JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE FOR REVISION OF AACR

MINUTES OF APRIL 2006 MEETING

The ARC Hotel, Ottawa, Canada.

24-28 April 2006

[Note: does not include Executive Sessions]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes: of the thirty-second meeting of the Committee held at the Arc Hotel, Ottawa, Canada, 24-28 April 2006.

Present:

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

Observers in attendance:
John Attig, Penn State University
Matthew Beacom, Yale University Library
Mary Curran, CCC
David Farris, Library and Archives Canada
Laura Heron, Library and Archives Canada
Judy Kuhagen, Library of Congress
Bill Leonard, Library and Archives Canada
Denise Lim, Library and Archives Canada
Dorothy McGarry, UCLA
Jane Thacker, Library and Archives Canada

62 Approval of the agenda

62.1 The draft agenda (5JSC/A/3/Rev) was approved. The minutes reflect those agenda items and document series that were discussed. The following draft agenda items were not discussed: 20 (Functions of the catalogue); 21 (Terms of reference for revising chapter 21); 22 (Proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules).

63 Minutes of the previous meeting held 10-14 October 2005

63.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held 10-14 October 2005 were approved with the following corrections:

63.1.1 5JSC/M/Restricted/23.6, third sentence: change "dependant" to "dependent".

63.1.2 5JSC/M/Restricted/30.3 and 5JSC/M/30.3, eighth sentence: change "as was waiting" to "as he was waiting".

63.1.3 5JSC/M/Restricted/30.14.1 and 5JSC/M/30.14.1, fifth sentence: change "T.U" to "T.U.".

63.1.4 5JSC/M/Restricted/30.17.1 and 5JSC/M/30.17.1, second sentence: change "language of the agency" to "language and script of the agency".

63.1.5 5JSC/M/Restricted/30.17.1 and 5JSC/M/30.17.1, ninth sentence: change "her suggested" to "her suggestion".

63.1.6   5JSC/M/Restricted/36.5 and 5JSC/M/36.5, penultimate sentence: change "Barbara Tillett how would you" to "Barbara Tillett asked how you would".

63.1.7   5JSC/M/Restricted/39.8.1 and 5JSC/M/39.8.1, first sentence: remove second occurrence of "that", and change "to A1.4D supply" to "to A1.4D to supply".

63.1.8   5JSC/M/Restricted/39.9.2 and 5JSC/M/39.9.2, fourth paragraph, seventh sentence: add quotation mark after "romanization table".

63.1.9   5JSC/M/Restricted/41.9.2 and 5JSC/M/41.9.2, first sentence: change "for the Prospectus had included" to "for the Prospectus he had included".

63.1.10   5JSC/M/Restricted/41.9.5 and 5JSC/M/41.9.5, second sentence: delete "in terms of".

63.2   The Chair explained that in the future, the focus of JSC minutes would be on decisions made and the rationale for these, rather than capturing all of the discussion. She added that it was anticipated that this would reduce the time required to prepare the minutes.

64   RDA: Resource Description and Access Part I - Constituency Review of December 2005 Draft

64.1   Received and considered the following documents:
          5JSC/RDA/Part I
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/1
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/2
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/3
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/4
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/5
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/LC response / 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3/LC response
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/CCC response
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3/CCC response
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/ACOC response / 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3/ACOC response
          5JSC/RDA/Part 1/ALA response
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/BL response / 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3/BL response
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/CILIP response / 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chapter 3/CILIP response
          5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/6

64.2   The Chair noted that some JSC members had discovered minor errors in their constituency's response to the draft of part I. She suggested that these be sent to the Secretary for inclusion in the meeting minutes. [Note: see Appendix A.]
          Action=Secretary

64.3   The Chair suggested that this part of the meeting focus on the critical issues arising from the constituency responses to the draft of part I, and in the Executive Session identify a way to address the bulk of the comments. She explained that the critical issues are those that will prevent objectives being achieved, those that are pervasive, and those that could have a ripple effect. The Chair suggested that the discussion begin with the summary the Secretary had prepared of general comments in the responses.

64.4   RDA as a tool for other communities

The first comment under this heading was from ACOC: develop a "Concise RDA" for use by other communities. Barbara Tillett said that she was assuming that the Web tool would be able to be viewed as a Concise version. The Editor noted that the flexibility to do this would only be available to the extent that there was pre-coding of the text. He added that his reading of the "RDA-Lite" proposed by ALA was that it was for a different audience. Jennifer Bowen said that "RDA-Lite" would be very different from a Concise version for cataloguers. She added that it would be a high-level conceptual document, which metadata communities could use to develop their own application profiles. She added that she did not think this was something that could be coded within RDA. She noted that you would not be able to catalogue something using "RDA-Lite", but that it could be put through the ISO or NISO process. JSC considered that this was a very different project to the one that was currently underway. The JSC members agreed that they wanted to know more about what was proposed before making a decision. [Note: see 5JSC/M/Restricted/65.5 and 75.8.]

64.5   Overall structure of RDA

Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had suggested that the JSC consider eliminating the separation of RDA into parts because there did not seem to be a clear distinction between parts I and II. She added that there was also confusion regarding what constituted an element, and the meaning of data elements labelled as "statements". The Editor suggested that the JSC discuss whether parts I and II were actually part of a whole. He suggested that if this were the case RDA would be more compatible with standards used in other communities. He added that a decision needed to be made on the issue before the end of the meeting. [Note: see 5JSC/M/73.2.]

64.6   Separation of content and presentation

The Chair said that ACOC had suggested that the option be provided to view examples with or without ISBD presentation. It was asked if this would be one of the Web views. The Editor replied that this would require a great deal of coding. The Chair noted that ALA had suggested that there was the need for an even more rigorous segregation of content from presentation. Jennifer Bowen said that there were still cases where presentation was included in the instructions, e.g. square brackets. [Note: see 5JSC/M/76.6.]

64.7   Terminology: "transcribe" vs. "record"

The Chair noted that CCC had said that the distinction between "transcribe" and "record" was not always clear. It was suggested that this was something that would be covered in the General Introduction. JSC agreed that if the terms had specific meanings they needed to be explained in the Introduction. [Note: see 5JSC/M/73.3.]
Action=Editor (General Introduction)

64.8   Numbering scheme

The ALA response included the comment that review was made more difficult because of the lack of numbering of the bullet points. Numbering at a lower level would also be

important for training and documentation. The Editor said that the current system was sufficient to support cross-references. The Editor circulated a "mock-up" of the way he could extend the numbering by one decimal point, and noted that it would have serious implications for the formatting. The JSC members said that they would like the Editor to pursue the fifth level of numbering. The Editor said that he would confirm with the online product developers that there would not be any negative implications from their point of view.
Action=Editor

64.9   Purpose and scope sections

The Chair noted that both ALA and LC had made the comment that the purpose and scope section at the beginning of an element should not just repeat the table of contents. Hugh Taylor asked for clarification as to whether the section was not required, or it needed to look different. There was agreement that the content should not be different. The Editor noted that the section was meant to be a brief summary.

64.10   RDA as data dictionary

Jennifer Bowen said that users of other schema wanted a section covering what kind of information to expect at each data element. The Editor said that there was a trade-off between creating a useful tool and formally documenting a metadata schema. Matthew Beacom noted that RDA was based on an existing manual, but if RDA became a data dictionary, then a separate manual would still need to be written. JSC discussed the suggestion, originating with the IEEE LOM community, to conduct a high-level data modelling exercise, and agreed that this would require long-term discussions.

64.11   Other issues

The following were also identified as critical issues requiring discussion at the meeting:
• notes vs. elements (5JSC/M/73.3);
• relationships between elements (5JSC/M/73.4) and repeatability of elements (5JSC/M/76.2);
• mandatory elements (5JSC/M/64.11, 5JSC/M/73.1) and options (5JSC/M/73.1);
• categorization of mode of issuance (5JSC/M/76.7);
• transcription (5JSC/M/76.4) and treatment of inaccuracies (5JSC/M/76.5);
• scope of chapters 5 and 6 (5JSC/M/73.2);
• originals and reproductions (5JSC/M/76.3).

Some other specific issues were identified: sources of information; revision of, or "backing up", the description; parallel titles; organization of chapter 3; and, categories used for parts, units, etc.

64.12   Mandatory elements of description

JSC discussed comments received on RDA draft instruction 1.4. Jennifer Bowen noted that with the way the instructions in RDA were written, it might appear that every element was mandatory, and so ALA had suggested that there be labelling at the element. JSC agreed that labelling of mandatory elements would assist useability. The Editor said that he would label elements in the text, and that the label would be placed before the table of contents for the element.

Action=Editor

It was noted that both ACOC and ALA had suggested that the second paragraph in 1.4 be moved before the list of elements. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

JSC discussed having two levels of designation in the text and at 1.4: "mandatory" and "mandatory if applicable". The distinction between the two is that for mandatory elements you will be instructed to supply data (e.g. title proper). It was noted that there were some elements that were only mandatory for a certain type of resource, e.g. scale for cartographic resources. The comment was made that the distinction between "mandatory" and "mandatory if applicable" was also one that the library community was used to seeing in MARC21 and OCLC guidelines. The Chair noted that what made an element mandatory was that it was required to undertake a user task. The Editor suggested that the term "required" be used instead of "mandatory". He noted that this was the term used in FRBR. [Note: see 5JSC/M/73.1.]

Executive Session 1

65   **Strategic plan for RDA 2005-2008**

     65.1   Received and considered the following document:
                     5JSC/Strategic/1

     65.2   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

66   **Liaison with the co-publishers of RDA**

     66.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

67   **Arrangements for reviewing and editing RDA drafts**

     67.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

68   **Communication with other resource description communities**

     68.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

69   **RDA Outreach Group**

     69.1   Received and considered the following documents:
                     5JSC/Chair/4
                     5JSC/Chair/4/Rev

                     5JSC/Chair/8

     69.2   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

70   **Training and implementation of RDA**

     70.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

71   **Risk assessment for RDA content development**

     71.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

72   **Formal recognition of individuals and groups contributing to the development of RDA**

     72.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

End of Executive Session 1

73   RDA: Resource Description and Access Part I - Constituency Review of December 2005 Draft (continued)

73.1   Required elements and Options

JSC discussed the suggestion from the previous day that "required" be used instead of "mandatory". JSC agreed that "required" was a better term. The discussion then turned to whether those elements that were not "required" or "required if applicable" should be marked in the text as "optional". The Editor noted that there were currently three types of options: those that instruct you to record additional data; those that instruct you to record the element in an alternative way; and, those that instruct you to omit data within an element. JSC decided that it would assist users of RDA to have consistency of presentation and to label every element in the text as either "Required element", "Element required if applicable" or "Optional element". JSC agreed to change existing occurrences of "optionally" to "alternatively", "optional addition" or "optional omission" as appropriate.
Action=Editor

JSC discussed what was meant by "required if applicable". The Editor noted that there were two issues, whether the element was applicable to the resource you were describing; or whether it was only applicable to certain categories of resources. JSC agreed that "required if applicable" did not mean that research beyond the resource was required, but that if information was available on a source of information for the resource, it was required. The Editor said that in the Web version the label at the element would be clickable so that people could follow it to 1.4 to find out what it meant. There was also agreement that the list at 1.4 would be split into the following categories: required elements; required if applicable; and then the same categories under different type of resources, e.g. serials and cartographic resources.
Action=Editor

Jennifer Bowen asked what the cataloguer should do when they could not record an element. She added that the ALA concerns were mostly to do with elements in chapter 3, and that now the labelling would make it clearer that they were not required. The Editor said that the sub-elements in the grouping of "other technical details" would now become elements in their own right.
Action=Editor

Barbara Tillett noted that LC had suggested that "type of content" be added to the list of required elements. The Editor said that it was premature to make a decision on this until it had been agreed what would go in this element. The Chair confirmed that the JSC would wait to make a decision.

Margaret Stewart said that because co-ordinates of cartographic content are an optional addition in AACR2, CCC did not want it to be a required element for RDA. The Chair noted that it was a required element in FRBR. The question was asked whether it could be made "required if applicable". It was noted that 4.15.02 said that information on recording coordinates could be taken from any source within the resource, but that both ALA and CCC had said that it should continue to be taken from any source. The comment was made that you would not want to require people to go beyond the resource to supply the coordinates.

The Chair said that CCC had suggested a change to the entry for "statement of responsibility" in the list at 1.4 to use plural forms, i.e. "Statement of responsibility (persons, families, or corporate bodies with principal responsibility)". JSC discussed how this related to the footnote which instructed that when there was more than one statement to choose the statement identifying the principal responsibility, and the option to provide a controlled access point in lieu of the statement of responsibility. The Chair confirmed that the entry in the list would read: "Statement of responsibility (statements identifying persons, families, or corporate bodies with principal responsibility)." It was agreed that the associated footnote was not required.
Action=Editor

The Chair said that there had been comments about the entry in 1.4 for "publisher, distributor, etc.": whether the "etc." was required; and, whether both the parenthetical statement and footnote were necessary. JSC agreed that the footnote was not necessary. It was noted that "etc." was part of the name of the element. The Editor said that the name of the element could change if this became a logical attribute under which elements were grouped, and in that case, "publisher" would be the required element. He noted that it would only be a required element for published materials.
Action=Editor

The Chair said that ALA had requested that an explanatory footnote be added for "numbering within series". The Editor replied that this was covered by the instruction itself.

The Editor noted that the phrase "considered to be important" introduced another level of optionality. The Secretary said that LC had suggested that the concept be explained in chapter 1 so that the wording "either for identification or for access" could be omitted from the instructions. The Editor indicated that the additional wording had been added because people wanted clarification on what was important in a particular context. JSC decided to retain the phrase as people might not read a general instruction, and sometimes the information is required at the specific instruction. The Editor said that he would add more qualifying statements if he thought they were needed.
Action=Editor

73.2   Relationship between part I and II

The Chair noted that the division between part I and II had been raised in the ALA response to the draft of part I, and by LC previously. Jennifer Bowen noted that people were confused that there were elements of what used to be access in part I, and thought that instructions on relationships in part I should be in part II. JSC discussed the earlier suggestion (5JSC/M/64.4) to combine parts I and II, and decided that this was the way forward. One reason for the decision was that what other resource description communities mean by "description" includes elements used for access.

JSC discussed how far to integrate the parts. The Editor said that instructions to do with relationships could be moved from chapter 4 into an extended chapter 9. The Editor suggested that the introductions to parts I and II and the introductory chapters (chapters 1 and 7) could be merged. JSC agreed.

The Editor pointed out that although it was not clear-cut, there would be some alignment between FRBR user tasks and chapters: i.e. one chapter on identification (ch. 2); two

chapters focussing on "select" (ch. 3 and 4), and one chapter on "obtain" (ch. 5). He noted that chapter 6 was currently an anomaly and would be broken up and the elements put where they most closely aligned. The Editor added that part of the justification for using "resource" throughout the instructions instead of manifestation was that in some cases you ended up describing the item. The question was asked about the user task "find". The Editor replied that it was supported in the draft of part II. He noted that any element in the description could be used to "find".

The Chair confirmed that there would still be a release for constituency review of the chapters in the current part II. The Editor undertook to prepare a revised Prospectus and Outline. He said that in terms of the current part II there would be one chapter dealing with relationships within FRBR group 1 entities, and another covering relationships between FRBR group 1 and group 2 entities. [Note: see 5JSC/M/84.2.]
Action=Editor

73.3   Notes and elements

The Chair commented that ALA had said that there needed to be a re-examination of the distinction between notes and other data elements. Jennifer Bowen said that the main query was what the rationale was for having a note. She added that some of what remained in part I appeared arbitrary. The Editor observed that a great deal had been carried over from AACR2, and that he was trying to allow clean mapping with as many syntaxes as possible (e.g. ISBD and MARC), with appropriate granularity. He said that in some cases a note was saying something about the element, and that most metadata schema made this distinction.

The Editor said that one way forward would be to have two categories of notes: those that made a comment about an element; and, those that were a different (free-form) way of expressing the same attribute (e.g. an attribute that was recorded using a structured list). He added that some existing notes would become separate data elements in their own right, e.g. those in 3.6.13 (Notes on other technical details). Jennifer Bowen asked about the existing notes on reproductions. The Editor said that these were relationships, and would be covered by that chapter.

JSC agreed that what the Editor had proposed was the way to proceed. The Editor said that he would clarify what was meant by the three operative instructions to "record", "transcribe" and "make a note" in both the introduction to the part (0.1.4) and in chapter 1. The Editor said that a note clarifying another element would be the last element in a group of elements.
Action=Editor

73.4   Relationships between elements

The Chair said that there were comments in the responses to the draft of part I that some elements were related, and that RDA had to show this. She added that this was particularly important for the data elements related to publication. The Editor pointed out that when there was only one occurrence of place, publisher and date it was straightforward, but the difficulty occurred with repetition. He added that the syntax (e.g. ISBD, MARC) was what would be used to group and display elements together. The JSC discussed other options for grouping, including pre-assembly of elements. The Chair suggested that the focus

could be on publication as an event, with place, publisher, and date as subordinate to this. [Note: see 5JSC/M/76.1.]

Executive Session 2

74   Joint meeting with the Committee of Principals

74.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

End of Executive Session 2

Executive Session 3

75   Communicating with stakeholders

75.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

End of Executive Session 3

76 **RDA: Resource Description and Access Part I - Constituency Review of December 2005 Draft (continued)**

76.1 Relationship between elements (continued)

The Editor explained that the basic organization of part I was into groupings of high-level elements that reflected logical attributes in FRBR. He added that there were two levels of breakdown at the next level: sub-types and sub-elements. He said that an example of the former was that the higher-level element of "title" has the sub-types of "title proper", "variant title", etc. He noted that "devised title" could be included with the title proper, as it was a way of supplying the title proper. He added that he had been thinking of putting all instructions on statement of responsibility together under one logical attribute, with subtypes for the statement of responsibility associated with the title, associated with an edition statement, etc. The Editor said that an example of a breakdown into sub-types is that the element of "edition" has sub-elements of "edition statement" and "statement relating to a named revision of an edition". The JSC members agreed that sub-types and sub-elements were both valid ways of handling relationships.

The Editor said that it had already been agreed that some of the high-level groupings were not working, e.g. that for publisher, distributor, etc. He confirmed that the JSC wanted to pursue the suggestion made the previous day to focus on the event. He said that this meant that there would be new high-level groupings for publication, distribution, manufacture, and production, and that each of these would have sub-elements of "name", "place" and "date".
Action=Editor

The Chair confirmed that relationships between elements would be handled by linking elements as sub-elements and sub-types, and by adding an upper-level in some cases. The discussion turned to that of the previous day on mechanisms to provide meaningful syntax. It was noted that there were difficulties if the title proper, other title information, and parallel title had asymmetrical values. JSC discussed whether syntactical assembly could be built into the instructions. JSC decided that it would prefer to refer to the appendices on presentation for syntactical representation.

76.2 Repeatability of elements

Jennifer Bowen asked about repeatability of elements, and noted that people saw this as something that was missing from RDA. The Editor said that in the interests of flexibility, there could not be instructions on repeatability. He said that he had been careful to use only the indefinite article when referring to elements e.g. "record a statement of responsibility" which implicitly meant that it could be repeated. Barbara Tillett commented that any element was repeatable. JSC agreed that it would be helpful to have a brief statement in RDA simply to say that there were no instructions on repeatability, and that it would depend on the encoding schema used.
Action=Editor

Margaret Stewart commented that at 2.8.5.4, it said to list changes in the place of publication in a note, and she wondered if this would be covered by repetition of the element. The Editor said that all of the instructions on reflecting changes over time would need to be reviewed. He added that this was tied to categorization by mode of issuance.

Action=Editor

76.3   Originals and reproductions

The Chair said that ACOC hoped that separation into elements meant a solution for the issue of reproductions. Jennifer Bowen said that this was something ALA would like. The Editor said that original/reproduction would be treated as a relationship and that if you were describing the reproduction you would reference the original. He added that there would be no limits to how detailed the reference to the original could be.

76.4   Transcription

Three issues related to transcription were identified: inaccuracies, reliance on transcription and the role in system matching; and the use of square brackets.

Margaret Stewart said that CCC was concerned that at 2.8.0.4 there was no limit on the number of places of publication to be transcribed. The Editor said that if there was more than one, and you decided to record more than one, the instruction told you what to do. The JSC agreed that this needed to be clarified. The Editor said that he would add "and more than one is being recorded" to the instruction at 2.8.0.4 and to other instructions as applicable. It was noted that there would still be a local decision as to how many to record.
Action=Editor

JSC discussed the role of transcription and noted that some other communities said that RDA placed too much importance on transcription, while others in the library community were concerned about implications of doing less transcription (e.g. by following the options at 1.6) for record matching. JSC decided that it would be useful to indicate for record matching purposes when one of the options at 1.6 was followed. It was suggested that authentication codes could be used for this purpose. JSC agreed that there were implications for MARC coding, and that this would be included in the discussion paper prepared for MARBI.
Action=Secretary; ACOC/CCC (MARC implications)

Jennifer Bowen said that the wording of the options at 1.6 was not as clear as it could be, and that ALA was not sure what was meant by the "etc." in the first option and whether it included abbreviations. The Editor said that the "etc." was included so as not to rule out new appendices. JSC agreed that "abbreviations" would be added after "symbols" in both the first paragraph and first option of 1.6.
Action=Editor

It was noted that transcription was a way to achieve certain objectives of the catalogue, but that had to be balanced with interoperability with other standards. The JSC discussed how it would be important to emphasise this key change in implementation and training. It was noted that in one of the Executive Sessions it had been agreed that the national agencies would be making joint decisions on options. [Note: see 5JSC/M/89.3.]
Action=Secretary (Implementation & Training implications)

76.5   Inaccuracies

Margaret Stewart said that CCC thought that it would be more helpful to correct inaccuracies than to transcribe them (as instructed at 1.6.8). Jennifer Bowen said that within ALA there had been a wide variety of opinions on the issue. The Chair said that ACOC thought that it would be useful to add an access point for the corrected form. JSC agreed. The Editor said that you could repeat the element in the way that you wanted it to be seen, rather than putting the corrected form in a note. JSC agreed to add an instruction to 1.6.8 to record the corrected form of the element. JSC also agreed to add specific references to countering rules as suggested by LC.
Action=Editor

76.6   Separation of content and presentation

JSC discussed whether square brackets would continue to be used to indicate information taken from outside the resource. Hugh Taylor said that this was one of the general comments made by CILIP. During the discussion it was suggested that if square brackets were not used another method (e.g. a content designator) would have to be found to indicate when data was taken from outside the resource itself. JSC decided to defer a decision until after revisiting the nature of the resource itself (i.e. whether or not accompanying material and containers were part of the resource) as this would determine how frequently square brackets would be used.

76.7   Categorization of mode of issuance

The Editor said that he would prepare a discussion paper outlining what he saw as the nature of the problem.
Action=Editor

77   GMD/SMD Working Group

77.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/Chair/6
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/LC response
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/ACOC response
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/BL response
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/CCC response
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/CILIP response
5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up/ALA response

5JSC/Chair/7

77.2   The Chair again offered a sincere thank-you from the JSC to the GMD/SMD Working Group members for their report. She then asked the Editor for an update on the RDA/ONIX initiative. The Editor explained that the interim report, which had been circulated to JSC members prior to the meeting, provided an outline of the proposed framework. He said that he wanted to obtain the reactions of the JSC and take these back to ONIX for use in the first draft of the framework.

77.3 The Editor explained that the approach taken in the framework was to have base categories for resource content and resource carriers, each with a set of attributes and specified primary values. He then proceeded to outline the attributes and values. It was asked whether there would be an additional value for dance. The Editor said that the question was whether choreography was included in one of the specific primary values for character. He added that dance/choreographed movement was being considered as a possible addition.

77.4 The Editor said that he had also circulated to the JSC a mapping of the terms recommended by the GMD/SMD Working Group to the draft RDA/ONIX framework. He noted that "cartographic" did not map to any of the base categories. He suggested that the designation of cartographic content could be handled by using "cartographic" as a qualifier for content categories, e.g. still image and moving image.

77.5 JSC and the Editor discussed how the framework would relate to RDA. The Editor noted that either RDA could specify values for each of the base categories of content and carrier, or they could be pre-coordinated in the knowledge that machines could deconstruct them. JSC agreed that that the preference would be for pre-coordinated labels that people could understand. It was noted that the underlying structure could be included in an appendix. The Chair confirmed that an approach based on the RDA/ONIX framework was one that the JSC wanted to pursue. The Editor said that to facilitate review by the constituencies he would provide both natural language and formal language definitions. He added that he would provide the short lists of terms for inclusion in RDA (i.e. the instructions at 3.2, 3.3, and 4.2) for review.
Action=Editor

78 RDA Part I Internationalization

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

78.2 The Chair noted that a table summarising the responses to 5JSC/LC/5 had been prepared. She asked Barbara Tillett to lead the discussion. Barbara Tillett said that LC wanted to make RDA more useable on an international scale.

78.3 General comments

Barbara Tillett noted that CCC had suggested that there be a general statement in the Introduction to avoid repeating some of the options. The Editor suggested that there might be a place in chapter 1 where a general instruction could be included. Barbara Tillett said that CCC had also suggested that options dealing with the addition of information should indicate that the information that is added is enclosed in square brackets. JSC agreed that this issue was the same as the general issue regarding square brackets and should be resolved the same way. Jennifer Bowen said that overall ALA wanted more guidance, and that people were concerned about the number of options. Barbara Tillett noted that ACOC had asked that optional provisions include the addition, but not the substitution of

numerals, except where it was not possible to record the script. The Chair said that ACOC wanted the transcribed statement to be the same in all cases.

78.4   Proposed revision of 1.6.2

JSC decided that the caption would be clearer as "Numbers expressed as numerals or as words" and to have the elements expressed in the singular, rather than using "any". JSC discussed the LC proposal to remove "Edition statement" and "Statement relating to a named revision of an edition" from the list in the second paragraph, and include them in the first paragraph. Barbara Tillett noted that the edition statement was a "required if applicable" element, and was important for identification. The comment was made that the proposed option at 1.5 would allow for addition or substitution of data elements in a transliterated form. Barbara Tillett confirmed that the JSC agreed with the proposed changes to 1.6.2.
Action=LC

78.5   Proposed revision of 1.6.2.1

Jennifer Bowen noted that ALA wanted to eliminate the provision to use lowercase roman numerals in paging or page references when uppercase roman numerals appear in the resource. JSC agreed that, in the spirit of "take what you see", the paragraph could be removed. The Chair asked why the first paragraph instructed you to substitute roman numerals. It was suggested that this was to cover dates of publication. The Editor noted that 1.6 only came into play for transcribed elements, and if the date was changed to a recorded element, the instruction could be included there. JSC decided that 1.6.2.1 would be deleted and that the first paragraph and option in 5JSC/LC/5 would be added at 2.6.0.3 (numbering) and 2.9.0.3 (date of publication, distribution, etc.). It was also agreed that the existing instruction at 2.9.0.3, to transcribe the date of publication in the form in which it appears, would become an option.
Action=LC

78.6   Proposed revision of 1.6.2.2

Hugh Taylor said that, in the context of the rest of the proposal, CILIP did not see the logic in requesting substitution of Western-style arabic numerals for numbers expressed as words. Barbara Tillett replied that it would only occur for the four elements listed at 4.2: numeric and/or alphabetic designation; chronological designation; date of publication, distribution, etc.; and numbering within series. It was noted that, with the changes to 2.6.0.3 and 2.9.0.3, the result would be the same, i.e. it would be recorded in Western-style arabic numerals. The comment was made that 2.10.6.3 (series numbering) already instructed you to record rather than transcribe. JSC decided to delete 1.6.2.2.
Action=LC

78.7   Proposed revision of 1.6.2.3

Barbara Tillett noted that ALA had suggested that the option be extended to cover when the agency simply preferred a different script of numerals. JSC agreed, and decided that the option would read: "Optionally, add or substitute numerals in the script preferred by the agency preparing the description".
Action=LC

78.8   Proposed addition of 1.6.2.6 and revisions of 2.6.2.3. and 2.9.0.3

It was noted that 2.6.2.3 and 2.9.0.3 were the only instructions with an option related to calendar. JSC agreed that an instruction was not also required at 1.6. JSC decided to refer to 2.6.2.3 at 2.10.6.3. It was noted that the reference would be more logical at 2.10.6.4 as that instruction dealt with chronological designation. [Note: see 5JSC/M/80.1.]
Action=LC

Executive Session 4

79   Update on Committee of Principals meeting

79.1   [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/62-99.]

End of Executive Session 4

80   RDA Part I Internationalization (continued)

80.1   Barbara Tillett suggested that given the number of adjustments and changes that had been made, LC should prepare a revised proposal. JSC agreed. Barbara Tillett said that there were still a few outstanding issues for discussion.

80.2   Proposed addition of new 2.10.6.4 and proposed revision of current 2.10.6.5 (as 2.10.6.6)

Barbara Tillett said that at existing 2.10.6.5, LC had proposed that "(or its equivalent in the language of the title proper)" be deleted and "in the language and script of the new sequence of numbering. If this criterion does not apply, supply the term in the language and script of the title proper of the series" added. She noted that ALA had said that this addition was not required and was covered by 1.5. Jennifer Bowen said that the community within ALA that had prepared the response preferred having instructions up front, but that the decisions made the previous day had gone in the other direction. Judy Kuhagen said that if specific instructions at 2.10.6.5 and 2.6.5 were removed, the implications would need to be made clear.
Action=LC

80.3   Proposed revision to 1.5

Barbara Tillett noted that ALA had suggested that "name, title and quotation incorporated into notes (including contents note)" be included under the list at 1.5. Jennifer Bowen said that ALA did not want to lose what was in the paragraph deleted by LC: "When recording within a note a name or title originally in nonroman scripts, use the original script whenever possible rather than a romanization". JSC decided to restore the paragraph and the exception that followed.
Action=LC

81   Persistent identifiers and URLs

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

81.2   The Chair said that ACOC would prepare a revised version of 5JSC/ACOC/1 based on the comments received. She asked if there were any major issues that needed to be discussed. It was noted that there was agreement to use "online" in place of "remote access resource" from all constituencies except CILIP. JSC discussed whether there was a need to distinguish between Web resources, and those networked locally. It was noted that "local" in this context was difficult to define. The Editor said that in the RDA/ONIX framework, a file server was listed as a type of carrier and the proposed label was "online". He added that this file server could be local or remote. JSC decided to use "online". The Chair said that the revised proposal would highlight any issues that required further discussion.
Action=ACOC

82   **Rule revision proposals relating to technical description of digital media**

82.1   Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/ALA/2

82.2   The Chair asked if there were any issues to discuss, or whether these would be left to the constituency responses. The Editor reminded the JSC that "other technical details" would now be broken into 13 separate elements. JSC agreed that the constituencies would respond to the proposal as written.
Action=ACOC; BL; CCC; CILIP; LC

83   **RDA Examples Group**

83.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/Chair/1
5JSC/Chair/1/Rev
5JSC/Chair/1/Rev/Chair follow-up

5JSC/Chair/2
5JSC/Chair/2/Rev

83.2   The Chair began the discussion by saying that she wanted to acknowledge the enormous effort of the Examples Group and to thank them for their work to date. She noted that a report on examples in part I had been distributed informally prior to the meeting. [Note: document later issued as 5JSC/Chair/1/Rev/Chair follow-up/2.] The Chair invited Denise Lim, the Chair of the Examples Group, to lead a discussion on the issues raised in the report. Denise Lim noted that it had been difficult working on examples in part I because of the constant changes.

83.3   Denise Lim asked what the JSC's opinion was on being less prescriptive in examples, e.g. did it matter if "1000" or "1,000" was used. The JSC decided that whenever an instruction did not require information to be given in a specific form, different forms could be used in the examples. It was noted that having different forms would illustrate that examples are not prescriptive, i.e. "cover title" and "title on cover" are both acceptable. JSC agreed that text should be added to 0.1.9 to make it clear that the use of varying forms of examples was intentional, and that inconsistency should be visible in the text. Examples that were not transcribed should reflect normal English usage.
Action=Editor

83.4   JSC discussed the use of abbreviations in examples, and noted that this would depend on the work done by the Appendices Working Group. [Note: see 5JSC/M/89.] JSC agreed that abbreviations would not be used in explanations to notes.

83.5   Denise Lim asked whether examples should be given to illustrate a see reference (e.g. 2.3.3.3 final paragraph). JSC decided that the examples should be put with the instruction being referred to. It was noted that this would encourage people to read that instruction, which, in the online tool, would be easy to access.

83.6   Denise Lim said that the Examples Group wanted to know if there should be more foreign language examples, including those reading from right to left. JSC agreed that these would only be included when they were useful in illustrating the instruction. Chronograms were

cited as an instance of this. It was noted that ALA had suggested that there be more CJK examples throughout RDA – but that this would best be handled by a supplementary document.

83.7   Denise Lim noted that CILIP had suggested having different ways of viewing the examples, e.g. OPAC presentation, ISBD presentation. She added that this was beyond the scope of the Group, which had just been focussing on the content of examples. JSC agreed that CILIP's suggestion would be desirable in the online version, but that the Examples Group could not be asked to take this on. It was noted that some examples were clearly indicated as following ISBD presentation, because this was required for formatting. The Editor commented that with everything to do with relationships moving to one chapter, this would remove many of the problematic examples.

83.8   The Editor said that there had been comments that the label "Contents" should not be used in examples of contents lists. He added that this was included in the examples as per the instruction. The Chair noted that ACOC had said that it was confusing at 2.3.1.6 to have the list of contents begin with "Contents list: Contents". The Editor explained that the example was showing more than one element, and the "Contents list" label made this clear. It was noted that the examples were in part illustrating the see reference. The Editor said that he would break the paragraph up into two parts, the first part containing the instruction for the title proper, with examples to match, and the second part a reference to 4.7 for preparing the contents list. The Chair confirmed that the Editor would make a similar change wherever necessary.
        Action=Editor

83.9   The Chair noted that because of the ongoing work required on examples in part I; Denise Lim was not able to also lead the work on parts II and III. She asked Denise Lim what the JSC could do to support the Group. Denise Lim replied that a collaborative workspace would assist the Group. [Note: see 5JSC/M/94.4.]

83.10   Jennifer Bowen said that ALA had received a large number of comments on examples that she had not put forward in the ALA response to part I. She asked if there would be a later constituency review of examples. JSC discussed the issue and it was noted that it was difficult to finalize the examples until the instructions had been finalized. JSC agreed that the Examples Group had been charged with the work on behalf of all constituencies. The comment was made that it was less of an issue to change examples after the first release of RDA. Jennifer Bowen said that she would send the ALA comments on examples directly to the Examples Group.
        Action=Jennifer Bowen

84   Draft of RDA Part II

84.1   Received and considered the following documents:
        5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part II
        5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part II/Chapter 8 supplementary

84.2   The Editor explained that based on the week's discussions there would now be a two-part code. The first part would cover both the current chapters 1-6 (with instructions to do with relationships removed and chapter 6 redistributed), and the current draft of RDA part II. The second part would cover access point control. JSC decided to call the parts A and B, at least during the transition period. It was noted that this would help to break away from

AACR2. The Editor said that when the chapters in the draft of part II were issued for review, it would be as chapters X-X of part A. He added that the Prospectus would be changed to reflect this.

84.3   The Editor noted that it had been agreed to align the existing RDA chapters 7-10 with FRBR. He said that one piece would deal with relationships between FRBR group 1 entities, and the basis for this was chapter 9. The second piece was relationships between group 1 entities and group 2 entities, and the basis for this was chapter 8. He noted that there were still decisions to be made about the special instructions for particular types of works in chapter 10. The Editor added that the introduction to part II, and chapter 7 would be shifted to the introduction and introductory chapter to part A. He noted that this would mean that the required elements could all be listed in one place.
Action=Editor

84.4   The Editor explained that the functional objectives at 0.2.1 would be combined with those at 0.1.1 to give a more complete picture. The Editor read out from 0.2.1:

0.2.1. FUNCTIONAL OBJECTIVES AND PRINCIPLES OF REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS

> The access points and citations provided as a means of reflecting relationships should enable the user to locate:
>
> > a)   all resources described in a catalogue that embody works and expressions of works associated with a particular person, family, or corporate body;
> > b)   works, expressions of works, manifestations, and items represented in a catalogue that are related to those retrieved in response to the user's search.

The Editor said that this was based on the IME ICC draft statement. JSC agreed that the wording should be changed from "locate" to "find". The Editor said that a) could potentially be extended to manifestations and items, but suggested that it be left as it was until a decision was made on whether there needed to be instructions. Barbara Tillett noted that the IME ICC statement also included subjects. It was further noted that although FRBR treats subjects as relationships, they could be treated as attributes. The Editor said that if this was included, it could be as an element that pointed to other standards. The Editor explained that what had not been included in 0.2.1 were hierarchical relationships, e.g. between editions, or all manifestations of the same expression. He added that another functional objective and appropriate instructions would be included.
Action=Editor

84.5   The Editor circulated some diagrams of potential implementation scenarios for RDA data. He explained that scenario 1 (relational / object-orientated database structure) was the ideal, and is the model behind RDA. The second (linked bibliographic and authority records) and third ("flat file") scenarios reflected the database structures conventionally used in library applications.

84.6   The Editor said that even with the restructuring of part II that was required, the issues he had highlighted in the cover letter to the draft still needed to be covered. He added that

one issue for discussion was whether the term "citation" would be used for relationships between Group 1 entities. It was noted that that many people did not like the term, and that in the legal community it had a different meaning. The Editor said that the alternative would be to use "reference" as in Dublin Core. The JSC members said that they did not think this term would find acceptance in the community. The Chair said that she had one general comment about the draft, which was that there were many long sentences. The Editor said that he thought that the restructuring of the chapters would help, and some of this was a carry-over from what was in AACR2. The Editor then led a discussion of the issues highlighted in the cover letter.

84.7   0.2.4. Mandatory access points

The Editor explained that discussion of the recommendations in 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 relating to mandatory access points had been deferred at the previous meeting. The Editor noted that so far the required elements had been elements that reflected attributes. JSC agreed that elements that reflected relationships could also be referred to as elements. The Editor said that the issue was what was included in the list of required elements, and the nomenclature that was used. It was noted that in the IME ICC statement at 7.1.2 it referred to "indispensable access points", and listed "the name of the creator, or first named creator when more than one is named". The comment was made that "first named creator when more than one is named" was a fundamental change to AACR2, which instructed you to record the person with primary responsibility. It was suggested that "creator" could be defined as the entity with principal responsibility. There was agreement that the required element was at least one of the people, families, or corporate bodies with principal responsibility for creation. The Chair noted that 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 was based on FRBR and included in the minimum level "access points for additional persons, families, or corporate bodies with principal responsibility". The comment was made that although this was pure as a principle, it was impossible in the current financial climate. The Editor noted that no longer having the "rule of three" opened up the potential to have a large number of additional access points.
Action=Editor

The discussion moved on to the IME ICC requirement to include the "uniform title for the work/expression". The Editor suggested that the required element could be the citation for the work/expression embodied in the resource. The comment was made that in many cases the first named creator would be included in the citation, although this would not always be the case. It was noted that the citation could be the same as the element used for the title proper. It was asked whether having the citation as a required element would mean that you would always have to construct a uniform title. The Editor suggested that this be looked at in the future in the context of how to construct a citation title.

84.8   0.2.5. Options

The Editor noted that the only options in the current part II were the optional additions for designations of role in chapter 10. Based on earlier discussions, the instructions on designation of function at 8.4 would be labelled as an optional element and that as a result the optional instructions in chapter 10 could be removed.
Action=Editor

84.9   0.27. Examples

The Editor said that examples in part II were given according to ISBD specifications for order of elements and prescribed punctuation. He said that he could not see a way around this. The comment was made that this could be an obstacle for other communities using RDA. The reply was made that a number of these other communities did not record relationships.

84.10   7.3. Sources of information

The Editor said that in line with decisions made at the Chicago meeting, he had included the following sentence at 7.3.1: "If the work(s) contained in the resource being described are also embodied in other resources, determine which access points to provide on the basis of statements appearing on the preferred sources of information in those resources as well". Barbara Tillett pointed out that the IME ICC draft statement only asked you to consult the manifestation or reference sources. She added that the extra work involved in looking at other resources would not be acceptable to management. JSC decided that the sentence was not required. JSC also decided to change the caption of 7.3.1 to "Persons, families and corporate bodies associated with the content of the resource". The Editor noted that he would need to make a similar change to 7.3.2 as at 7.3.1. It was noted that 7.3.2 needed to be broadened to cover more than just statements appearing prominently in the resource.
Action=Editor

The Editor noted that the guidelines under 7.3 referred to other statements appearing prominently in resources embodying the work. He asked if it was necessary to define "appearing prominently". JSC agreed that the use of the term matched the English language dictionary definition. It was noted that this would be a training issue, as in AACR the meaning was linked to the sources of information.
Action=Secretary (Implementation & Training implications)

84.11   Chapter 8

The Editor explained that in order to reduce the size of chapter 8, only those instructions with a parallel in the *Concise AACR2* had been included.

84.12   8.1.1.2. One family responsible for creating the work

JSC discussed what creation meant in terms of families. JSC agreed that families could be creators, and that there would be an instruction based on 8.1.1.1 (One person responsible for creating the work). It was also agreed that there would be references to other guidelines in the introductory text, as families could play roles other than as creators. The Editor noted that the definition of family had been taken from FRAR: "two or more persons related by birth, marriage, adoption, or similar legal status." A problem with this definition was that it could include married couples, performing groups etc. It was agreed that it would need to be clear in the instruction that it should only be applied if the people presented themselves as a family.
Action=Editor

The Editor asked if anyone could supply examples of a family responsible for creating a work other than an archive. The Chair said that ACOC had found specific examples when they had discussed 5JSC/LC/6 and that she would supply these.
Action=Chair

84.13   8.1.4. Modifications of previously existing works

The Editor said that it had been difficult to write general guidelines because of the different kinds of modifications. The Chair noted that ACOC had made the following suggestion in 5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ACOC response: "Primary access should be given to the original author if they can still be considered responsible for the intellectual or artistic content of the work. Consider the original author to still be responsible if … . In the case of textual works consider … to indicate that the original author is still responsible." JSC agreed that it was important to state the general principle.
Action=Editor

84.14   8.1.5. Performances

The Editor said that in response to the suggestion in 5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ALA response, he had recast 21.23 as a set of instructions on choosing the primary access point for performances. He noted that the general thrust was that performers would not be elevated to creators unless that was what they were. In response to a query about an example, he asked the JSC to alert him to any examples that were now in the wrong place. JSC asked the Editor to make the general principle, i.e. to use the primary access point for the work, more prominent.
Action=Editor

Barbara Tillett suggested that 8.1.5.2 and 8.1.5.3 might be combined, but it was agreed to keep them separate as although the result was the same, they related to different conditions.

84.15   8.3. Change in responsibility

The Editor asked if any changes were required to reflect the possibility of an access point for a family being used as the primary access point for a multipart monograph, serial, or integrating resource. The JSC members did not identify any changes.

84.16   Chapter 10

The Editor explained that in terms of the special rules in chapter 21, he had used the responses to 5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up where possible. He noted that the general instructions had changed since the responses were made. The Editor said that there were only two cases (to do with illustrations) where he had incorporated examples from an AACR2 special rule under the general instructions in chapter 8.

After discussion, JSC agreed that the special instructions in chapter 10 would go forward into the draft for constituency review. The reasons for this were that there had already been a process to simplify these rules that had not been successful, and that the communities who used the special rules wanted them all kept in one place. However, the cover letter for the draft for review will ask for suggestions on incorporating the special instructions with the general instructions. The Editor said that where possible he would refer from the general instructions to the special instructions.
Action=Editor

84.17   Supplementary instructions for possible inclusion in chapter 8

The Editor explained that he had prepared a document containing rules from AACR2 chapter 21 that did not have a counterpart in the *Concise AACR2*. He suggested that the JSC discuss each in turn.

84.18   8.1.1.X. Works erroneously or fictitiously attributed to a person, family, or corporate body (21.4C1, 21.4C2)

JSC decided to move the examples to the general instruction (8.1.1).
Action=Editor

84.19   8.1.1.X. Works of uncertain origin (21.5A)

JSC agreed to restore the instruction at 8.1.6. Works of unknown origin, and to change the caption.
Action=Editor

84.20   8.1.1.X. Works by heads of state, other high government officials, popes, and other high ecclesiastical officials (21.4D1)

JSC decided that the instruction was not implicit in the general instructions and might be missed. The Editor said that he would create a category for official communications in chapter 10, and that there would be a reference from the instruction for works by one person. JSC decided that section b) Other works was not required and that some of the examples could be moved to chapter 8.
Action=Editor

84.21   8.1.2.X. Changes between editions of the work (21.6C1)

JSC decided that this instruction was not required. It was noted that the citation for the work would be the same if the general instructions were followed.

84.22   8.1.2.X. Shared pseudonyms (21.6D1)

The Editor suggested that if two or more people working together were represented as one person, i.e. one bibliographic identity, this could be covered under 8.1.1.1 One person responsible for creating the work. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

84.23   8.1.2.X. Reports of interviews or exchanges (21.25A, 21.25B)

JSC decided that interviews would be included at 8.1.2.0. c) (works consisting of an exchange between two or more persons or families), and that the examples at 8.1.2.X would be slotted under 8.1.2.2 (Two or three persons, families, or corporate bodies principally responsible) and 8.1.2.3 (More than three persons, families, or corporate bodies responsible).
Action=Editor

84.24   8.1.2.X. Spirit communications conveyed through a medium, etc. (21.26A)

JSC decided that spirit communications would be included at 8.1.2.0. c) (works consisting of an exchange between two or more persons or families), and that the example would be

put under 8.1.2.2 (Two or three persons, families, or corporate bodies principally responsible).
Action=Editor

84.25   8.1.3.X. Compilations of official communications (21.4D1, 21.4D3)

The Editor noted that this could be included in the new section in chapter 10 on official communications.
Action=Editor

84.26   8.1.4.1. Adaptations – second instruction

JSC decided that the "in case of doubt" paragraph would be included at 8.1.4.1.
Action=Editor

84.27   8.1.4.4. Revisions – second instruction (21.12A1)

JSC decided not to add the second instruction as in certain circumstances it reversed what was in the first part of 8.1.4.4. Barbara Tillett pointed out that the only instruction to add an additional access point for the title was at 8.1.4.4, even though there were many places where this could be included. The Editor said that he would remove it.
Action=Editor

84.28   8.1.4.5. Works with added commentary, criticism, biographical matter, etc. – third instruction (21.13D1)

JSC decided that this was not required.

84.29   8.1.6.X. Person, family, or corporate body responsible identified only by a characterizing word, phrase, device, etc. (21.5C)

JSC decided to include the first two examples at 8.1.1.1 (One person responsible for creating a work) and the third example at 8.1.6 (Works of unknown origin).
Action=Editor

84.30   8.2.X. Other relationships (21.30H1)

The Editor noted that the final sentence ("For example, provide a secondary access point for the name of a collection from which reproductions of art works have been taken or for a collection of books upon which a bibliography is based") belonged in the chapter on relationships between group 1 entities. JSC agreed.
Action=Editor

85   Rule proposals for archival and manuscript resources

85.1   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

85.2   JSC discussed the text suggested for part II on p. 12 of 5JSC/LC/3/LC follow-up. In terms of families as primary access points, JSC decided to add at 8.1.0 references to international archival standards, i.e., ISAD(G) and ISAAR(CPF). It was noted that the references would have to be as meaningful as possible so that people knew why they were being sent to another standard. Laura Heron from LAC said that she would check both ISAD(G) and ISAAR(CPF) to see where detailed references could be made.
        Action=Laura Heron

86   Levels of description, access, and authority control

86.1   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

86.2   JSC discussed at length the option at 1.4 in RDA part I to use an access point in lieu of the statement of responsibility. The ALA and CCC responses to the draft of part I raised concerns about the implications for identification and authority control. Barbara Tillett commented that, as opposed to the AACR2 environment, there were now new opportunities for authority records to play more of a role, and contain identification information. Jennifer Bowen said that currently NACO libraries were used to looking at the bibliographic record to justify what went into the authority record. Jennifer Bowen and Margaret Stewart raised the issue that people did not know if part B would instruct them to use evidence found on the resource. It was noted that in FRBR the statement of responsibility was considered important for identification. It was observed that if neither a statement of responsibility nor a designation of function is recorded, there may be no information in the description about the role played by those given access points. JSC members said that they were aware that statements of responsibility tended not to be recorded in metadata schema such as Dublin Core. Jennifer Bowen said that one option suggested by ALA was that guidance be included that indicated not to follow the option for library descriptions. It was noted that even the first level of description in AACR provided for the first statement of responsibility to be recorded if it was different from the main access point in form or number.

86.3   JSC decided to retain the option, partly because it is an option only, but also to enable RDA to be used with schema such as Dublin Core.

86.4   The Editor noted that the list of required elements would have to be revised in light of discussions earlier in the meeting (5JSC/M/73.1, 5JSC/M/84.7). He suggested that the covering memo for the review of the chapters dealing with relationships summarise the relevant changes.
        Action=Chair

87   Family names

87.1   Received and considered the following documents:
5JSC/LC/6
5JSC/LC/6/BL response
5JSC/LC/6/CCC response
5JSC/LC/6/CILIP response
5JSC/LC/6/ACOC response
5JSC/LC/6/ALA response

87.2   As access points for families per se had already been covered (5JSC/M/84.12), JSC discussed the LC proposals for the form of family names. It was noted that a significant difficulty is that the national standards (DACS - USA, RAD- Canada, NCA naming rules - UK) have varying approaches to the differentiation of family names. JSC agreed that there were two options that could be offered: to use another international standard such as ISAAR(CPF); or, to follow LCSH practice. Laura Heron from LAC said that she would report on what was in ISAAR(CPF). JSC decided to defer the decision.
Action=Laura Heron

88   Revised draft statement of objectives and principles for RDA

88.1   Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Objectives and Principles/Rev/2

88.2   The Editor said that in the responses to the draft of part I there had been some comments about the objective of "comprehensiveness". He suggested that it be made clear that this objective did not mean that RDA would be exhaustive and cover every detail of all types of resources.

88.3   The Editor explained that he had revised the objectives and principles to include access point control. He noted that the new structure would not affect the language used, but that he would ensure that it did not suggest that descriptive elements did not include access.
Action=Editor

88.4   The Editor said that changes to the document were highlighted, and that there were no changes to the design objectives. Under the design principles a new paragraph had been added under "generalization" which was largely derived from the September 2005 draft of the IME ICC statement. FRAR had also been consulted. He noted that "relationship, name, title, etc." had been added under "specificity".

88.5   The Editor said that in the section on functionality of records produced using RDA; under "Responsiveness to user needs", he had added a new third section on access point control data. Barbara Tillett commented that in the paragraph above, "find" should be used instead of "locate". The Editor explained that in the third paragraph there were two instances of "clarify" rather than the FRAR "contextualise". He said that he had used "understand" in preference to the FRAR "justify", as "understand" related to what the user needed to know, rather than being from the perspective of the cataloguer. Barbara Tillett asked if the section could be simplified, for example: clarify the relationship between one entity and another, and clarify the relationship between an entity and its name. The Editor said that he could replace the lists of entities with "entity". Hugh Taylor queried the use of

the term "name used in religion". The Editor said that "religious name" could be ambiguous. The Editor explained that FRAR broke relationships into two groups: relationships between entities, and relationships between an entity and the name used by the entity. The Editor said that he would go back to FRAR to see if there was a way to shorten the objective. The Chair noted that the enumeration of the entities made it difficult to understand the meaning.

Action=Editor

88.6   The Editor commented that he had added "items" to a few principles because he had noticed they were missing.

88.7   The Editor said that under the principle of "representation" he had added several paragraphs extrapolated from the IME ICC statement. The Chair suggested that rather than repeating text, "In the guidelines and instructions on access point control" could be put at the beginning. Barbara Tillett noted that some of the relevant text had changed in the April 2006 version of the draft statement, and that she would circulate this. She added that this meant it could be possible to combine first two paragraphs and the second two paragraphs.

Action=Barbara Tillett

88.8   Jennifer Bowen suggested that "search for a name" would be better than "conducting a search". John Attig said that it appeared that the final paragraph qualified the entire sentence. The Editor said that he would correct the sentence to add a missing "or", i.e. "or that the user might be expected to use when conducting a name search".

Action=Editor

88.9   The Editor said that he had added a principle for "language preference". Barbara Tillett said that she thought that the meaning was different from the IME ICC statement at 5.1.3. John Attig pointed out that one difference was that the statement used "language and script". The Editor said that when writing the principle he had focussed on IME ICC 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5. Barbara Tillett referred the Editor to 5.1.3 and said that to her they were not contradictory. The Editor said that he would look at the latest version of the IME ICC statement. He noted that RDA would not use the term "authorized heading" but rather, "preferred name".

Action=Editor

88.10   The Editor said that for the next principle, "common usage" he would need to see the revised IME ICC statement. The Chair noted that in responses to RDA part I, some of the other rule makers had difficulties with the term "common usage". Barbara Tillett pointed out that the meaning for "common usage" was different in the IME ICC statement. There was discussion about whether the text added to "common usage" would fit better under "common practice". It was noted that the important concepts were predictability and user expectations.

Action=Editor

88.11   The Editor noted that the revised principles would not be issued until the draft of part B was ready for review. He added that the version on the public website (5JSC/RDA/Objectives and Principles) did not need anything changed for the review of the "part II" chapters. Jennifer Bowen said that in preparing the ALA response to the draft of RDA part I she had not included comments received on the objectives and principles. It

was decided that she should pass them on informally to the JSC and Editor. JSC agreed that there would be no constituency review of the objectives and principles.
Action=Jennifer Bowen

88.12　The Editor said that the objectives and principles had been on the agenda because they would influence his work on part B. He noted that in the instructions he would be largely incorporating AACR2 practice.

89　Revision of Appendices (incorporating Abbreviations in AACR3 – Principles)

89.1　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

89.2　The Chair reminded the JSC that at the previous meeting it had been agreed that there would be a working group on appendices, and that the terms of reference still needed to be clarified. The Editor added that the Examples Group could not finalize their work until decisions had been made on abbreviations.

89.3　The JSC agreed that the current position was essentially the third recommendation in 5JSC/CILIP/1: "In the interests of clarity and ease of use by both cataloguers and users of catalogues, abbreviation of words and terms should be minimised." It was noted that there were two ways to reduce use of abbreviations: either to reduce the list of abbreviations in the Appendix; or, reduce the elements in which they can be used. It was agreed that the JSC should determine the elements where it was important to transcribe data as found and not abbreviate, and that the Working Group could recommend the abbreviations to use in other elements. The following was agreed:
- 2.3.1 Title proper (will included devised titles) – transcribe
- 2.3.2 Parallel title – transcribe
- 2.3.3 Other title information – transcribe
- 2.3.4 Variant title – transcribe
- 2.3.5 Earlier/later title – transcribe
- 2.3.6 Key title – transcribe
- 2.4.0 Basic instructions on recording statements of responsibility – transcribe
- 2.4.1 Parallel statement of responsibility – transcribe
- 2.5.1 Edition statement – transcribe
- 2.5.3 Statement relating to a named revision of an edition – transcribe
- 2.6 Numbering – not transcribed
- [For 2.7, 2.8, 2.9 the structure will be different]:
  - Name – transcribe
  - Place – transcribe
  - Date – record
- 2.10.1 Title proper of series – transcribe
- 2.10.2 Parallel title of series – transcribe
- 2.10.3 Other title information of series – transcribe
- 2.10.4 Statement of responsibility relating to series – transcribe

- 2.10.5 ISSN of series – transcribe
- 2.10.6 Numbering within series – record (will have a reference back to 1.6)
- 2.10.7 Subseries – transcribe (will be restructured as a repetition of 2.10.1-.2.10.6)
- 2.11 Frequency – not transcribed
- 2.12 Resource identifier – not transcribed
- 2.13 Published description – not transcribed
- Chapter 3 – no elements transcribed
- Chapter 4 – not tied to transcription
- Chapter 5 – record
- Chapter 6 – not transcribed

89.4   The JSC agreed that at 1.6 there would be a listing of transcribed elements, and that abbreviations will not be used in transcribed elements. In addition, each element that is to be transcribed will be labelled as such in the text.
Action=Editor

89.5   The JSC discussed the large number of abbreviations currently used in the extent, and noted that there was increasing evidence that users of catalogues did not understand these abbreviations. JSC decided that abbreviations would not be used in the extent.

89.6   It was noted that one abbreviation that caused confusion for users of catalogues was "c" for "copyright". The JSC agreed that the copyright symbol should be used if available to the cataloguer, and if not the word should be spelt out.

89.7   The discussion moved on to the use of abbreviations in additions to transcribed elements. It was noted that there had been discussion on RDA-L on the use of postal codes. It was explained that there had been objections to replacing postal codes with other abbreviations, but that the substitution of abbreviations would now no longer occur. In addition, because "place" is a transcribed element the only abbreviations would be those found on the source. It was noted that this left the issue of what to use when adding to a place. It was argued that since the principle of consistency had been subordinated to the principle of representation, there was no logic in imposing consistency on additions.

89.8   The question was asked whether abbreviations, such as "fl.", "b.", "ca.", "d.", would be used in additions to headings. It was noted that continuing to use these abbreviations was an internationalization issue. However, a change in practice would lead to inconsistencies with existing headings. As the overriding purpose of the instructions in part B was to pull things together, for which consistency was important, the JSC agreed that abbreviations would continue to be used in access points. It was acknowledged that catalogue users might not understand some existing abbreviations such as "ca." for "circa". The JSC decided not to make decisions on individual abbreviations used in headings at the meeting, but to ask the Appendices Working Group to make recommendations. It was agreed that there would need to be a strong justification for any change in practice.

89.9   The JSC agreed that the Appendices Working Group would be asked to examine Appendix A (Capitalization), Appendix B (Abbreviations), and Appendix C (Initial articles). It was noted that there was currently a proposal on Breton initial articles (5JSC/LC/7), and that ACOC was planning a proposal on Māori and Pacific Island initial articles. It was agreed that in terms of Appendix C, the focus of the group would be on the

organization of the appendix, not the content, as the list had to be kept in synch with the MARC21 list of initial articles.
Action=Secretary; ACOC/CCC (MARC implications)

89.10   The discussion moved on to capitalization. It was noted that 1.6 instructed you to follow the appendix for transcribed elements, unless you had decided to follow one of options. The JSC agreed that it was not expecting to see recommendations for sweeping changes to the appendix on capitalization, but rather ways to restructure it. The Chair noted that the Group would need to see the revised 1.6. The Editor said that he would be able to work on this after mid-June. It was noted that the revision of 5JSC/LC/5 would affect 1.6.
Action=Editor; LC

89.11   The question was asked about the existing AACR2 appendix for numerals. The Editor replied that the provisions were either included in the text of the instructions, or had been removed.

89.12   JSC agreed that the Group would be asked to review the three appendices and suggest ways in which they can be structured, as well as make recommendations on changes and deletions. The emphasis will be on clarity and ease of use. In addition, the Group will do a general review of the appendices in relation to all changes that have been made to the instructions.

89.13   John Attig and Judy Kuhagen were both present at the meeting and volunteered to be members of the Group. The JSC decided that it was not necessary for all constituencies to be represented on the Group. It was agreed that there were advantages to having all members of the Group based in the same geographical area, and that another member would be found on this basis. Judy Kuhagen was asked to be the Chair of the Group. JSC asked the Group to report by 7 August 2006, and constituencies to respond by 18 September 2006.
Action=Appendices Working Group; ACOC, ALA, BL, CCC, CILIP, LC

89.14   JSC decided that it was not necessary to have a group look at the remaining appendices, Appendix D (Presentation of descriptive data) and Appendix E (Presentation of access point control data). In the case of Appendix E, no one could be asked to start work on this until part B has been drafted. It was noted that a draft of D.1 (ISBD Presentation) had gone out for review and there was a process for dealing with the resulting comments. The JSC discussed what would be included in the remainder of the Appendix for the initial release of RDA in 2008. It was agreed that the ISBD display and MARC display were essential. It was noted that ACOC and CCC had already been charged with mapping RDA to MARC21. The Editor commented that he had already done a mapping of RDA to the Dublin Core library application profile as part of his work on the RDA Prototype. He confirmed that he was willing to update this for inclusion in the Appendix. It was agreed that this was more important than including an OPAC display, especially as OPAC displays vary so widely and there is no standard.

89.15   The Chair and CILIP rep were asked to finalize the charge for the Working Group on Appendices.
Action=Chair, CILIP rep

90 **General principles for inclusion of terms in the AACR Glossary**

90.1 Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Policy/3

90.2 The Chair reminded the JSC that she had sent them a revised version of 5JSC/Policy/3 for comment. She noted that the issue of the relationship between the definitions in the text and the Glossary had been raised. The Editor explained that all elements, element types, and sub-elements had been defined in the text. He added that in the online version bolded words or phrases would be a clickable link to the definition. He suggested that the "Definition" caption used in the text should be changed to "Scope" as it was usually only the first bullet point that contained the definition. The JSC agreed, and decided that definitions for elements, element types, and sub-elements would also be included in the Glossary.
Action=Editor

90.3 The Editor said that terms included in the sections on terminology at 1.1 and 7.1 would be included in the Glossary, although the wording used in the Glossary might be different. It was agreed that terms for categories of resources, e.g. type of content and type of carrier would be defined in the text and the Glossary.

90.4 The question was asked whether there would be any terms that were not defined in both the text and the Glossary. The Editor replied that there would be terms that were used in the text, but not defined in the text, which would only be in the Glossary, e.g. "page", "leaf", and "column".

90.5 The Editor commented that although the online version would have clickable links, there would be no references to the Glossary in the print version.

90.6 The JSC agreed that examples should not introduce terms that require definition or hinder the understanding of the instruction.

90.7 The Chair was asked to update 5JSC/Policy/3 based on the discussion.
Action=Chair

91 **2005 Annual Report**

91.1 Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Annual report/2005

91.2 The Chair noted that the 2005 annual report had been issued.

92 **Update on related projects and other resource description communities**

92.1 IFLA

Barbara Tillett noted that ISBD(A) was available for worldwide review and that the ISBD Review Group had a new chair: Elena Escolano Rodríguez. The Chair noted that she had an action to contact the Chair of the Material Designation Study Group to update them on changes to the GMD.

Action=Chair

Barbara Tillett added that Pat Riva was now the Chair of the FRBR Review Group, and there was a new working group on aggregates. She noted that amendments proposed by the Working Group on the Expression Entity would be going out for worldwide review soon. The FRAR group were still discussing comments received on the draft and would likely report back at IFLA in August. The FRSAR group was in the process of being formed. The Working Group on a Bibliographic Standard for Digital Text Documents was looking at involving producers. A multi-lingual cataloguing terminology group was also being formed.

92.2   IME ICC

Barbara Tillett explained that the third IFLA Meeting of Experts for an International Cataloguing Code had been held in December in Cairo, and that she would send the JSC the latest version of the documents. She added that the next meeting was scheduled for Asian rule makers in Seoul in August 2006.
Action=Barbara Tillett

92.3   VIAF

Barbara Tillett explained that there had been some delays in the Virtual International Authority File project, but that there would be a report at IFLA in August.

92.4   Library of Congress

Barbara Tillett noted that the JSC members would have heard that week about the LC series treatment decision. She added that there was an LC and CONSER pilot project on access level records for serials, and that this had proposed using access points in lieu of elements in the description.

92.5   ISTC

Sally Strutt said that there had been some exploratory discussions with Nielsen BookData to see what could be done in terms of library data to support the International Standard Text Code. She said that she would ask the new BL rep to forward information as it became available.
Action=BL rep

92.6   ISO

Margaret Stewart said that there was a new ISO proposal for an International Standard Party Identifier. She added that there was also a request for a collection identifier originating in Finland. She noted that there was a draft proposal for the DOI to become an ISO standard.

92.7   XC (eXtensible Catalog) project

Jennifer Bowen explained that the University of Rochester had received a grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation to develop a project plan for an extensible open source catalogue. The Project's scope included metadata, software, and user studies.

92.8   Crosswalks

Barbara Tillett noted that LC archival staff had developed a crosswalk for RDA/ISAD(G)/DACS/EAD, and questioned whether it would be included in RDA. JSC decided that resources such as this would not be part of the standard, but be made available on an RDA Web site as ancillary material. Barbara Tillett said that in the meantime LC would keep the archival crosswalk up to date. JSC asked the Secretary to keep a list of such supporting documents.
Action=LC; Secretary

93   Next meeting

93.1   The next meeting will be held from 16-20 October 2006 at the Library of Congress. JSC provisionally agreed that the following meeting would be held 16-20 April 2007 in Ottawa. The Chair said that she would confirm this with the Chair of the CoP (as there would be a joint meeting).
Action=Chair

94   JSC program of work

94.1   The Project plan was updated (see Appendix B). There was additional discussion on the following:

94.2   GMD/SMD Working Group

The Chair was asked to update the GMD/SMD Working Group and forward to them the interim RDA/ONIX report and mapping tables. The GMD/SMD Working Group will be invited to respond to the drafts of RDA sections 3.2 (Media category), 3.3 (Type of carrier) and 4.2 (Type and form of content). The Chair was also asked to update the ISBD Materials Designation Study Group.
Action=Chair

94.3   Responses to RDA part I

JSC confirmed the decision (made in Executive Session) to use the response table format to resolve comments arising from the draft of RDA part I. Jennifer Bowen noted that ALA had made a number of offers to prepare proposals, and asked if these would be handled by the table. She added that the most important of these was the offer to draft high-level instructions for changes requiring a new description (1.3). The Editor said that this was linked to the categorization of mode of issuance, the subject of his planned discussion paper. He said that the discussion paper would help to determine when a category of resource required its own instruction. He said that the attributes that would determine the categories were partitioning (how many parts), release (all at once or in succession), intended termination, and reviseablity and extensibility. The Chair confirmed that the JSC representatives would indicate in the response table whether they would like ALA to do a proposal. The Editor said that he would like to take up the ALA offer to provide a list of all relevant specialist cataloguing manuals for inclusion at 0.1.1. Jennifer Bowen agreed that ALA would supply this list.
Action=ALA

94.4   Examples Working Group

JSC agreed that there needed to be a second working group on examples to cover the former part II and part B. The Chair was asked to contact the current members of the group to see if they were willing to work on these parts and to see if any of them were willing to be the chair. The JSC members were asked to investigate groupware options for use by the Examples Groups (and other JSC groups).
Action=Chair; JSC

94.5   Glossary

Jennifer Bowen asked the JSC what she should do with the Glossary comments that had not been submitted as part of the ALA response to the draft of RDA part I. It was noted that the JSC had yet to discuss the Glossary comments arising from the review of AACR3 part I. The JSC decided that what was required was an evaluation of all of the comments that had been made against the newly revised Glossary principles. Sally Strutt offered to do this work. JSC accepted, and asked Sally Strutt to do the following: examine the AACR2 and AACR3 part I glossaries and eliminate all terms that will be defined in the text by the Editor; for the remaining terms, pull together all of the comments in the constituency responses and using the Glossary principles, evaluate whether a definition is still required. At the October meeting, the JSC will make decisions on the remaining comments. Jennifer Bowen said that she would collate the recent ALA Glossary comments and send them to Sally Strutt.
Action=Sally Strutt; Jennifer Bowen

95   JSC list of tasks

95.1   Received and considered the following document:
5JSC/Sec/2

95.2   The Secretary said that she wanted to update the status column in the JSC list of tasks, with the intent of making it an inactive document. JSC discussed each of the tasks:

95.3   Singular/plural inconsistencies in chapter 21: JSC confirmed the previous decision to refer this to the Editor.

95.4   Use of "description" and "entry": JSC confirmed the previous decision to refer this to the Editor.

95.5   Definition of "numbering": Sally Strutt was asked to include this in her review of Glossary terms.
Action=Sally Strutt

95.6   Bold/italic convention: JSC agreed that this was moot.

95.7   Definition of "collection": Sally Strutt was asked to include this in her review of Glossary terms.
Action=Sally Strutt

95.8   Definition of "predominance": JSC noted that this should have been "prominence", and agreed that a definition was not required because the usage of the term was the same as the dictionary definition.

95.9   Review/update examples in AACR: JSC noted that this was being handled by the JSC Examples Groups.

95.10   Harmonize spacing convention in AACR with MARC21: JSC agreed that this task was no longer required.

95.11   Latin abbreviations "e.g." and "i.e.": The Editor said that his usage of punctuation had been consistent.

95.12   Levels of detail in the description (1.0D): JSC noted that this had been dealt with.

96   Statement of policy and procedures for JSC

96.1   Received and considered the following documents:
         5JSC/Policy/4/Rev

96.2   The Secretary confirmed that there were no changes to be made to the document.

97   List of Actions arising out of the JSC Meeting October 2005

97.1   The Secretary noted that she had an action from the previous meeting to "keep a list of potential MARC changes". She asked the JSC if they wanted this to be a numbered JSC document or an informal document. JSC agreed that this would be an unnumbered document on the Workspace. The Secretary said that she would keep track of topics identified for inclusion in the General Introduction in the same way.
         Action=Secretary

97.2   The Secretary explained that she had discussed her action to update the general RDA PowerPoint with the Project Manager, and that it had been agreed to leave this as a historic document. The JSC asked the Secretary to make it clear on the public Web site that the presentation was not up to date. The JSC agreed that there was a need for a general PowerPoint presentation, and that it would be appropriate for the Outreach Group to maintain this. The JSC discussed different options for making RDA PowerPoints available to those giving presentations, and the Secretary said that she would outline these so that the JSC could make a decision.
         Action=Secretary

98   Outcomes from April 2006 meeting

98.1   The Secretary obtained JSC agreement on the topics to be included in the meeting outcomes. For the outcomes see: http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/0604out.html.

99   Any other business

99.1   The Editor asked if there were any changes to the "Functional Requirements for a Web-accessible version of RDA" based on review of the RDA Prototype, as he would be using this document in his discussions with online product developers the following week. He noted that he had the summarised feedback from the focus groups. The Editor said that he would stress the editorial function of the online version.

99.2   As this was the last meeting Sally Strutt would attend as the British Library representative, the JSC members expressed their thanks to Sally Strutt for her work as both as JSC representative and as JSC Chair.

Appendix A

Corrections to 5JSC/RDA/Part I/ACOC response

p.7:

2.8.1 Definition of place of production

Should read:

2.8.4 Definition of place of production

p.14:

~~**6.3.1 IMMEDIATE SOURCE OF ACQUISITION OR TRANSFER OF ARCHIVAL RESOURCES**~~

> ➤ For archival resources, record the source(s) from which the resource being described was acquired, the date(s) of acquisition, and the method of acquisition, if this information is not confidential.

> ~~Received from Charles Edward Eaton, Chapel Hills, N.C., in a number of installments beginning in 1977.~~

Should read:

~~**6.3.1 IMMEDIATE SOURCE OF ACQUISITION OR TRANSFER OF ARCHIVAL RESOURCES**~~

> ➤ ~~For archival resources, record the source(s) from which the resource being described was acquired, the date(s) of acquisition, and the method of acquisition, if this information is not confidential.~~

> ~~Received from Charles Edward Eaton, Chapel Hills, N.C., in a number of installments beginning in 1977.~~

Corrections to 5JSC/RDA/Part I/ALA response

p. 28:

> iii) a source of information identifying the lowest numbered issue or part available, if the issues or parts are ~~sequentially~~ numbered and <u>the first issue or part is not available</u> issued in sequence

Should read:

> iii) a source of information identifying the lowest numbered issue or part available, if the issues or parts are ~~sequentially~~ numbered and ~~the first issue or part is not available~~ <u>issued in sequence</u>

p. 54:

3.5.0.4

A number of guidelines – such as 3.5.0.4 first bullet, 3.6.5.5 last bullet, 3.6.5.8, 3.6.9.3 first bullet, 3.6.11.3 second bullet, 3.6.13.6, 3.9.0.3 – reference characteristics that are "common" or "typical" of the medium. This is not helpful to cataloguers working with materials with which they are unfamiliar, which happens frequently. If standardization is desired, it would be preferable to identify what is typical.

There are a number of persistent issues regarding cartographic material. Although final resolution must wait until final lists of media categories and types of carrier are available, we would like to make the following points: (a) While not all cartographic resources are printed, all cartographic resources are graphic representations of spatial information – with the exception of globes, which are three-dimensional resources. (b) There continues to be ambiguity about the significance of the term *map*. To the extent that maps may be presented on slides, jigsaw puzzles, etc., *map* is a type of content. As a type of carrier, however, the term *map* identifies a map on one or more sheets. This ambiguity needs to be kept in mind when defining and using this term in Chapter 3.

- Move caption and first paragraph to comments on 3.5.0.4 (p. 63)
- Move second paragraph to comments on 3.4.0.3

Corrections to 5JSC/RDA/Part I/CILIP response

Date of document should be: 20 March 2006

Appendix B

RDA Project Plan - B. Content Development as at 17 August 2006

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.0	**Overall RDA**				
	B.0.1	**Preparation of meeting Outcomes**				
	B.0.1.1	**October 2005 Outcomes**			Done	2005-11-14
	B.0.1.2	**April 2006 Outcomes**			Done	2006-05-29
	B.0.2	**Revise draft Prospectus**				
	B.0.2.1	**Revision after October 2005 meeting**			Done	2005-12-12
	B.0.2.2	**Revision after April 2006 meeting**			Done	2006-06-20
	B.0.3	**Revise Strategic plan**				
	B.0.3.1	**Revision after October 2005 meeting**			Done	2005-12-12
	B.0.3.2	**Revision after April 2006 meeting**			Done	2006-05-29
	B.0.4	**Revise Policy and procedures document**			Done	2005-12-12
	B.0.5	**Statement of objectives and principles**				
	B.0.5.1	**Revision after October 2005 meeting**			Done	2005-12-12
	B.0.5.2	**Revision after October 2006 meeting**				
2006-09-18	B.0.5.2.1	Revise draft objectives and principles	Ed	B.3.3		
2006-11-15	B.0.5.2.2	Discussion complete on objectives and principles	JSC reps			
2006-11-30	B.0.5.2.3	Prepare final version of objectives and principles	Ed			
2006-12-01	B.0.5.2.4	Issue objectives and principles and post to Web site	Sec			
	B.0.6	**Add extra level of numbering**				
2006-05-02	B.0.6.1	Check with online product developer that there are no negative implications to numbering change	Ed		Done	2006-05-02
2006-05-12	B.0.6.2	Change numbering for part A (chapters for review)	Ed		Done	2006-06-19
2007-03-15	B.0.6.3	Change numbering for part A (other chapters)	Ed			

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.1	**Part A-I of RDA (part formerly known as part I)**				
	B.1.1	**Review punctuation within elements**			Done	2005-12-08
	B.1.2	**Prepare GMD/SMD proposal (5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up)**				
2005-11-01	B.1.2.1	Submit WG report	GMD/SMD WG		Done (Deadline revised to 2005-12-05)	2005-12-28
2005-11-18	B.1.2.2	Discuss GMD/SMD proposal	JSC reps		Done (Deadline revised to 2006-01-09)	2006-01-10
2006-01-16	B.1.2.3	Issue GMD/SMD proposal for Constituency review	Chair/Sec		Done	2006-01-19
2006-03-27	B.1.2.4	Submit responses on GMD/SMD proposal	JSC/Const		Done	2006-03-27
2006-04-24	B.1.2.5	Review responses on GMD/SMD proposal at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-05	B.1.2.6	Provide feedback to ONIX	Ed		Done	2006-05-05
2006-05-31	B.1.2.7	Update GMD/SMD Working Group and Materials Designations Study Group	Chair		Done	2006-06-26
2006-06-15	B.1.2.8	Final report from RDA/ONIX Workshop (5JSC/Chair/10)	Ed/ONIX		Done	2006-08-01
2006-08-07	B.1.2.9	Prepare drafts of 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 including definitions (based on RDA/ONIX framework)	Ed		Done	2006-08-04
2006-09-18	B.1.2.10	Submit responses on drafts of 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization)	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.2.11	Discussion of 5JSC/Chair/10 and responses to 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.3	**Develop proposal re sources of information**			Done	2005-12-08

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.1.4	**Review proposal re URLs (5JSC/ACOC/1)**				
2005-11-18	B.1.4.1	Comment on ACOC rep proposal	JSC reps		Done	2005-11-28
2005-11-24	B.1.4.2	Finalize proposal re URLs	ACOC rep		Done	2005-11-29
2005-12-01	B.1.4.3	Incorporate URL proposal into draft of Part I	Ed		Done as far as possible? (Deadline revised to 2005-12-08)	2005-12-08
2006-02-13	B.1.4.4	Issue formal proposal on URLs	ACOC		Done	2006-02-10
2006-03-27	B.1.4.5	Submit responses on URLs proposal	JSC/Const		Done	2006-03-27
2006-04-24	B.1.4.6	Review responses on URLs proposal at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-08-07	B.1.4.7	Revise URLs proposal	ACOC		Done	2006-08-07
2006-09-18	B.1.4.8	Submit responses to 5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.4.9	Review responses to 5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.5	**Prepare draft of Part I for constituency review**			Done	2005-12-08
	B.1.6	**Prepare cover letter for constituency review**			Done	2005-12-09
	B.1.7	**Constituency review of Part I (5JSC/RDA/Part I)**				
2005-12-01	B.1.7.1	Issue draft of part I for constituency review	Ed/Sec	B.1.5/B.1.6	Done (Deadline revised to 2005-12-08)	2005-12-12
2006-01-16	B.1.7.2	Issue chapter 3	Ed/Sec	B.1.2.2	Done	2006-01-19
2006-03-20	B.1.7.3	Submit constituency responses to draft of part I	JSC/Const		Done	2006-03-20
2006-04-24	B.1.7.4	Review constituency responses to draft of part I at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-15	B.1.7.5	Annotate own responses in first round response	JSC reps		Done	2006-05-15

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
		table				
2006-05-31	B.1.7.6	Prepare second round response table and mount on Web site	Sec		Done	2006-06-05
2006-08-07	B.1.7.7	Indicate agreement/disagreement in second round response table (constituency consultation not response)	JSC reps		Done (not BL)	2006-08-07
2006-08-21	B.1.7.8	Composite table on part I comments	Sec			
2006-09-04	B.1.7.9	Final assessments on part I comments in table	JSC reps			
2006-10-16	B.1.7.10	Discussion of part A-1 comments at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.8	**Prepare/review new proposals for Part I**				
2006-02-13	B.1.8.1	Submit proposals arising from review of Part I	JSC/Const		Done	2006-02-28
2006-03-27	B.1.8.2	Submit responses to proposals	JSC/Const		Done	2006-03-27
2006-04-24	B.1.8.3	Review proposals/responses at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-08-07	B.1.8.4	Submit new part A-I proposals	JSC/Const		Done	2006-08-07
2006-09-18	B.1.8.5	Submit responses to new part A proposals	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.8.6	Discussion of new part A proposals at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.9	**Rules for digital media (5JSC/ALA/2)**				
2006-03-27	B.1.9.1	Proposal due on digital media	ALA	B.1.7.2	Done	2006-03-30
2006-09-18	B.1.9.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/ALA/2	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.9.3	Review responses to 5JSC/ALA/2 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.10	**Internationalization (5JSC/LC/5)**				
2006-02-13	B.1.10.1	Proposal due on internationalization	LC		Done	2006-02-28
2006-03-27	B.1.10.2	Submit responses on internationalization proposal	JSC/Const		Done	2006-03-29
2006-04-24	B.1.10.3	Review responses on internationalization proposal at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-30	B.1.10.4	Revise internationalization proposal	LC		Done	2006-06-21
2006-09-18	B.1.10.5	Submit responses to 5JSC/LC/5/Rev	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.10.6	Review responses to 5JSC/LC/5/Rev at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.11	**Mode of issuance**				

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
2006-06-30	B.1.11.1	Prepare discussion paper of mode of issuance (5JSC/Editor/RDA/Mode of issuance)	Ed		Done	2006-06-30
2006-10-16	B.1.11.2	Discuss 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Mode of issuance at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.12	**Video Format Characteristics (5JSC/LC/9)**				
2006-08-07	B.1.12.1	Submit proposal (Revised 9 Aug 2006)	LC		Done	2006-07-31
2006-09-18	B.1.12.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/LC/9/Rev	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.12.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/LC/9/Rev at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.13	**Specialist Cataloguing Manuals (5JSC/ALA/3)**				
2006-08-07	B.1.13.1	Submit proposal	ALA		Done	2006-08-06
2006-09-18	B.1.13.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/ALA/3	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.13.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/ALA/3 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.14	**Dimensions of binding (5JSC/CILIP/2)**				
2006-08-07	B.1.14.1	Submit proposal	CILIP		Done	2006-08-02
2006-09-18	B.1.14.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/CILIP/2	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.14.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/CILIP/2 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.1.15	**Accessible formats (5JSC/CILIP/3)**				
2006-08-07	B.1.15.1	Submit proposal	CILIP		Done	2006-08-03
2006-09-18	B.1.15.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/CILIP/3	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.1.15.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/CILIP/3 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.2	**Part A-II of RDA (part formerly known as part II)**				
	B.2.1	**Preliminary draft of part II**			Done	2006-04-24
	B.2.2	**Levels of access (5JSC/ACOC rep/1)**				

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
2006-04-24	B.2.2.1	Discussion of outstanding part II issues on levels at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-18	B.2.2.2	Incorporate outcome of levels discussion into draft of part A-II	Ed		Decided not to include	
	B.2.3	**Archival rules (5JSC/LC/3)**				
2006-04-24	B.2.3.1	Discussion of outstanding part II issues on archival rules at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-18	B.2.3.2	Incorporate outcome of archival rules discussion into draft of part A-II	Ed	B.3.1.5	Done	2006-05-18
	B.2.4	**Prepare draft of Part A-II for constituency review**				
2006-05-18	B.2.4.1	Incorporate changes agreed at JSC meeting into Part A-II	Ed	B.2.1/B.2.2/B.2.3	Done	2006-05-18
2006-06-02	B.2.4.2	Comment on revised draft of Part A-II	JSC reps		Done	2006-06-16
2006-06-14	B.2.4.3	Close off discussion on revised draft of part A-II	JSC reps		Done	2006-06-16
2006-06-19	B.2.4.4	Finalize draft of part A-II	Ed/Sec		Done	2006-06-20
	B.2.5	**Prepare cover letter for constituency review**				
2006-05-22	B.2.5.1	Identify issues for inclusion in cover letter for Part A-II	Chair/Sec		Done	2006-06-16
2006-06-01	B.2.5.2	Consult with project manager re cover letter for part A-II	JSC reps		Done	2006-06-18
2006-06-14	B.2.5.3	Finalize cover letter for part A-II	Chair		Done	2006-06-20
	B.2.6	**Constituency review of part A-II**				
2006-06-20	B.2.6.1	Issue draft of part A-II for constituency review	Ed/Sec	B.2.4/B.2.5	Done	2006-06-20
2006-09-18	B.2.6.2	Submit constituency responses to draft of chapters 6-7	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.2.6.3	Review constituency responses to draft of chapters 6-7 at meeting	JSC/Ed			

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.2.7	**Prepare/review new proposals for Part A-II**				
2006-08-07	B.2.7.1	Submit proposals arising from review of Part A-II	JSC/Const		Done	2006-08-07
2006-09-18	B.2.7.2	Submit responses to proposals arising from Part A-II	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.2.7.3	Review proposals/responses to Part A-II proposals at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.2.8	**Other agreements involving jurisdictions (5JSC/CCC/1)**				
2006-08-07	B.2.8.1	Submit proposal	CCC		Done	2006-08-07
2006-09-18	B.2.8.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/CCC/1	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.2.8.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/CCC/1 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.3	**Part B of RDA**				
	B.3.1	**Names of families (5JSC/LC/6)**				
2006-02-13	B.3.1.1	Submit proposal on names of families	LC		Done	2006-02-28
2006-03-27	B.3.1.2	Submit responses to proposal on names of families	JSC/Const		Done	2006-03-27
2006-04-24	B.3.1.3	Review proposal/responses on names of families at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-15	B.3.1.4	Obtain more information on international standards for archival materials	CCC rep		Done	2006-05-04
2006-08-07	B.3.1.5	Make decision on names of families - part A-II issues	JSC reps		Done	2005-05-17
2006-08-07	B.3.1.6	Make decision on names of families - part B issues	JSC reps			
	B.3.2	**Functional requirements for part B**			Not required	
	B.3.3	**Objectives and principles for part B**				
2006-03-27	B.3.3.1	Revise Objectives and principles to include part B	Ed		Done	2006-04-13
2006-04-24	B.3.3.2	Discussion on revised Objectives and principles at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.3.4	**Preliminary draft of part B**				
2006-09-18	B.3.4.1	Preliminary draft of part B completed	Ed			
2006-09-18	B.3.4.2	Preliminary draft of part B on Workspace	Sec			
2006-10-16	B.3.4.3	Discussion on preliminary draft of part B at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.3.5	**Levels of access (5JSC/ACOC rep/1)**				
2006-10-16	B.3.5.1	Discussion of outstanding part B issues on levels at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2006-11-01	B.3.5.2	Incorporate outcome of levels discussion into draft of part B	Ed			
	B.3.6	**Archival rules (5JSC/LC/3)**				
2006-10-16	B.3.6.1	Discussion of outstanding part B issues on archival rules at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2006-11-01	B.3.6.2	Incorporate outcome of archival rules discussion into draft of part B	Ed			
	B.3.7	**Prepare draft of Part B for constituency review**				
2006-11-01	B.3.7.1	Incorporate changes agreed at JSC meeting into Part B	Ed	B.3.5/B.3.6		
2006-11-15	B.3.7.2	Comment on revised draft of Part B	JSC reps			
2006-12-01	B.3.7.3	Finalize draft of Part B	Ed			
	B.3.8	**Prepare cover letter for constituency review**				
2006-11-01	B.3.8.1	Identify issues for inclusion in cover letter for Part B	Chair/Sec			
2006-11-15	B.3.8.2	Consult with project manager re cover letter	JSC reps			
2006-12-01	B.3.8.3	Finalize cover letter for draft of part B	Chair			
	B.3.9	**Constituency review of Part B**				
2006-12-01	B.3.9.1	Issue draft of part B for constituency review	Ed/Sec	B.3.7/B.3.8		
2007-03-01	B.3.9.2	Submit constituency responses to draft of part B	JSC/Const			
2007-04-16	B.3.9.3	Review constituency responses to draft of part B at meeting	JSC/Ed			

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.3.10	**Prepare/review new proposals for Part B**				
2007-02-01	B.3.10.1	Submit proposals arising from review of Part B	JSC/Const			
2007-03-01	B.3.10.2	Submit responses to proposals arising from Part B	JSC/Const			
2007-04-16	B.3.10.3	Review proposals/responses arising from part B at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.3.11	**Bible Uniform Titles (5JSC/LC/8)**				
2006-06-01	B.3.11.1	Submit proposal	LC		Done	2006-06-01
2006-09-18	B.3.11.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/LC/8	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.3.11.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/LC/8 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.4	**Other RDA**				
	B.4.1	**General Introduction**				
2007-03-01	B.4.1.1	Work on General Introduction	Ed	B.0.5/B.3.3		
2007-04-16	B.4.1.2	Discussion on General Introduction at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2007-06-15	B.4.1.3	Issue General Introduction for constituency review	Ed/Sec			
	B.4.2	**Revision of Appendices**				
2006-03-27	B.4.2.1	Issue a charge for Appendices working group	Chair/CILIP rep		Draft circulated	2006-04-04
2006-04-24	B.4.2.2	Creation of a working group on appendices at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-06-15	B.4.2.3	Finalize charge and membership for working group on appendices	Chair		Done	2006-07-04
2006-09-18	B.4.2.4	First progress report on Appendices	Appendices WG			
2006-10-16	B.4.2.5	Discussion on progress report on appendices at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2007-03-01	B.4.2.6	Further work on appendices	JSC/Appendices WG			
2007-04-16	B.4.2.7	Discussion on appendices at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.4.3	**Review of Examples (5JSC/Chair/1)**				

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
2005-11-01	B.4.3.1	Respond to Examples Group with status report	CCC rep		Done	2005-11-01
2006-03-27	B.4.3.2	Report on Examples in part I	Examples WG		Done (Deadline revised to 2006-04-13)	2006-04-11
2006-04-24	B.4.3.3	Discussion on report on examples in part I at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-06-01	B.4.3.4	Sort out membership of Examples Group and Chair for remaining chapters	Chair		Done	2006-06-27
2006-06-15	B.4.3.5	Set up second Examples WG	Chair		Done	2006-06-27
2006-09-18	B.4.3.6	Status report on examples in part A-II	2nd Examples WG			
2006-10-16	B.4.3.7	Discussion of report on examples in part A-II at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2006-10-16	B.4.3.8	Resolution of part A-I instructions to do with examples at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2007-03-01	B.4.3.9	Report on examples in part B	2nd Examples WG			
2007-04-16	B.4.3.10	Discussion on report on examples in part B at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.4.4	**Revision of Glossary**				
2006-04-24	B.4.4.1	Discuss 5JSC/Policy/3/Rev at meeting	JSC/Ed		Done	2006-04-24
2006-05-12	B.4.4.2	Send out final draft of 5JSC/Policy/3/Rev	Chair		Done	2006-05-15
2006-05-15	B.4.4.3	Issue final draft of 5JSC/Policy/3/Rev	Sec		Done	2006-05-18
2006-05-30	B.4.4.4	Pull together all Glossary comments arising from review of part I	ALA rep		Done	2006-05-30
2006-09-18	B.4.4.5	Document on Glossary terms	Sally Strutt			
2006-10-16	B.4.4.6	Discussion of outstanding part I Glossary comments at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2007-03-01	B.4.4.7	Work on Glossary	JSC reps			
2007-04-16	B.4.4.8	Discussion on Glossary at meeting	JSC/Ed			

Timeline	Reference	Task	Responsibility	Dependency	Status	Date completed
	B.4.5	**Breton initial articles (5JSC/LC/7)**				
2006-04-20	B.4.5.1	Submit proposal	LC		Done	2006-04-20
2006-09-18	B.4.5.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/LC/7	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.4.5.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/LC/7 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.4.6	**Maori & Pacific Island initial articles (5JSC/ACOC/2)**				
2006-08-07	B.4.6.1	Submit proposal	ACOC		Done	2006-08-01
2006-09-18	B.4.6.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/ACOC/2	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.4.6.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/ACOC/2 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.4.7	**Irish initial articles (5JSC/CILIP/4)**				
2006-08-07	B.4.7.1	Submit proposal	CILIP		Done	2006-08-03
2006-09-18	B.4.7.2	Submit responses to 5JSC/CILIP/4	JSC/Const			
2006-10-16	B.4.7.3	Discussion of responses to 5JSC/CILIP/4 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
	B.4.7	**RDA and MARC**				
2006-08-07	B.4.7.1	Mapping RDA to MARC21	ACOC and CCC		Ongoing	
2006-09-18	B.4.7.2	Prepare discussion paper on RDA and MARC21	ACOC and CCC			
2006-10-16	B.4.7.3	Review discussion paper on RDA and MARC21 at meeting	JSC/Ed			
2006-12-01	B.4.7.4	Submit discussion paper to MARBI	JSC reps			
	B.5	**Final drafts of RDA**				
2007-09-15	B.5.1	Completion of final drafts of Parts A, B, and Gen Intro	Ed			
2007-10-01	B.5.2	Sign-off on all final RDA drafts at meeting	JSC reps			

A shaded date means that the timeline is yet to be confirmed.