the content of a sound recording contains sung text. Restoring this instruction as B6.7B3 would help clarify the situation." The Editor said that the rule only referred to the content, and that "spoken or sung" was no longer there. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this was OK.

48.18   14.6.0.3. Summarizing the content

48.18.1   Line 729: include in A1.7B20 instruction to add a summary for accessible materials (CILIP 13: p. 17).

The Editor noted that this had been done because everyone agreed with the suggestion.

48.18.2   Line 727: review instructions in A1.7B20 for a resource "that consists entirely or predominantly of music" (CILIP 13: p. 17)

Jennifer Bowen said that the rule instructed not to provide a summary of the content if the resource was entirely or predominantly music, but that sometimes you might want to make this note. The Editor said that this would mean removing the parenthetical from the rule. The Chair read out the comment from 5JSC/AACR3/I/CILIP response: "A1.7B20. The rule carries over from AACR2 an instruction not to provide a summary for a resource "that consists entirely or predominantly of music". This requires review. What about, for example, a sound recording that accompanies an art installation? (Real world example: Recorded sound that accompanies sequence of paintings by Richard Mortensen at Trapholt Museum, Denmark. The sound is available on a separate medium). There seems to be no provision for providing this information in a B6.7 note either." Jennifer Bowen said that she did not want a summary for music to be required. John Attig commented that there was no requirement to make any note. The Editor said that he would remove the parenthetical statement.
Action=Editor

48.18.3   Line 728: suggest rewording for "music" in A1.7B20 (ALA 13: p. 90)

The Secretary noted that according to the response table no one had agreed with the suggestion. Jennifer Bowen said that she would not pursue it.

48.18.4   Line 730: suggest add to end of A1.7B20 "if considered to be important" (ALA 13: p. 90)

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA did not want the note to be required, and as per the previous discussion, it was not.

48.19   14.7.0.3. Listing contents

48.19.1   Line 734: revise A1.7B21: to cover provisions in B4.7B21 and B6.7B21 (ACOC 13: p. 17)

The Editor said that he had kept separate instructions for musical works. Barbara Tillett said that there was no base line of the elements to be included, only examples. The Editor said that for printed music and sound recordings there were extra things to be added to the contents list, which was why he had a separate instruction at 14.7.1. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC wanted it to be clear that you could record statements of responsibility. Barbara Tillett asked if cartographic works and graphic works required separate instructions. John Attig suggested that the JSC discuss the other line numbers listed after the rule, as he knew that ALA had made some suggestions.

48.19.2   Line 736: revise A1.7B21: change instructions on recording titles formally (ACOC 13: p. 17)

Deirdre Kiorgaard read the comments from 5JSC/AACR3/I/ACOC response: "Whether recorded manually by a cataloguer from the item, or using data supplied by a publisher, it is more cost-efficient to take the information from a contents listing. Additional guidance could be provided for cases where the titles differ, for example: "When recording titles formally, take them from a unified source such as a contents list. If the title given on the head of a part differs from that in found in the contents list, and it is considered to be important, record both."" The Editor noted that the rule in the current draft made no instruction as to the source of the contents listing. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that text from chapter 4 was included in the December 2004 draft of part I: "When recording titles formally, take them from the head of the part to which they refer rather than from contents lists, etc." The Editor said that he had been told to remove everything from the draft that originated in chapter 4. John Attig asked if it was sufficient that the rule no longer told you to take titles from the head of the part. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC would prefer that titles were taken from a unified source.

48.19.3   Line 737: change instructions at A1.7B21 on recording titles formally (ALA 13: p. 85)

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had recommended the following text: "When recording titles formally, take them from the source in the item being catalogued that provides the best identification." Barbara Tillett said that it was important to be able to machine capture contents lists from publishers. The Editor said that in order to do this it would be better not to prescribe the source of the information. Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if it mattered if the titles were different in different places. The Editor replied that this instruction was just for the contents list, and not for related parts. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the problem sentence was no longer in the rule.

Judy Kuhagen asked if 11.7.8 would come into play. The Editor replied that it would not, as it was to do with citations. The Editor noted that the first example showed a problem with the new approach, in that it had multiple elements separated by ISBD punctuation. He added that he did not know what to do with examples like this. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that an explanatory note could be added, e.g. "Example in ISBD display". The Editor said that he would include something in the introduction to part I to say that for the most part examples only showed the element being discussed, but if they showed multiple elements, they would be presented using ISBD presentation. Margaret Stewart said that this was an area on which the Examples Group wanted guidance. The Chair confirmed that an explanatory note would be added for examples that included ISBD punctuation. **Action=Editor**

48.19.4   Line 738: add a general instruction to A1.7B21 on other information to be recorded (ALA 13: p. 85)

John Attig noted that this was similar to the ACOC suggestion in line 734.

48.19.5   Line 739: add to A1.7B21 or A2.7B21 "Do not give contents notes for monographic series" (ALA 13: p. 85)

Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if you were doing a comprehensive record why you could not give a contents note. The Editor said that no one said that you had to give it. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought this was an education issue in terms of following RDA.

The Editor said that there was still the issue of whether 14.7.1-14.7.4 would be rolled into the general rule (14.7.0.3). Margaret Stewart said that these communities wanted their own instructions and examples. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the specific examples did not always add anything new. Jennifer Bowen suggested that all of the examples could be listed under the general rule. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that all that was being added by the specific instructions were statements of responsibility not recorded in the statement of responsibility element, and extent. The Editor said that duration would be covered by extent. Jennifer Bowen said that 14.7.1 instructed you to add opus numbers. John Attig said that the cataloguer needed to make a judgement about what other information to include. The Editor noted that the general rule did not specify what to include or not include. He suggested that the minimum to include in addition to the title would be the statement of responsibility (not otherwise recorded) and the extent. Barbara Tillett said that this would mean more rule interpretations. Jennifer Bowen asked if the rule interpretations would say not to do it. Barbara Tillett said that would be the case. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that there could be an option to add the statement of responsibility and the statement of extent. The Editor said that he would add an option under the general rule. He added that this meant that 14.7.1-14.7.4 would be deleted and some of the examples moved to the general rule. Jennifer Bowen asked about the opus number. The Editor said that no one was limiting what you included in the content listing. Jennifer Bowen said that she would like to see an example with opus numbers. The Editor said that he would do this, and he would include a graphic example with frames.
Action=Editor

48.19.6   Line 742: add more guidance to B6.7B21 (ALA 13: p. 93)

Jennifer Bowen said that this comment was to do with the format of the duration. She asked if an example could be added in the HH:MM:SS format. The Editor said that there were rules on duration in chapter 13. He added that there would need to be discussion of the ALA suggestion to use this format in general (Line 679).

48.19.7   Line 740: fold B4.7B21 into A1.7B21, or move relevant example (CCC 2B: p. 4; LC 2B: p. 21)

The Editor noted that this had now been done.

48.20   14.8.0.3. Noting indexes and finding aids

48.20.1   Line 745: add general guidance on when notes are included in the shareable part of the bibliographic description (e.g. A1.7B22, A1.7B28, A1.7B29, A1.7B30) (ACOC 13: p. 18)

Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested the issue be discussed with the item-specific instructions. She added that it had been agreed the previous day that if a resource was unique, notes would be included in the shareable part of the bibliographic description.

48.20.2   Line 746: clarify scope of A1.7B22 (CILIP 13: p. 17)

The Chair read out the comment from 5JSC/AACR3/I/CILIP response: "A1.7B22. The inclusion of finding aids is welcome. The scope might be clearer if it indicates that, while indexes can apply at item-level and collection-level, other aids - such as lists, catalogues and descriptive monographs - apply to collections of resources." The Editor noted that he was going to use the definition from DACS. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think that the limitation was critical.

48.20.3   Line 747: separate A1.7B22 into separate rules (ALA 13: p. 91)

Jennifer Bowen said that the ALA comment was: "It seems odd to have these two notes grouped together. Is there a reason to not give them in separate rules?" The Editor said that the reason was that the definitions overlapped. John Attig said that having the definition at the front of the rule (as in the current draft) would help.

48.20.4   Line 748: make A1.7B22 unequivocal re indexes (CILIP 13: p. 17)

The Chair read out the comment from 5JSC/AACR3/I/CILIP response: "It is difficult to know whether an index is 'considered to be important'. It would be much better either to be told either to mention indexes every time or to ignore them altogether. The rule needs to be unequivocal, otherwise we shall never get any consistency." Jennifer Bowen commented that no note was required. Margaret Stewart said that some instructions for notes had "if considered to be important". Jennifer Bowen asked if there needed to be a general directive to make notes only if considered to be important. The Editor said that any instruction such as this would have to be in the General Introduction. He said that he could either expunge instances of "if considered to be important", or add them when they were not there. He commented that the phrase did not only appear in conjunction with notes, but with elements such as Layout. Barbara Tillett said that during the transition period to people thinking in terms of elements and cataloguers judgement, she would prefer to retain "if considered to be important" to provide guidance. JSC agreed.

48.21   14.9.0.3. Describing related content

48.21.1   Line 655: expand A1.7B9 to cover provisions in B6.7B9 and B7.7B9 [this rule may require further revision when the rules for added entries are revised] (ACOC 13: p. 16)

Deirdre Kiorgaard read the comment from 5JSC/AACR3/I/ACOC response: "ACOC would prefer that this rule be expanded to explicitly cover the provisions currently found in later rules for sound (B6.7B9) and moving images (B7.7B9), such as the date of original production, country of original release, edition of the work performed, or the history of the recording. Appropriate examples could be included and the supplementary rules could then be eliminated." The Editor said that he had included examples. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that ACOC's motivation was to promote consistency, and if on this occasion that had been done by deleting rules, she did not know that it mattered.

Judy Kuhagen asked whether it had been decided to remove "bibliographic" from "bibliographic history". The Editor said that it would read: "Make notes on the

bibliographic history of the resource being described and/or its relationships to the content of other resources." [Note: see 5JSC/M/37.15.]

48.22   14.9.1.0. Notes on preceding, succeeding, and simultaneously issued resources

48.22.1   Line 656: add category for "issued with" to A2.7B9 (ALA 5: p.34)

Jennifer Bowen said that the rule for "issued with" (12.7B22) had not been carried over from AACR2, and ALA recommended the addition of another category. The Editor confirmed that he would add another category under 14.9.1. He asked if it should be limited to serials. JSC decided that this was not necessary.
Action=Editor

The Editor said that he had yet to accommodate the "with" note in the draft because he was not sure whether it meant published together, or stuck together later. He noted that there was currently a reference at 11.2.2 to "XX.X". The Editor confirmed that "issued with" would cover "with" notes.
Action=Editor

48.23   14.9.1.1. Continuation or sequel

48.23.1   Line 649: query re usage of "name" of another resource in A1.7B9a-d (ALA 13: p. 89)

The Editor said that he would change the phrase "provide the name of the succeeding resource" to "make a note citing the succeeding resource" to match the wording in the first bullet point in the rule.
Action=Editor

48.23.2   Line 650: expand A1.7B9a to include making a note about a sequel to the resource being described, and to include prequels (ALA 13: p. 89)

The Editor confirmed that he would change the caption to "Continuation, sequel, prequel, etc." and mention prequels in the text of the rule.
Action=Editor

48.24   14.9.1.5. Translation

48.24.1   Line 652: problems with word "edition" in A1.7B9b and A1.7B9c (LC Editorial table)

Barbara Tillett read out the comments from 5JSC/AACR3/I/LC response: "Problems with word "edition" in b) [it's really a different resource because language is different], in c) [they're different resources]." The Editor said that the intention was to use 14.9.1.5 for a translation and 14.9.1.6 for a simultaneous edition. John Attig said that he thought it would be very hard to avoid the use of "edition" in the rule. The Editor agreed.

Judy Kuhagen noted that the second bullet in 14.9.1.6 referred to the "name of the other resource" when it should refer to the citation. John Attig noted that the phrase also occurred in 14.9.1.5. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that it could read: "If unable to cite the other edition, make a general note". JSC agreed.

Action=Editor

48.25   14.9.2.1. Recording details of the original manifestation

48.25.1   Line 595: move final paragraph of A1.7A4 to A1.7B (ALA 13: p. 87)

          Barbara Tillett noted that this had already been discussed. [Note: see 5JSC/M/30.15.6.]

48.25.2   Line 596: delete second sentence of A1.7A4 final paragraph as given at A1.7B26 (ALA 13: p. 88)

          The Editor said that the final paragraph had been removed.

48.25.3   Line 770: merge A1.7B26 with A1.7A4 (ALA 2A: p. 20)

          John Attig said that this was the same as Line 596.

48.25.4   Barbara Tillett said that there was a problem with the first example in 14.9.2.1 ("Facsim. of: 2nd ed., rev. London : Routledge, 1877") as it did not have the details of the original manifestation, i.e. no title or statement of responsibility. The Editor said that this example was for a facsimile of the same work. Barbara Tillett asked if the rule needed to state to omit elements if they were identical. The Editor said that the example was following 11.7.7. Judy Kuhagen noted that it had been decided to delete 11.7.7, and follow 11.7.8. [Note: see 5JSC/M/30.21.]

          Jennifer Bowen suggested that "the" be removed from "record the details of the original manifestation". The Editor said that he would use "record relevant details of the original manifestation"; and remove the first example as the rules for citing another edition had changed. JSC agreed.
          Action=Editor

49   Status report of the CC:DA Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media

49.1   Received and considered the following document:
          5JSC/ALA/1

49.2   The Chair asked John Attig, Chair of the CC:DA Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media to address the meeting. John Attig explained that the Task Force was planning to make final recommendations based on the draft of RDA part I. He asked if he could share the Editor's draft with the Task Force. The Editor said that it would be better for the Task Force to wait to see the draft that incorporated changes from the current meeting.

49.3   John Attig said that he wanted to clarify where digital graphic representation would go in the draft. He added that in discussions with the Editor it had been agreed that it would go in chapter 13 rather than chapter 14. The Editor said that he would remove digital graphic representation from Chapter 14. John Attig said that the Task Force was looking to see how much these instructions should be generalized. He noted that they had been written by cartographic materials specialists for a cartographic data standard. He added that the

Task Force wanted to see if others describing graphic materials would find the instructions adequate. The Editor suggested that the Task Force should specifically look at CAD resources.
Action=Editor; CC:DA Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media

49.4   Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the Task Force was able to move forward without advice from the JSC. John Attig said that there were issues in the status report to do with what constituted a data element, but that he now had a much better understanding of this.

50   Punctuation within elements

50.1   Received and considered the following document:
        5JSC/Sec/4

50.2   Barbara Tillett said that she thought that ISBD(CM) would also need to be consulted. The Secretary replied that section 0.3 of ISBD(CM) had been consulted in the preparation of 5JSC/Sec/4. She explained that it had been difficult in some cases to identify the punctuation within elements, which is why she had made the decision to compare the December 2004 draft with the instructions in only 0.3 and 0.4 of the ISBDs.

50.3   The Editor said that in the current draft he had left out all of the preceding and enclosing punctuation in the ISBD outlines. He said that in terms of what had been identified in 5JSC/Sec/4, he had retained instructions if they were required for the intelligibility of the data element, e.g. beginning date and end date. He suggested that the JSC see how the instructions that had been carried over looked in the latest draft. The Secretary suggested that she prepare a table mapping the rules in 5JSC/Sec/4 to the rules in the Editor's draft. JSC agreed.
        Action=Secretary

51   Numbering scheme used in RDA

51.1   The Editor explained that there had been comments on the numbering both in relation to the Prospectus, and from those who had seen the Editor's draft. He said that one problem that had been identified was that the numbering needed to be precise enough to allow you to make references. He added that he thought this had been taken care of.

51.2   The Editor said that the second problem was with the chapter numbers. He explained that currently the "0" numbers in AACR2 referred either to the General Introduction or to the introduction to one of the parts, and from the index it was difficult to know where to go. He said that everyone had insisted that all paragraphs in introductions be numbered, and to make it clear which introduction was meant, he had numbered paragraphs in the General introduction as 0.X, and paragraphs in the introduction to part I as 10.X. He noted that people did not like starting part I with Chapter 11.

51.3   The Editor suggested that it would be possible to number the paragraphs in all introductions to begin with 0, i.e.

0.0 - General Introduction
0.1 - Introduction to part I
0.2 - Introduction to part II
0.3 - Introduction to part III

John Attig asked if this meant that the General Introduction would be chapter 0. The Editor said that it would not; this was just the way of numbering the paragraphs within it. He said that as an example, the paragraphs in the Introduction to part I would be numbered as 0.1.1, 0.1.2, 0.1.3.

51.4   The Editor said that this numbering of the introductions would mean that part I could start with chapter 1, and that part II could follow without a gap. He added that there was a slight risk that a new chapter would be required in part I, but he thought that the risk was much less with the RDA arrangement as there would not be a new type of material. Jennifer Bowen noted that people were currently used to the gap between parts. Barbara Tillett said that other communities would find it strange. The Chair noted that part II would begin with chapter 7. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that the JSC needed to be certain that there would not be any new chapters in part I. The Editor said that this was also the case with the other parts. JSC agreed to the new system for numbering the introductions proposed by the Editor.

51.5   The Editor said that people did not seem to be entirely happy with a numeric scheme with three decimal places. He noted that a numeric scheme was used by the ISBDs. He added that in the Prospectus comments, it had been suggested that a decimal scheme be used, but he was not sure how to do this. Barbara Tillett commented that DACS used an alphanumeric scheme. Jennifer Bowen said that the JSC had managed over the meeting to use the existing scheme. The Editor said that if there was an alphanumeric scheme there was the potential for conflict with the current rules. Jennifer Bowen asked at what level a letter would be used. The Editor replied that it would serve as a separator and save two decimal points (e.g. 1.1A1). He added that there would still be four levels of subdivision, with additional breakdown by a), b), c), and then small roman numerals if necessary. He noted that in the current draft, all numbers began with two digits for the chapter, and this would change to one.

51.6   The Editor said that the JSC had to make a final decision on the numbering scheme, as renumbering was complicated and time-consuming. Barbara Tillett said that she preferred an alphanumeric scheme for citing purposes. Jennifer Bowen said that it would be easier to notice if something was wrong with the numbering. The Editor said that another factor was that RDA was being presented as something new. Margaret Stewart asked what the implications were in terms of the Web product. The Editor said that in terms of generating a concise version he thought there might be gaps of numbers. Margaret Stewart commented that this would occur whatever scheme was chosen. She added that she liked the new numeric approach. The Chair said that she liked it because it would send the message that RDA was different. Deirdre Kiorgaard commented that an alphanumeric was easier to say, but that the numeric approach looked more modern. Jennifer Bowen said that she was concerned that alphanumeric numbers could be confused with AACR2 numbers. Barbara Tillett said that when rules were referred to you would identify where

they came from, e.g. AACR2. Margaret Stewart said that in the short-term training would be easier if the numbering was different.

51.7   The Chair noted that the JSC members had different opinions, and some had no opinion. She suggested that the Project Manager be asked her preference from a library educator's perspective. The Editor suggested that the Project Manager ask the co-publishers for their opinion. John Attig noted that a decision was required quickly. The Editor said that he needed a decision before the next version of the draft, which he hoped to complete by November 1. The Chair said that she would contact the Project Manager and the CILIP representative (who had also left the meeting). [Post meeting note: JSC decided to use a numeric scheme.]
Action=Chair

52   Proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules

52.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/Chair/5
5JSC/Chair/5/CCC follow-up
5JSC/Chair/5/LC follow-up
5JSC/Chair/5/ALA follow-up
5JSC/Chair/5/CILIP follow-up
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/CILIP response
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ALA response
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ACOC response
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/CCC response
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/LC response
5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/BL response

52.2   The Chair noted that there had been little agreement on the proposals to simplify chapter 21 special rules. The Editor said that he would carry over everything from the existing chapter 21 and only make changes when there was agreement.
Action=Editor

53   Introductions to RDA

53.1   Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Restricted/Chair/2

53.2   The Editor said that between November 1 and December 1 he would draft the introduction to part I. He noted that some people had asked for the draft of the General Introduction to be included with the draft of part I, but that this would not be done.
Action=Editor

54   Revision of Appendices (incorporating Abbreviations in AACR3 – Principles, and Draft of RDA Appendix E – Presentation of Descriptive Data)

54.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/CILIP/1
5JSC/CILIP/1/CCC response
5JSC/CILIP/1/LC response
5JSC/CILIP/1/ALA response
5JSC/CILIP/1/ACOC response
5JSC/CILIP/1/BL response

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Appendix E

54.2   The Editor reminded the JSC that he had sent out a discussion paper on the organization of the appendices, to which they had responded by email. He noted that the first four appendices (on capitalization, numerals, initial articles, and abbreviations) were to be applied as rules, and the remainder were informative. The Editor said that he had suggested in his memo that when rules currently in the appendices applied to a specific element, they be included with that element. He noted that over the last few days it had been discovered that this could be problematic. He added that he did not think that this invalidated the idea. He said that he would work on the rules where it had seemed to go wrong, but not the appendices themselves. He confirmed that the appendices were in the correct order. Barbara Tillett noted that because there would no longer be levels, appendix G (Comparative table of levels of description) and appendix H (Comparative table of levels of access point control) were not necessary. The Editor agreed and noted that this had been discussed as a possible separate product. Barbara Tillett asked what would be used for appendix F (Presentation of access point control data). The Editor said that he thought that GARR was on the same level as ISBD. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think this was the case as Italy was the only country she knew of that followed GARR. The Editor said that this would be discussed with part III.

54.3   The Editor said that he was planning to circulate Appendix E (Presentation of descriptive data) with the draft of part I. He asked the JSC members to look at the Appendix and let him know if there was anything that they thought was strange. He noted that the table in the Appendix contained a mapping of the RDA elements to the ISBD elements. John Attig said that one thing which had been unclear was the status of ISBD presentation, and he thought that Appendix E would help to clarify this. The Editor said that it would also help to flag those things that could be problematic from a MARC point of view in terms of programming.

54.4   John Attig said that he thought it would be worth considering a parallel appendix on encoding standards. Barbara Tillett asked if the JSC could discuss what would be in Appendix E on OPAC displays. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought it would be good to give some examples of what would be included. The Editor said that he did not think that it was realistic to include anything on OPAC displays in the December 2005 draft. Jennifer Bowen noted that having a crosswalk between MARC and RDA had been discussed. The Editor said that he thought that this was important in terms of consultation

with stakeholders. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she would be like to see one record done in three ways: ISBD; MARC; and how the user would see it. Jennifer Bowen said that it would be interesting to see a record using two different encoding schemes.

54.5   Jennifer Bowen said that she was pleased that Appendix E would be going out with the draft of part I, and she hoped that there could be an explanation of what would be included at a future stage for OPAC displays. The Editor said that one difficulty was that the IFLA document only contained guidelines. He added that it could be explained in the cover letter that the ISBD instructions were included because they were part and parcel of the rules that were being transformed.

54.6   The Chair asked about the line numbers listed in the draft. The Editor said that he would hide these in the draft for constituency review.
        Action=Editor

55   **General principles for inclusion of terms in the AACR Glossary**

55.1   Received and considered the following document:
        5JSC/Policy/3

55.2   The Chair noted that discussion on the Glossary would be deferred, as it would not be issued with the December 2005 draft of part I.

56   **RDA Examples Group**

56.1   Received and considered the following documents:
        5JSC/Chair/1
        5JSC/Chair/1/Rev

        5JSC/Chair/2
        5JSC/Chair/2/Rev

56.2   The Chair asked Margaret Stewart to lead a discussion on the issues listed in the status report of the RDA Examples Group [which was issued after the meeting as 5JSC/Chair/1/Rev/Chair follow-up].

56.3   The Chair noted that the first issue was a request that the Examples Group be given access to the drafts currently on the Workspace. Margaret Stewart said that the work of the Group had been stalled because they did not have access to a draft. She asked if it would be better for the Group to wait until changes arising from the meeting had been incorporated. The Editor said that it would be appropriate for the Group to have access to the November 1 version of the draft.

56.4   Margaret Stewart said that she thought there was some discomfort in the Group with the lack of ISBD presentation, and there were questions regarding explanatory text. The Editor said that the Group would be able to see what he had done in the draft when modifying existing examples. He said that repetitions in an element were given without line spaces, and if explanation was required, he had added comments, or labels in front of

the element. Barbara Tillett noted that it had been agreed to add a caption for examples using ISBD presentation.

56.5   Margaret Stewart said that there had been a suggestion from the Group that ISBD punctuation be used in examples, but that she now understood that it was only to be used as an exception when there was no other effective way to display the data.

56.6   Margaret Stewart said that the next issue was that if the display was by data element, there were likely to be more explanatory notes. She said that the Group knew that some examples would have notes and some would not, and wanted to know if consistency was necessary. Margaret Stewart said that her understanding was that the JSC just wanted examples to be clear.

56.7   Margaret Stewart said that the Group was wondering whether the bulk of examples would be appearing in a separate document. She added that this was related to the number of examples. She said that her understanding was that under the general rules there should be a mix of examples for different types of resources. The Editor asked the Examples Group to add a code to examples to show the type of content or carrier, as this was not always self-evident.
        Action=Examples Group

56.8   Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the JSC needed to formally respond to the Examples Group. Margaret Stewart said that she would report back to Denise Lim, the Chair of the Group.
        Action=Margaret Stewart

56.9   Margaret Stewart asked if the JSC was still thinking about a separate document for examples. Barbara Tillett said she would like the Working Group's advice.

56.10   Margaret Stewart said that the next question from the Group was whether the general rule and the rule at the specific element should both have examples. She added that her understanding was that this redundancy was acceptable. The Editor said that he thought it was desirable. Margaret Stewart noted that the Group needed to think in terms of the Web product. The Editor suggested that the Group be very conscious of the rules with a "C*" in them as these would appear in the concise version.

56.11   Margaret Stewart said that the Group would like confirmation that it should pursue links from the examples to relevant images in the online version. Jennifer Bowen suggested that if the Group were identifying real examples they could keep a file as they went. The Editor suggested that the Group do what they could with a minimum amount of effort. John Attig confirmed that the Group was not investigating the feasibility of linking, but providing the data. The Editor said that he thought that the big cost would be getting clearance to use images.

56.12   Margaret Stewart said that the last issue was a proposed timeline. She said that they had suggested that from November 2005-March 2006 they would work on part I. The Chair noted that the JSC would see the results at the April meeting. John Attig asked whether the examples would be presented as a separate list. Jennifer Bowen asked if the Group should insert the examples into the draft for constituency review. Margaret Stewart said

that it would be easier to review the examples in context and that perhaps the Group could do both. The Editor suggested that he discuss this further with the Group. He said that if examples were inserted into the draft, the new and changed examples would need to be highlighted.
Action=Editor; Examples Group

56.13   Deirdre Kiorgaard asked if the Working Group needed to be made aware of what was happening with chapter 13. Margaret Stewart said that the Group was aware, and they were ignoring it for the time being.

56.14   The Editor said that the proposed timeline for the Examples Group were fine with him. Jennifer Bowen noted that the Examples Group would work on examples for a part at the same time that the draft of that part was issued for review. Barbara Tillett said that this was another point to be included in the cover letter, i.e. that examples were subject the change and a Group was working on them.

57   RDA Outreach Group

57.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/Chair/4
5JSC/Chair/4/Rev

5JSC/Chair/8

57.2   The Chair said that when she had a report from the Outreach Group she would distribute it to the JSC. She added that she had a report from Robina Clayphan on the Dublin Core Conference that she would forward for information.
Action=Sally Strutt

58   Draft of RDA chapters 11-16 (continued)

58.1   The Editor said that in terms of the remainder of the lines in the response table (5JSC/AACR3/I/Discussion guide/Sec follow-up/Rev) he would make changes only if he felt that there was reasonable consensus. He added that in November he would email the JSC members with a list of issues he wanted a second opinion on.
Action=Editor

58.2   The Chair said that it needed to be clear what was meant by simplification. The Editor said that as CILIP had noted, the JSC needed to stop thinking of the draft as a linear text. He added that there was not a simple equation between length of text and simplification. He noted that sometimes a little more explanation simplified the task of the cataloguer, and that because of the structure of RDA and the potential for different views, redundancy would assist the user. The Editor said that as an example, he had included definitions at the top of each element, and these had been tagged as such, which meant display could be masked. Jennifer Bowen said that this was an area where the JSC needed the advice of a Web designer. She added that in many cases the text of the rule repeated the wording of the caption. The Editor noted that a number of rules did not originally have a caption, and he had added it. Jennifer Bowen asked if this was an opportunity to simplify the wording

of the rules. The Editor replied that he did not think so, because you still needed the instruction. Jennifer Bowen suggested that this was something to explore with the Web developer. The Editor said that he thought it was an editorial issue.

58.3   Deirdre Kiorgaard said that one thing that ACOC had found appealing about the LC simplification was that you could look at it and get the main things out of it quite quickly. The Editor said that the instructions in the LC proposal were so slim because rules had been dropped. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought that rules needed to be looked at on a case-by-case basis to see if they were required. The Editor noted that "simplification" did not appear in either the strategic plan or the Prospectus. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that there had been comments on simplification throughout the process and a goal of the new approach was to have the wording of the rules as clear as possible. The Editor said that style was one thing, but he thought that the managers at LC wanted the rules to be less complicated to apply. The Editor noted that simplification had not been done systematically and rigorously.

58.4   The Chair suggested that during stakeholder discussions library trainers and educators be asked for their views. Jennifer Bowen said that she agreed. The Chair noted that the new Project Manager was a library educator. The Editor said that from informal feedback he knew that educators liked it when there was a model and the concepts were clear.

58.5   Jennifer Bowen said that she thought that during the discussions at the meeting the JSC had been finding the middle ground in terms of simplification. Deirdre Kiorgaard said that she thought the wording of the definitions under the basic instructions for recording titles were very clear, and this was a style to aim for in new text. The Editor said that this was what he had tried to do, but he had not felt at liberty to make major changes. Jennifer Bowen suggested that the Editor be given more encouragement to do this. The Editor said that sometimes it was difficult to change wording without changing substance. He added that it in terms of the timeline, he needed to stop work on part I. Deirdre Kiorgaard suggested that for the next two parts the Editor be given a stronger brief to simplify wording. Jennifer Bowen said that she thought that with parts II and III more work would be needed to make the concepts clear for other communities. She said that she agreed that it was probably too late to do much more with part I. Deirdre Kiorgaard noted that the introduction to part I would be important in setting the stage and needed to be simply worded.

59   JSC program of work

59.1   The program of work was updated [Note: as at 7 November 2005]:

Overall Structure of RDA

Revisions	Series	Who	When
Prospectus	5JSC/RDA/ Prospectus	Editor	Dec 1, 2005: Prospectus revised
		Secretary	Dec. 1, 2005: Revised prospectus on Web site, translators notified

Numbering scheme used for RDA		Chair	Oct. 21, 2005: Consult with CILIP rep and Project Manager
		JSC reps	Oct. 28, 2005: Decision on numbering
		Editor	Nov. 1, 2005: Used in draft of part I

Part I of RDA

Related 4JSC series: LC/56, CILIP-BL/2 (Multipart items); ALA/36, CCC/6, CCC/7 (Specific material designations); Chair/73, ACOC rep/1 (GMDs/Class of materials); Chair/75, ALA/49, ALA/50, ALA/53, ALA/54, ALA/60 (Consistency in part I); ALA/46 (Abbreviation of metric symbols); Sec/7 (Punct. in language examples); ALA/61 (Early printed monographs)

Revisions	Series	Who	When
Constituency review of part I draft	5JSC/AACR3/ I	Editor	Nov. 1, 2005: Draft to JSC reps
		JSC reps	Nov. 18, 2005: Comments due
	5JSC/Editor/R DA/ Part I/…	Editor	Dec. 1, 2005: Draft issued
		JSC/Const	Mar. 20, 2006: Responses to part I draft due
	5JSC/Sec/3	JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Review of resps at meeting
Cover letter for part I draft		Chair/Sec	Nov. 1, 2005: Identify issues for inclusion in cover letter
		JSC reps	Nov. 18, 2005: Consultation with Project manager, Communications advisor
		Chair	Dec 1, 2005: Cover letter issued
New proposals arising from part I draft		JSC/Const	Feb. 13, 2006: Proposals due
		JSC/Const	Mar. 27, 2006: Responses due
		JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion at meeting
Sources of information	5JSC/LC/1	ALA rep	Nov. 1, 2005: Informal document on preferred sources of information
		JSC reps	Nov. 18, 2005: Discussions complete
		Editor	Dec. 1, 2005: Incorporated into part I draft

GMD/SMD working group	5JSC/Chair/6 5JSC/Chair/7	WG	Nov. 1, 2005: Report
		JSC reps	Nov. 18, 2005: Discussions complete
		Editor	Dec. 1, 2005: Incorporated into part I draft (if agreement)
Rules for digital media	5JSC/ALA/1	ALA	Feb. 13, 2006: Proposal due
		JSC/Const	Mar. 27, 2006: Responses due
		JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion at meeting
Punctuation within elements	5JSC/Sec/4	Secretary	Nov. 1, 2005: Chart mapping 5JSC/Sec/4 to rules in draft of part I
		JSC reps	Nov. 18, 2005: Comments to Editor
		Editor	Dec. 1, 2005: Incorporated into part I draft
URLS		JSC reps	Nov. 18, 2005: Comments on document from ACOC rep
		ACOC rep	Nov. 24, 2005: Comments to Editor
		Editor	Dec. 1, 2005: Incorporated into part I draft (if agreement)

Part II of RDA

Related 4JSC series: ACOC/1 ("Rule of 3"); CCC/9 (Replace "main/added entry" terminology)

Revisions	**Series**	**Who**	**When**
Part II	5JSC/Chair/3	Editor	Mar. 27, 2006: preliminary draft of part II on Workspace
	5JSC/Editor/ Part II/ Function	JSC/Ed	Apr. 2006 discussion at meeting
		Editor	May-Jun. 06: finish reworking of part II
	5JSC/Chair/5	JSC/Const	July-Sept. 06: Responses to part II
		JSC/Ed.	Oct. 2006: Review of resps at meeting

New proposals arising from part II draft		JSC/Const	Aug. 2006: Proposals due
		JSC/Const	Sept. 2006: Responses due
		JSC/Ed.	Oct. 2006: Discussion at meeting
Levels of description, levels of access, levels of authority control	5JSC/ACOC rep/1	JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion of outstanding part II issues
Archival rules	5JSC/LC/3	JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion of outstanding part II issues

Part III of RDA

Related 4JSC series: LC/54 (Authority control); Chair/71 (FVWG);

Revisions	Series	Who	When
Part III		Editor	Mar. 27, 2006: Draft documents on functional requirements and objectives and principles for part III
		JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion at meeting
		Editor	May-Sept. 06: Begin drafting part III
		JSC/Ed	Oct. 2006: Discussion at meeting
		Editor	Nov.-Dec 06 : Finish drafting part III
		JSC/Const	Jan. 06-Mar. 07: Responses to part III
		JSC/Ed.	April 2007: Review of resps at meeting
New proposals arising from part III draft		JSC/Const	Feb. 2007: Proposals due
		JSC/Const	Mar. 2007: Responses due
		JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2007: Discussion at meeting
Levels of description, levels of access, levels of authority control	5JSC/ACOC rep/1	JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion of outstanding part III issues
Archival rules	5JSC/LC/3	JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion of outstanding part III issues

Names of families	New proposal	LC	Feb. 13, 2006: Proposal due
		JSC/Const	Mar. 27, 2006: Responses due
		JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: Discussion at meeting

General RDA

Related 4JSC series: Chair/76, LC/60 (FRBR terminology); Sec/5 (AACR Glossary); Sec/6 (Considered to be important); Sec/9 (Comparison of "optional addition" and "optionally").

Revisions	**Series**	**Who**	**When**
Introduction	4JSC/CILIP-BL/1	Editor	Nov. 06-Mar. 07: Work on General Introduction
	5JSC/Restricted/Chair/2	JSC/Ed.	April 2007: Discussion at meeting
Statement of objectives and principles	4JSC/Chair/74	Editor/ Secretary	Dec. 1, 2005: draft available on public Web site
	5JSC/Editor/RDA/Objectives and Principles		
Revision of Appendices	5JSC/CILIP/1	CILIP rep/Chair	Mar. 27, 2006: Issue charge for working group
	5JSC/Editor/RDA/Appendix E	JSC/Ed.	Apr. 2006: creation of working group
		WG	Sept. 2006: first report
		JSC/Ed.	Oct. 2006: Discussion at meeting
		JSC/WG	Nov. 06-Mar. 07: Work on appendices
		JSC/Ed.	April. 2007: Discussion at meeting
Glossary	5JSC/Policy/3	JSC reps	April 2006: revised version of 5JSC/Policy/3, prior to/at meeting
		JSC/Ed.	Oct. 2006: Discussion of outstanding part I Glossary comments
		JSC	Nov. 06-Mar. 07: Work on Glossary
		JSC/Ed.	April. 2007: Discussion at meeting

| Review of examples | 5JSC/Chair/1
5JSC/Chair/2 | CCC rep.

WG

JSC/Ed.

WG

JSC/Ed.

WG

JSC/Ed. | Nov. 1, 2005: Respond to Examples Group on status report

Mar. 27, 2006: Report on examples in pt I

Apr. 2006: Discussion of report at meeting

Sept. 2006: Report on examples in pt II

Oct. 2006: Discussion at meeting

Mar. 2007: report on examples in pt III

Apr. 2007: Discussion at meeting |

Other actions

Action	Series	Who	When
General report on October 2005 meeting		Secretary Secretary	Oct. 21, 2005: First draft to JSC reps/Editor/Proj. manager Nov. 1, 2005: Report finalized and on public Web site
Specifications for Web version		Secretary	Oct. 21, 2005: Revise specifications for Web version of RDA and send to Project manager
Revise strategic plan	5JSC/Strategic/1	Chair JSC reps Chair Secretary	Nov. 1, 2005: Revise wording and send to JSC reps/Editor/Project manager Nov. 1-17, 2005: Discussion and consultation with communications advisor Nov. 18, 2005: Wording agreed and sent to CoP Dec. 1, 2005: Revised document issued and available on public Web site
RDA presentation		Secretary	Dec. 1, 2005: Revised version on public Web site

FAQs		Proj man./ Outreach WG/Com municatio ns advisor/ Secretary	Dec. 1, 2005: FAQs available on Public Web site
Policy and procedures document		Chair	Nov. 1, 2005: Revise wording and send to JSC reps Editor/Project manager
		JSC reps	Nov. 1-17, 2005: Discussion and consultation with communications advisor
		Chair	Nov. 18, 2005: Wording agreed and sent to CoP
		Secretary	Dec. 1, 2005: Revised document issued and available on public Web site

59.2   JSC discussed the decision that had been made at the April 2005 meeting to issue a call for simplification of chapter 22-25 rules to mirror what had been done for chapter 21. JSC decided that instead the most effective way to advance work on part III was for the constituencies to respond to the draft of part III, rather than to issue a call for proposals.

60   Any other business

60.1   John Attig suggested that there needed to be a proposal on names of families. Barbara Tillett said that LC would prepare a proposal by 13 February 2006.
Action=LC

61   List of Actions arising out of the JSC Meeting April 2005

61.1   The Secretary said that she would discuss outstanding actions from the April 2005 meeting with the current Chair.
Action=Secretary and Chair