MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 2013 MEETING

Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

American Library Association – Washington Office
Washington, D.C., USA
4-8 November 2013

[Note: Excludes Executive Sessions]

TABLE of CONTENTS

End of Executive Session 2

Minutes: of the fortieth meeting of the Committee held at the American Library Association Washington office, Washington, D.C., USA, 4-8 November 2013.

Present: **JSC**

Alan Danskin, British Library
Gordon Dunsire, Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals; Chair-Elect
Christine Frodl, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
Kathy Glennan, American Library Association
William Leonard, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
Kevin Marsh, Australian Committee on Cataloguing
David Reser, Library of Congress
Barbara Tillett, Chair
Judith Kuhagen, Secretary

ALA Publishing

James Hennelly
Troy Linker (Nov. 4; Nov. 8, via Internet)

Observers in attendance

John Attig, Pennsylvania State University (Nov. 4-8)
Deborah Fritz, The MARC of Quality (Nov. 8, via Internet)
John Hostage, Harvard University (Nov. 6-7)
Damian Iseminger, New England Conservatory (Nov. 6)
Kate James, Library of Congress; Chair of the Examples Group (Nov. 4-8)
Betsy Moon, U.S. Senate Library (Nov. 6)
Nannette Naught, IMT, Inc. (Nov. 5-8)
Melanie Polutta, Library of Congress (Nov. 7)
Cathy Sackmann, IMT, Inc. (Nov. 5-8)
Manon Théroux, U.S. Senate Library (Nov. 6)
Valerie Weinberg, Library of Congress (Nov. 6)
Steve Yusko, Library of Congress (Nov. 6)

Executive Session 1

398 Liaison with the co-publishers of RDA

399 Scope and maintenance of JSC/AACR/RDA Toolkit web sites & RDA-L

400 Report from July discussion by Barbara and Gordon with Committee of Principals

401 Method for documenting JSC work (continue Programme of work, Strategic plan, Action items?)

402 Status report from JSC members on from November 2012 JSC meeting

403 Communication with other resource description communities (including museums and archives)

404 Formal recognition of individuals and groups contributing to the development of RDA

End of Executive Session 1

405 Beginning of the public session

315.1 Barbara Tillett welcomed the observers. All present introduced themselves.

406 Approval of the agenda

406.1 The JSC received and considered 6JSC/A/3/rev/2.

406.2 The order of topics for November 8 was changed: #21 (Other appendices) was moved after #23 (Remaining Fast Track entries). The agenda was approved. During the meeting week, other changes were made to the order of topics in the agenda. [The minutes follow the order of the topics as discussed.]

407 Minutes of the previous meeting held (November 2012)

407.1 The JSC received and considered 6JSC/M/Restricted/309-397.

407.2 The minutes were accepted as corrected, based on emails from JSC members before the meeting, and with a request for the Secretary to check the spelling of Gordon Dunsire's name. The Secretary will post the restricted minutes on the Workspace and the public version (minus the sections for the Executive Sessions) on the JSC website.
Action=Secretary

408 Next meeting in 2014

408.1 The JSC decided that the 2014 meeting would be November 3-7, again at ALA's Washington Office in Washington, D.C., USA.

409 Update roster of JSC members

409.1 Barbara Tillett welcomed the new members of the JSC to their first meeting as representatives: Kathy Glennan (ALA) and Dave Reser (LC).

409.2 Kevin Marsh, whose term as the ACOC representative ends in April 2014, said he would be moving to Tasmania early in 2014. He will notify the JSC who will represent ACOC after April.

409.3 Barbara Tillett presented John Attig with a gift from the JSC representatives in acknowledgement of his service for two terms as the American Library Association representative to the JSC and for his other service to the JSC over many years.

410 General: 6JSC/CCC/13 [Revision of RDA 1.7.3 (Punctuation)]

410.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

410.2 Purpose of the proposal: to separate the exceptions from the main instruction and move the examples to appropriate paragraphs.

410.3 The JSC accepted the proposal with some revisions: accepted LC's explanations for the examples, Kate James' additional example, and a DNB example originally submitted as a Fast Track entry. Kathy Glennan withdrew the ALA suggestion.

410.4 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/CCC/13/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

411 General: 6JSC/DNB/Discussion/1 [Discussion paper: First issue v. latest (current) issue]

411.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

411.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to give a general outline of possible changes to RDA to support both the "first issue" and "latest issue" approach in describing resources issued in more than part.

411.3 Christine Frodl gave the background for the discussion paper: a discussion on behalf of the German-speaking library community during the 2012 JSC meeting and a JSC announcement after that meeting in which DNB was invited to write a discussion paper on revising RDA to allow for descriptions to be based on either the first or the latest issue. She clarified that the possibilities are not to be applied to multipart monographs (still description

from first issue) because only serials (described from the latest issue) are included in the Zeitschriftendatenbank (ZDB).

411.4 Barbara Tillett and Gordon Dunsire noted how serials are addressed -- or not -- in FRBR and in FRBRoo. Gordon said that the FRBR Review Group had been discussing the event-driven approach in PRESSoo: a manifestation record of a serial must wait until the serial is complete; so, you can only record the intended title, frequency, language, etc., when the serial starts to be published. Christine Frodl said that a solution is needed for the German-speaking community so that RDA can be implemented.

411.5 The JSC discussed the two possibilities explained in the paper:
-- a new alternative in 2.1.2.3 with revised wording and alternatives added to instructions for elements in chapter 2, including wording for relevant instructions for notes about these elements;
-- a new set of elements (e.g., "later parallel title" and "earlier parallel title").

411.6 Christine Frodl also said that there would need to be a way to identify in a record which approach (first or latest issue) had been used for the description.

411.7 Gordon Dunsire expressed concerns about the number of elements in the second possibility proposed and noted that the result is a conflation of element and time. John Attig suggested instead a single element with information about instance of elements; Alan Danskin said that EURIG was interested in what John suggested. Dave Reser said an explanation could be included in chapter 0. Christine Frodl said DNB was not interested in different RDA versions; a solution should be found how to integrate the Zeitschriftendatenbank (ZDB) with descriptions based on latest issue into the RDA environment.

411.8 Alan Danskin and Gordon Dunsire said the use of multiple alternatives is also problematic; there is the danger of creating parallel versions. Gordon said that the solution returns to "data about data." John Attig said he thinks the JSC needs to decide about "data about data" to solve structural issues before writing instructions. Dave Reser recommended that the DNB issue a policy statement to follow their latest-issue practice and that the JSC issue a paper about what "data about data" really means because what it means and how it would be implemented in RDA are not clear. Alan Danskin noted that in the past the JSC had said it was out of scope. Gordon noted that the data needs to be machine-actionable for various implementations. Nannette Naught expressed the opinion that JSC needs to grasp the nettle of data about data because it limits uptake.

411.9 Barbara Tillett asked if the new JSC Technical Working Group would take on the task of preparing such a paper. Gordon Dunsire said that the task is about modeling, not about a technical problem. Gordon said he would take on this task and Barbara agreed to assist him.
ACTION=Gordon Dunsire, Barbara Tillett

411.10 Dave Reser noted another issue to be considered: how to maintain the identification of a serial work in linking relationships; perhaps only identifiers should be used.

412 General: 6JSC/Examples/Discussion/1 (Contextual Examples in RDA)

412.1 Kate James, Chair of the Examples Group, presented the two topics in the discussion paper: (1) creation of an Examples Guide; and (2) disparity between the guidelines for examples presented in 6JSC/Chair/2 and the large number of examples within RDA that do not follow these guidelines. She clarified that contextual examples are the examples included in the text of RDA and illustrate the instructions with which they are associated.

412.2 The JSC agreed that the Examples Group should create the Examples Guide for JSC review and assigned a June 1, 2014 deadline for a first draft. The JSC will decide later if it will be a separate document or part of the Editor's Guide.
ACTION=Examples Group

412.3 The JSC discussed the three options related to the disparity topic:
(A) The Examples Group will undertake a project to evaluate every applicable example in RDA to determine if the initial article should be included to follow the current guideline in 6JSC/Chair/2.
(B) The existing examples will remain, a few English examples showing the initial article will be added, and a statement will be added to 0.10 explaining the disparate practices. Guidelines for the Examples Group would be amended to allow for both basic instructions and alternatives to be applied in areas other than the Alternatives themselves.
(C) The existing examples could remain unchanged in form, but have explanations added to them when initial article is omitted. A statement could also be added to 0.10 explaining the disparate practices. The Examples Group Guidelines would be amended.

412.4 The initial response from JSC to the three options was divided between options A and C with no one liking option B. After discussing the investment of time involved in each option, the JSC decided that the Examples Group should generally follow option A and used a phased approach, prioritizing and submitting updated examples when possible. Kate James noted that the phased approach is more difficult became the same example often appears in multiple instructions and so would require that the updating work be synchronized.
ACTION=Examples Group

413 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/CCC/11 [Revision of RDA 2.3.1.7 (Titles of Parts, Sections, and Supplements) and RDA 2.3.2.6 (Collective Title and Titles of Individual Contents)]

413.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

413.2 Purpose of the proposal: to reword the two instructions to reduce the ambiguity.

413.3 Bill Leonard said that CCC agrees with the counter-proposal in ALA's response to introduce the concept of "dependent title" to be in accord with ISBD. He noted that an explanation is needed at the beginning of the instruction to indicate the split into two categories and glossary entries are needed. The JSC agreed to this change in how the instruction would be revised and agreed to remove the instruction on punctuation; Dave Reser noted that the punctuation information is in appendix D.

413.4 Judy Kuhagen explained the back-and-forth history of the instructions about titles of parts, etc., in AACR2 and RDA. Because cataloguers had difficulty in determining what was a dependent title in order to follow the AACR2 rule, the JSC had decided during development of RDA chapter 2 to use presence or absence of the common title as the factor in determining what was included in the title proper.

413.5 Gordon Dunsire said that the revision could use the ALA approach without using the terms "dependent title" and "independent title." The JSC asked Bill Leonard and Kathy Glennan to submit a follow-up document by November 30, 2013 with responses from the JSC via email by December 31, 2013. **ACTION=ALA rep, CCC rep**

413.6 After the JSC meeting, the JSC discussed and then approved the follow-up proposal. For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/CCC/11/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

414 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/ISSN/2/JSC response/ISSN response [Response to JSC response on the ISSN discussion paper/2]

414.1 Barbara Tillett said that no further action was needed by the JSC in response to the ISSN response giving further information about the tests to determine how to identify major title changes in languages that do not divide text into words, etc.

414.2 No one in JSC had heard about the results of the tests that were to have been reported at the ISSN Directors meeting in Bucharest in late October 2013. The JSC will await further information from the ISSN community.

415 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/DNB/3 [Attributes of manifestations: Instructions for more than one instance of an element]

415.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

415.2 Purpose of the proposal: to clarify the wording in instructions about situations when more than one instance of the same element appears on the resource.

415.3 Christine Frodl asked the intent of these instructions: to be selective in transcribing instances in some cases, to be selective always, or always transcribe all instances. Dave Reser replied that cataloguers were told in training sessions to give the first instance or give all instances. Dave said LC was most concerned about place of publication; for legal reasons, LC cataloguers will have to transcribe a U.S. place of publication if not transcribing all places. Alan Danskin, Kevin Marsh, and Bill Leonard said their constituencies all want to be able to give a "home country" place of publication.

415.4 Alan Danskin said that RDA should allow latitude in transcribing instances when there is more than one on a resource. Gordon Dunsire said that a revision of 0.6 would lay the groundwork for application profiles. The JSC revised the proposed wording of 0.6.1 in the proposal and decided to revise both 2.3.4.3 and 2.5.2.3 to be consistent with comparable instructions.

415.5 For the final version of the approved change to 0.6.1, see 6JSC/DNB/3/Sec final on the JSC website. For the revisions of 2.3.4.3 and 2.5.2.3, see 6JSC/Sec/11 on the JSC website.

415.6 Kevin Marsh asked how a review of 0.6 would be carried out. Gordon Dunsire replied that it would be part of an application profile discussion; he suggested that national libraries might be the best groups to work on this task and asked if there were volunteers. Alan Danskin volunteered and suggested also involving a DNB person. The BL and DNB will check how to proceed.
ACTION=BL rep, DNB rep

416 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/LC/24 [Revisions to instructions for production, publication, distribution and manufacture statements (2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10)]

416.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

416.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add additional information for clarification and to move the optional omission about producer, publisher, etc., from the instruction on statements for each function to the individual instructions for the sub-elements producer, publisher, etc.

416.3 The JSC agreed to moving the optional omission to the instructions for the sub-elements and to adding a reference to chapter 21, using the CCC recommended "relationship" wording in those instructions. The JSC also agreed to add a first paragraph about recording the statements to instructions lacking them and to expanding information in the scope statements for producer, publisher, etc.

416.4 Alan Danskin expressed concern about adding, in each of the instructions on statements, a paragraph about a statement on a resource containing information belonging to another element. He said that how a statement is presented is not as important as a controlled form.

416.5 Gordon Dunsire said there were really two issues involved when talking about "statements" in both ISBD and RDA: transcription (e.g., statement of responsibility) that probably cannot be changed; and aggregation (e.g., publication statement) that could be changed). He said that aggregated statements really belong in applications with information about order and punctuation.

416.6 Alan Danskin said he would prepare a discussion paper on publication, etc., statements, including statement of function, by May 1, 2014.
ACTION=BL rep

416.7 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/LC/24/Sec final on the JSC website.

417 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/LC/25/rev [Recording dates in more than one calendar (RDA 2.6.7.1, 2.6.9.1, 2.7.6.3, 2.8.6.3, 2.9.6.3, 2.10.6.3)]

417.1 The JSC received and considered the revised proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

417.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add instructions and add/revise core element conditional statements about recording dates in more than one calendar on a resource.

417.3 Dave Reser withdrew the optional omission wording because the core element conditional statements addressed the situation adequately. The JSC approved the other changes in the proposal and the use of ALA's wording "If the date as it appears ..."

417.4 In response to Kevin Marsh's question about copyright dates, the JSC agreed to extend the changes in 2.6-2.10 to copyright dates at 2.11.

417.5 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/LC/25/rev/Sec final on the JSC website.

418 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/ACOC/9/rev [Qualifications after an identifier – Amendments to RDA 2.15.1.7]

418.1 The JSC received and considered the revised proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

418.2 Purpose of the proposal: to revise the examples to broaden and annotate the examples to provide greater clarity to cataloguers in interpreting the instruction and acknowledge the RDA principle that abbreviations may not be understood by the cataloguer.

418.3 Kevin Marsh agreed with the revision of the examples in the LC response. The JSC also agreed with those changes and with the addition about format in the CCC response.

418.4 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/ACOC/9/rev/Sec final on the JSC website.

419 Manifestations and items – transcription: 6JSC/ALA rep/6 [Note on Manifestation and Item]

419.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

419.2 Purpose of the proposal: to divide the element Note on manifestation and item for both identifying manifestations/items (ch. 2) and describing carriers (ch. 3) into two elements for each chapter and rename the elements appropriately. The proposal included questions about both (1) the labels and definitions for the elements, and (2) the status of the element sub-types.

419.3 John Attig (former ALA rep), for Kathy Glennan, explained that this proposal is a follow-up to the changes approved at the 2011 JSC meeting. In 2012 he had identified inconsistencies between RDA and the Open Metadata Registry; he had agreed to prepare a proposal to fix those inconsistencies.

419.4 The JSC agreed that the element sub-types are useful. The JSC also agreed to approve option 1 for the placement of the separate elements in chapters 2 and 3 even though extensive renumbering would be required. Nannette Naught noted that the metadata would need to be changed, too.

419.5 The JSC agreed with the recommendation in the LC response not to add a Note on item for chapter 3 but to merge that proposed element with Item-specific carrier characteristic. The JSC agreed with the recommendation in the ACOC and LC responses to change the ch. 3 Note on manifestation to Note on carrier.

419.6 Later during the week, the JSC reviewed revised definitions from John Attig. After the meeting, the JSC continued discussion of the proposal via email.

419.7 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/ALA rep/6/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

420 Manifestations and items – carriers: 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/1 [Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA: Discussion Paper (2013)]

420.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

420.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to describe the work of the ALA Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data and to propose questions for JSC comment and discussion. It is a follow-up document to 6JSC/ALA/17.

420.3 All except LC had agreed with the first recommendation; Dave Reser withdrew LC's objection to going forward with adding Extent of expression to the RDA element set. Alan Danskin expressed the desire for user-friendly labels; Gordon Dunsire noted that is a separate issue to be addressed throughout RDA.

420.4 The JSC did not agree with the second recommendation to add Extent of item to the RDA element set because that element is not in FRBR. Alan Danskin asked if there was value in having machine-actionable information (more than an annotation) at this level. Gordon Dunsire said that sub-types for notes on items is a future task.

420.5 The JSC expressed strong support for the third recommendation to extend the RDA/ONIX Framework for Resource Categorization to have fuller sets of types for content and carrier; the JSC also endorsed the creation of more user-friendly terms. Gordon Dunsire recommended establishing a JSC group on the RDA/ONIX Framework. Gordon said it is urgent for work to begin in this area in January. Alan will circulate terms of reference for the group. Gordon will contact the ISBD Review Group for its participation.

420.6 The ALA task force thinks more work needs to be done with real examples for the fourth recommendation (modify the Aspect-Unit-Quantity model to accommodate complex extent data). John Attig said that the task force is looking at data structures and then considering how the results will look in the instructions. Gordon Dunsire, also a member of the task force, said the task force is trying to keep results looking the same as now; he noted the three intentions of RDA: all machine-actionable (elements), semi-actionable (e.g., authorized access points), no machine-actionable (annotations).

420.7 The JSC asked the ALA task force to prepare proposals for as much as possible related to the first and third recommendations for the 2014 meeting and to keep the JSC and the new JSC RDA/ONIX Working Group informed.

The task in the third recommendation will be forwarded to the new JSC RDA/ONIX Working Group. Kathy Glennan will check with the ALA task force members and with ALA's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access about the membership of the task force.
ACTION: ALA task force, ALA rep, JSC RDA/ONIX Working Group

421 Manifestations and items – carriers: 6JSC/CCC/14 [Revision of RDA 3.5.3 (Dimensions of still images)]

421.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

421.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add an instruction to clarify the situations when the dimensions of the sheet, or sheets, carrying still image(s) may be recorded (such an instruction is present for those situations for cartographic materials).

421.3 Bill Leonard said that he was withdrawing the proposal on behalf of CCC in response to the opinions in the JSC responses. He said he hoped that other work being discussed would address the situations. Gordon Dunsire said that the issues raised in the CCC proposal should inform the work of the ALA Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements.

422 Manifestations and items – carriers: 6JSC/ALA rep/1/rev [Revision to: Categorization of content and carrier]

422.1 The JSC received and considered the document sent October 5, 2013. No formal JSC responses were required.

422.2 Purpose of the document: to follow up on the recommendations in 6JSC/ALA rep/1: revision of the categorization document, mapping issues involving current RDA categories, and suggestions for further revision of those categories or of the RDA/ONIX Framework.

422.3 John Attig, who wrote the original document as ALA rep, noted that the revisions included in the revised document do not affect the content of RDA. He noted that Gordon Dunsire had already raised these issues for action.

422.4 The JSC discussed some of the issues in the document. Kevin Marsh asked how to propose the addition of terms to content, carrier, and media types; Gordon Dunsire said such proposals should be sent to the JSC for its own discussion before the proposed additions are discussed with the RDA/ONIX Framework group.

422.5 Because the JSC members had not had time to discuss the revised version of 6JSC/RDA/Categorization (included as part of the revised ALA rep document) with constituencies, Gordon Dunsire asked that they submit responses by

May 1, 2014. [After the meeting, Gordon said such responses were not necessary because the 6JSC/ALA rep/1/rev document had been referred to the new JSC RDA/ONIX Framework Working Group.]

423 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/LC rep/4 [Treatment of Choreographic Works in RDA]

423.1 The JSC received and considered the document and the responses of the JSC constituencies, including an ALA follow-up document representing the views of the New York Public Library. Gordon Dunsire said that the CILIP response should have been what was in the BL response.

423.2 Purpose of the document: to raise issues and solicit guidance from the JSC for the addition of instructions in RDA about choosing the preferred title and constructing authorized access points for choreographic works before LC revises its policy statement or prepares a formal proposal.

423.3 Kate James, on behalf of Dave Reser, explained that there are choreographic work examples in RDA but no instructions. She noted that CCC had withdrawn its 6JSC/CCC/6 proposal at the 2013 meeting because the issues raised were not unique to choreographic works; that proposal had incorporated parts of the Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging (LC-PCC) policy statement. She said that the LC-PCC policy statement was a carryover from the AACR2 LC rule interpretation, which had been formulated from recommendations from the Dance Heritage Coalition. LC had reviewed that policy statement and determined that it was not based on sound principles.

423.4 The JSC discussed the questions posed in 6JSC/LC rep/4.
-- agreed that a choreographic work was a "work" in the RDA sense but that clarification was needed about what constitutes such a work;
-- agreed that the choreographer would be considered the creator of the work;
-- noted that the general principles of choosing a preferred title should be followed with additional clarification for all non-describing resources, not just choreographic works;
-- noted that there are many possible relationships;
-- agreed that chapter 6 should include instructions for untitled works;
-- agreed not to consider a "superwork."

423.5 Kathy Glennan explained an analogy to opera with a pragmatic compromise about real-time collaboration or later collaboration. Alan Danskin noted the application to gymnastics as well.

423.6 Dave Reser asked about the CCC suggestion for a new content type. Gordon Dunsire said such a proposal should be sent to the new JSC RDA/ONIX Working Group.

423.7 Dave Reser raised the question of naming performances. Kathy Glennan said that differences can occur; she suggested looking at the music instructions for adaptations and arrangements.

423.8 LC will prepare a proposal for the 2014 JSC meeting.
ACTION=LC rep

424 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/2 [Illustrative content and other augmentations: Discussion Paper]

424.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

424.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to handle illustrations and other augmenting content at the work or manifestation level (not the work or expression level): moving 7.15 Illustrative content to chapter 3; moving information about illustrators and others responsible for augmentative content from chapter 20 to chapter 21.

424.3 Alan Danskin presented the discussion paper on behalf of EURIG and explained that it was based on the FRBR Review Group's Working Group on Aggregates' final report.

424.4 The JSC expressed concerns about making changes to RDA before the FRR Review Group had considered the incorporation of the working group's report into FRBR. Barbara Tillett and Judy Kuhagen, members of the working group, explained that the main part of the report represented the opinions of only some members of the group; the appendix to the report contains the opinions of the other members of the group (including Tillett and Kuhagen).

424.5 The JSC did not agree with making changes in RDA related to moving augmentations from expression level to manifestation level. The JSC noted that RDA allows the flexibility to catalog an augmentation separately or not or even to ignore certain content depending on the importance of that content to the library.

424.6 Gordon Dunsire asked how to record the absence of recording, saying that one solution would be a manifestation note to say what is not missing. Alan Danskin suggested as an unstructured relationship. Gordon said the question is a marker for considering extent of expression and extent of manifestation.

424.7 The JSC did not accept the discussion paper.

424.8 The JSC asked Alan Danskin to prepare a draft response JSC review for Barbara Tillett to send to EURIG.
ACTION=BL rep, JSC Chair

424.9 For the response to EURIG, see 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/2/JSC response on the JSC website.

424.10 Christine Frodl had asked the JSC if the email query from Heidrun Wiesenmüller (Stuttgart, Germany) to Barbara Tillett could be discussed at the meeting. The issue she raised: "The question of how to handle books with many pictures (e.g., a coffee table book). The main difficulty here is that 7.15 (Illustrative content) can, according to its definition, only be used if the illustrations are not the main part of the resource. Quite consistently, the former 'chiefly illustrations' or 'all illustrations' were abandoned." Kevin Marsh indicated that cataloguers in Australia had the same concern. Dave Reser encouraged using "still image" as content type and ignoring the restriction in 7.15. Kate James said that the problem is the carrier type. Gordon Dunsire said he would refer the topic to the JSC RDA/ONIX Working Group. Kate James also noted that the extent of still image instruction doesn't allow the recording of pages. Dave Reser also suggested that ALA use "artist's book" as a use case when considering extent of expression.
ACTION: Gordon Dunsire

425 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/3 [Compilations of Works: Discussion paper]

425.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

425.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: "identify with more precision the various compilations which users should be enabled to distinguish ... introduce the possibility of signaling the various works included in a compilation with more flexibility that is currently permitted by the RDA rules, by allowing institutions to define their policy in that matter so as to meet their users' needs;" also to associate the creator of an aggregating work with the work rather than the expression.

425.3 Alan Danskin presented the discussion paper on behalf of EURIG and explained that it was based on the FRBR Review Group's Working Group on Aggregates' final report.

425.4 The JSC again expressed concerns about making changes to RDA before the FRR Review Group had considered the incorporation of the working group's report into FRBR. (See Minute 424.4.)

425.5 Alan Danskin said that RDA already allows much of what EURIG wants. The JSC last year, in response to EURIG, said that extra elements should not be added at the end of authorized access points; such information can be recorded as separate attributes with a decision if the information is important enough or is needed at the end of an authorized access point to distinguish one access point from another.

425.6 The JSC agreed with EURIG that the situation in RDA of compilations by more than one person, family, or corporate body could be clarified. Dave Reser said that LC would prepare a proposal for the 2014 meeting following the suggestion for 6.2.11 in the CCC response to 6JSC/ACOC/5.
ACTION=LC rep

425.7 The JSC did not accept the discussion paper. The JSC will discuss the EURIG recommendations about compiler when discussing 6JSC/ACOC/7 (see Minute 444).

425.8 The JSC asked Alan Danskin to prepare a draft response JSC review for Barbara Tillett to send to EURIG.
ACTION=BL rep, JSC Chair

425.9 For the response to EURIG, see 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/3/JSC response on the JSC website.

426 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/4 [Representing date of works and expressions in RDA: Discussion Paper]

426.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

426.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to change 6.4 and 6.10 to represent different types of dates according to the type of content of the resource: create generic elements Chronological information for work and Chronological information for expression, with two element-subtypes for each, and each of element sub-types having two sub-elements.

426.3 Alan Danskin noted that RDA does allow latitude for what can be recorded. Some libraries, especially Bibliothèque nationale de France (BnF), want to make the dates actionable. He noted that many JSC responses said the recommendations are too complicated and included some suggestions to simplify.

426.4 Gordon Dunsire said the paper presents a wrong approach; CILIP suggests that the JSC look at event-based possibilities. When FRBR ER and FRBRoo are reconciled and if "event" is added to the FRBR ER model, then all else is relationships.

426.5 John Attig asked what is needed to make actionable, perhaps data about data? Gordon Dunsire said a simplistic approach would be to add Note on date of expression.

426.6 The JSC did not accept the discussion paper as presented but expressed appreciation for EURIG's work. The issues raised in the discussion paper will be forward to the JSC Technical Working Group. Dave Reser asked if a

vocabulary is needed for type of date. Alan Danskin repeated what had been in many of the JSC responses that there are so many different types of dates for different resources.

426.7 The JSC asked Alan Danskin to prepare a draft response JSC review for Barbara Tillett to send to EURIG.
ACTION=BL rep, JSC Chair

426.8 For the response to EURIG, see 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/4/JSC response on the JSC website.

427 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/5 [Representing language of expressions in RDA: Discussion Paper]

427.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

427.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to develop the ideas from 6JSC/EURIG/3 to address the following use cases: identify expressions in the language in which the work was originally expressed, select direct/indirect translations, and select expressions by language of captions, dubbing, etc.

427.3 Alan Danskin expressed EURIG's concern that although RDA does address various aspects of language, the results are not machine-actionable and that EURIG members have requirements which are dependent on machine actionability.

427.4 The JSC responses did not agree with EURIG that Language in which the work was originally expressed is an attribute of work rather than of expression. The JSC did not want to make such a change until the FRBR Review Group had made such a change to the model.

427.5 Gordon Dunsire expressed concern that adding information about first language could lead to requests to add first information for other elements (e.g., first content type).

427.6 The JSC was concerned about adding a "statement" to chapter 6 because aggregated statements in RDA apply to information transcribed from the resource. Alan Danskin said that the information is being captured in an unstructured way but cataloguers should be able to do so in a structured way. Barbara Tillett suggested that such statements should be prescribed instead in application profiles.

427.7 The JSC reiterated what it had said in response last year to 6JSC/EURIG/3 that the attributes suggested are really relationships; the JSC would welcome refinements of the "translation/translation of" relationship designators.

427.8 The JSC did not accept the discussion paper.

427.9 The JSC asked Alan Danskin to prepare a draft response JSC review for Barbara Tillett to send to EURIG.
ACTION=BL rep, JSC Chair

427.10 For the response to EURIG, see 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/5/JSC response on the JSC website.

428 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/ALA/23 [Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties]

428.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

428.2 Purpose of the proposal: to respond to the law cataloging community and change the instructions for the creation of the authorized access point for a treaty to base it on the preferred title.

428.3 Kathy Glennan used the LC response as the context for discussion of the JSC responses to the proposal. For the two issues raised at the beginning of the LC response, the JSC agreed (1) to remove Signatory to a treaty from ch. 6 and consider that role part of Other persons, families, or corporate bodies associated with legal works in ch. 19, and (2) to remove all wording referring to "agreement" from the instructions because the definition of "treaty" had been expanded to include agreements.

428.4 The JSC agreed to the recommendations in the LC response and to the CCC recommendation to delete "of preference" in the wording "in this order of preference" in 6.19.2.7.

428.5 Alan Danskin expressed concern about the different ways of recording a date in different RDA instructions. Christine Frodl asked that JSC consider establishing an RDA element Place of signing a treaty comparable to the element Place of origin of the work.

428.6 Kathy Glennan said she would prepare a revised proposal by December 15, 2013 for review by the JSC. The Secretary was asked to identify references to be corrected outside the instructions being revised in 6JSC/ALA/23.
ACTION=ALA rep, JSC Secretary

428.7 The JSC reviewed the revised proposal and approved it via email discussion during December 2013 and January 2014.

428.8 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/ALA/23/rev/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

429 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/DNB/1 [Parts of the Bible: Books (RDA 6.23.2.9.2)]

429.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

429.2 Purpose of the proposal: to revise the instruction bring it in line with RDA's claim of being designed for use in an international context. All cataloguing agencies, also those outside the English-speaking world, should be allowed to record titles for books of the Bible according to common usage in their preferred language. Therefore a more general instruction should be given.

429.3 Christine Frodl said that DNB liked the CCC rewording but would want not to include "a brief form" and was concerned that the wording about language would cause a problem for translations. Dave Reser said that LC thought it was important to keep wording such as "a brief citation form" because that concept was consistent with the RDA principle of using a commonly known title.

429.4 Dave Reser also raised the issue of how to revise the various Bible examples throughout RDA: remove them or add explanations? Because a specific version tells cataloguers which books are considered to be canonical in addition to giving the names of the books, Dave suggested putting a table of the books from various versions in RDA Toolkit. Judy Kuhagen suggested that the table could be posted on the Tools tab with a link from the instruction.

429.5 Barbara Tillett said the JSC would return to discussion of this proposal later in the meeting week. When the JSC returned to this proposal, Christine Frodl said she was withdrawing the proposal on behalf of DNB; she would prepare a policy statement for the DNB. She and Dave Reser will prepare a follow-up to the proposal for the 2014 JSC meeting to cover revision of the instruction and possibilities for posting information on RDA Toolkit's Tools tab.
ACTION=DNB rep, LC rep

430 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/LC/26 [Changes to instructions on liturgical works (6.30.1.5)]

430.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

430.2 Purpose of the proposal: to clarify which types of liturgical works are covered by the instruction and add missing references for liturgical works of the Orthodox Eastern Church and for Jewish liturgical works.

430.3 Dave Reser said that LC agreed with the ALA response about the captions and structure of the instructions; JSC agreed as well.

430.4 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/LC/26/Sec final on the JSC website.

431 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/ALA/24 [Variant title as access point (RDA 6.27.4.1, 6.28.4.1, 6.29.3.1, 6.30.5.1, 6.31.3.1)]

431.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

431.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add missing wording for constructing a variant access point using a variant title for the work on its own because there is wording in some instructions for creating a variant access point using the preferred title on its own.

431.3 The BL, CILIP, and LC responses indicated they thought there wasn't a need for this specific wording because there was already was wording to "construct additional variant access points if considered important for access." The JSC agreed not to accept the proposal.

431.4 John Attig said then that the wording about creating a variant access point using the preferred title on its own should be removed. The JSC agreed and also decided to move related examples to the end of each instruction. The Examples Group will submit information about moving examples and adding explanations as appropriate.
ACTION=Examples Group, JSC Secretary

431.5 After the meeting, the JSC decided, via email discussion, to retain wording about using the preferred title when constructing variant access points in the two instructions about parts of works (6.27.4.3, 6.30.5.2).

431.6 For the final version of the approved changes related to removing existing wording related to the preferred title and the changes to examples, see 6JSC/LC/26/Sec final on the JSC website.

432 Works and expressions: other than music: 6JSC/ALA/26 [Colour Content (RDA 7.17)]

432.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

432.2 Purpose of the proposal: to present two options for the replacement of current 7.17 to have a consistent set of terms for describing colour content in any context and to provide a single set of instructions for describing the colour content of resources.

432.3 John Attig, for Kathy Glennan, said that CCC did not support the proposal and that there was not agreement among the other JSC constituencies about which option in the proposal to follow for the revision of the instructions.

432.4 John Attig indicated that the CILIP response also proposed a different approach to distinguish monochrome from polychrome. On behalf of ALA, John withdrew the ALA proposal in deference to that different approach. Gordon Dunsire will prepare a proposal based on the CILIP response for the 2014 JSC meeting.
ACTION=Gordon Dunsire

433 Works: music: 6JSC/Music/1 [Proposed revision to instructions 6.2.2.9.2, "Two or More Parts," 6.14.2.7.2, "Two or More Parts," 6.27.2.3, "Two or More Parts," and 6.28.2.3, "Two or More Parts"]

433.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

433.2 Purpose of the proposal: to resolve inconsistencies and differences between various instructions for authorized access points for two or more parts of various categories of works.

433.3 Steve Yusko, chair of the RDA Music Joint Working Group, explained that the working group had received the charge from the JSC to prepare this proposal.

433.4 The JSC did not approve the changes to the 6.27.2.3 general instruction; the JSC had asked the working group to determine if the approach taken in 6JSC/CCC/7 for consecutively numbered parts of musical works could be applied in the general instructions. The JSC agreed with the LC response that there is a fundamental difference between the two types of parts of works and that the changes in 6JSC/CCC/7 for musical works were not appropriate for the general instructions.

433.5 The JSC approved the other changes and the example recommended by LC for 6.2.2.9.2.

433.6 After the meeting, the JSC agreed to make further wording changes in the approved instructions and added a change in 6.28.3.4.

433.7 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/Music/1/Sec final on the JSC website.

434 Works: music: 6JSC/Music/2/rev/2 [Proposed revision to instruction 6.14.2.5, "Preferred Title Consisting Solely of the Name of One Type of Composition"]

434.1 The JSC received and considered the second revised proposal (not sent by the working group until October 24, 2013) and the responses of the JSC constituencies to the first revised proposal.

434.2 Purpose of the proposal: to revise the instructions to be language-neutral.

434.3 Steve Yusko, chair of the RDA Joint Music Working Group, explained that the working group had prepared the second revised proposal to respond to the JSC responses to 6JSC/Music/2/rev.

434.4 The JSC generally accepted the second revised proposal but converted the a) and b) sections into sub-instructions. After the meeting, the JSC and the RDA Joint Music Working Group made further revisions, via email discussion, in the text and examples.

434.5 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/Music/2/rev/2/Sec final on the JSC website.

435 Works: music: 6JSC/Music/3 [Proposed revisions for medium of performance (RDA 6.15.1, 6.28.1.9, 6.28.1.10, and Appendix E.1.1)]

435.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

435.2 Purpose of the proposal: to revise the instructions for the element Medium of performance and for the inclusion of the element in authorized access points

435.3 Steve Yusko, chair of the RDA Joint Music Working Group, reviewed the comments in the responses for the proposed revisions.

435.4 The JSC agreed generally with the proposed revisions and incorporated some suggestions from ALA, CCC, and LC. For 6.15.1.5.2, the optional addition was changed to the base instruction with the former instruction becoming the option. Proposed 6.15.1.5.3 was split into two instructions. After Christine Frodl said that DNB would not want to apply all the exceptions in 6.28.1.9.1, the JSC agreed to add an alternative at the end of the instruction saying that individual exceptions could be applied according to the policy of the agency.

435.5 After the meeting, the JSC and the RDA Joint Music Working Group made further revisions, via email discussion, in the text and examples.

435.6 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/Music/3/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

436 Persons, families and corporate bodies: 6JSC/BL/13 [Revision of RDA 9.6]

436.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

436.2 Purpose of the proposal: to resolve the inconsistency between 9.6 and 9.19.1.7.

436.3 The JSC agreed to use the CCC wording for the core element statement at 9.6 and for a similar revision in 9.0.

436.4 The JSC agreed with LC that 0.6.4 and 8.3 also needed revision and approved the LC wording, modified by the CCC wording accepted for 9.6/9.0.

436.5 Dave Reser discussed the LC handout distributed at the meeting showing a recommended further revision of 9.19.1.1; the JSC agreed with that revision. The JSC also agreed with LC's breakdown of 9.19.1.2 into six sub-instructions and with the CCC version of the paragraph "When applying multiple other designations ..." in 9.19.1.2 itself. The reference in 9.19.1.7 would also be updated.

436.6 Dave Reser agreed, with a deadline of Nov. 30, 2013, to prepare an LC follow-up document to incorporate the 9.19.1.2 breakdown and other approved changes in the proposal.
ACTION=LC rep

436.7 After the meeting, the JSC approved, via email discussion, the follow-up version of the proposal.

436.8 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/BL/13/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

437 Persons, families, and corporate bodies: 6JSC/LC/23 [Language of the Family (10.8)]

437.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

437.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add the element Language of the family to be in alignment with the 2011 modification of FRAD.

437.3 The JSC agreed with the CCC recommendations for wording at 10.8.1.1 (also affecting 10.8.1.3) and 10.8.1.2 and the identification by ALA of additional references to be corrected.

437.4 After the meeting the JSC agreed, via email discussion, to update 9.14.1.2 to be consistent with wording in 10.8.1.2.

437.5 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/LC/23/Sec final on the JSC website.

438 Persons, families, and corporate bodies: 6JSC/BL/11 [Revision of RDA 11.4 and 11.13 and Glossary]

438.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

438.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add an element sub-type for Period of activity of the corporate body.

438.3 The JSC agreed with LC that 0.6.4 and 8.3 also needed revision and approved the LC wording.

438.4 The JSC approved the proposal including the LC recommendation to add instructions from 9.3.1.3 to 11.4.5 and the example explanation at 11.13.1.5.

438.5 After the meeting, the JSC approved, via email discussion, the revision of the wording in 9.3.1.1, 10.4.1.1, and 11.4.1.1 and related wording at 11.4.2.3.

438.6 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/BL/11/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

439 Persons, families, and corporate bodies: 6JSC/BL/12/rev [Revision of RDA 11.7 and 11.13]

439.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

439.2 Purpose of the proposal: to change the label at 11.7.1.4 and add three element sub-types.

439.3 The JSC agreed with LC that 0.6.4 and 8.3 also needed revision and approved the LC wording; the JSC also agreed with the LC revision of the core statement at 11.7.

439.4 The JSC approved the proposal with the following changes: CCC/DNB change at 11.7.1.4, CCC change at 11.7.1.5, LC change at 11.7.1.6, ACOC correction at 11.13.1.1, and ALA changes at E.1.2.4.

439.5 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/BL/12/rev/Sec final on the JSC website.

440 Persons, families, and corporate bodies: 6JSC/BL/14/rev [Revision of RDA 11.13.1.8.2]

440.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

440.2 Purpose of the proposal: to clarify when to add location of a conference to an authorized access point.

440.3 Kathy Glennan and Kevin Marsh withdrew the ALA and ACOC recommendations for 11.13.1.8.1. The JSC did not accept the CCC recommendation for 11.13.1.1.

440.4 The JSC approved the proposal with the LC recommendations for 11.13.1.1, 11.13.1.8.2, and 19.3.1.3.

440.5 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/BL/14/rev/Sec final on the JSC website.

441 Places: 6JSC/BL/10 [Revision of 9.8.1.3, 9.9.1.3, 9.10.1.3, 9.11.1.3, 10.5.1.3, 11.3.1.3, 11.13.1.3, 16.2.2.4, 16.2.2.9.2, B.1, B.11 to eliminate use of abbreviations for places]

441.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

441.2 Purpose of the proposal: to replace abbreviations used to contextualise place names associated with persons, families and corporate bodies and to remove the distinction at 16.2.2.4 between recording names of jurisdictions, contextualised by the name of the larger jurisdiction in parentheses, and names of other entities separated from the name of the associated place by comma space.

441.3 Alan Danskin said that the BL agrees with DNB that the names of larger places are relationships.

441.4 The JSC constituencies with the exception of LC agreed with BL to go ahead with the proposal or with parts of the proposal. Dave Reser explained that LC did not agree that now was the time to go ahead with the proposal and recommended that the JSC develop a comprehensive plan for looking at various issues connected to places.

441.5 Barbara Tillett said that the BL proposal raised good issues and will be helpful as the larger topic is considered in the future. Gordon Dunsire recommended that the JSC establish a working group on places; the JSC agreed. Alan Danskin said he would prepare a follow-up to the proposal, incorporating reworded text based on the JSC responses, for the use of the new working group.
ACTION=JSC Chair, BL rep, JSC Places Working Group

441.6 Kathy Glennan will consult with the ALA group studying places to ask about interest in the new JSC working group.
ACTION=ALA rep

441.7 For the follow-up to the proposal, see 6JSC/BL/10/BL follow-up on the JSC website.

442 Places: 6JSC/DNB/2 [Larger place – Revision of RDA 16.2.2.4 (Recording the Preferred Name); 16.2.2; 16.2.2.9.1; 16.2.2.9.2; 16.2.2.10; 16.2.2.10.1; 16.2.2.11; 16.2.2.11.1; 16.2.2.12; 16.2.2.13; 16.2.2.14]

442.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

442.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add alternatives not to include the larger place as part of the preferred name of a place and to record information about the relationship of the larger place as a separate element, perhaps as a code.

442.3 ACOC, ALA, CCC, and LC did not agree with going forward with the proposed changes for chapter 16 at this time. Concerns were expressed about the number of alternatives and the lack of the definition of a separate element for the larger place. It was hoped that the use of codes would be handled in a more general way in RDA rather than just in chapter 16. Dave Reser said he thought the chapter11/16 overlap should be considered as a larger topic.

442.4 Gordon Dunsire said the FRBR Review Group may be deprecating Group 3 and adding "place" as an entity. Barbara Tillett said that "time" and "event" should also be considered.

442.5 The JSC decided to add the suggested paragraph to 0.12 in LC's response.

442.6 The JSC will forward the DNB proposal to the JSC Places Working Group.
ACTION=Gordon Dunsire

443 Subject relationships: 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/2 [Treatment of Subjects in RDA] and 6JSC/Chair/8 [Proposals for Subject Relationships]

443.1 The JSC received and considered together the ALA discussion paper, the Chair proposal, and the responses of the JSC constituencies to the two documents.

443.2 Purpose of the documents:
6JSC/ALA/Discussion/2: to give the recommendations of the ALA Subject Analysis Committee Subcommittee on RDA on the 2011 discussion paper 6JSC/LC rep/3.
6JSC/Chair/8: to add instructions in the subject placeholder chapters and add instructions in other chapters to refer to the subject chapters.

443.3 The JSC decided it was premature to consider the detailed instructions in 6JSC/Chair/8.

443.4 Kathy Glennan asked Gordon Dunsire if there would be changes related to subject during the reconciliation work of the FRBR Review Group. He replied that it was likely that FRBR Group 3 would be deprecated. Kathy then asked if there were tasks the ALA subcommittee could be doing while the FRBR Review Group was working on the reconciliation. Alan Danskin said that there are some general things that could be done. John Attig suggested that perhaps chapter 23 from 6JSC/Chair/8 and a relationship designator could be implemented. Gordon said that JSC could add "has subject" for work with multiple relationships to work and to person, family, and corporate body.

443.5 Barbara Tillett asked Kathy Glennan if ALA wanted to prepare a proposal for adding a relationship designator; Kathy said ALA might consider a proposal. Otherwise, the JSC decided not to pursue the proposals until the FRBR Review Group reconciliation work had been completed; the JSC was concerned that other actions taken now might otherwise need to be reversed. **ACTION=ALA rep**

444 Other relationships: 6JSC/ACOC/7 [Compilers and editors of compilations – Amendments to RDA 20.2.1]

444.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

444.2 Purpose of the proposal: to clarify the instruction at 20.2.1.

444.3 The JSC agreed with the recommendation from ALA for the third paragraph of 20.2.1.

444.4 Alan Danskin asked why there was a separate relationship designator "editor of compilation," wondering if end users understand what it means or if it has any functional value. Dave Reser said that designator could be merged with "editor" if the definition of the latter was broadened.

444.5 The JSC did not agree with the recommendation in 6JSC/EURIG/Discussion/3 to add a relationship designator for "creator of compilation."

444.6 Later in the week, the JSC approved (1) the deletion of the relationship designator "editor of compilation;" and, (2) a revised definition for "editor" prepared by Gordon Dunsire.

444.7 For the final version of the approved changes, see 6JSC/ACOC/7/Sec final/rev on the JSC website.

445 Other relationships: 6JSC/ACOC/8 [Addition of the Copyright holder relationship – Amendments to RDA 21.6.1.1 and Appendix I]

445.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

445.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add the relationship of copyright holder to 21.6.1.1 and I.4.

445.3 The CCC and LC responses pointed out that the proposed relationship was outside the scope of RDA as stated in 0.3.3. All of the responses also asked if the relationship wasn't to the work and/or expression instead of or in addition to the manifestation.

445.4 Kevin Marsh, on behalf of ACOC, withdrew the proposal.

446 Other relationships: 6JSC/ALA/Discussion/3 [Instructions for Recording Relationships: Discussion Paper]

446.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

446.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to present recommendations about revisions to chapters 24-28 to add instructions about recording relationships. Two specific cases were addressed to illustrate possible instructions: structured descriptions for contents notes and for accompanying material.

446.3 Responses from the JSC noted that there are no current instructions for authorized access points for manifestations/items and disagreed with the statement that a structured description is a composite element.

446.4 John Attig, for Kathy Glennan, noted that the responses indicated that there wasn't a need to be exhaustive when addressing the possible relationship designators from appendix J. There were concerns about the possible growth of the instructions.

446.5 John Attig noted the LC suggestion to add wording to explain that structured descriptions are not really used to describe another work or expression but are used to describe a manifestation that embodies the related work or expression. The other JSC members agreed to consider that approach.

446.6 John Attig asked Gordon Dunsire for more information about the CILIP statements about application profiles and machine-actionable notes. Gordon said that the instructions could offer different approaches (e.g., machine-actionable information, free text); an application profile would tell the machine what data to use in what order.

446.7 The JSC agreed that the ALA task force should start over with the idea of writing instructions and then illustrating them with new or revised examples rather than trying to fix the status quo.
ACTION=ALA task force

447 Other relationships: 6JSC/ALA/25 [RDA Appendix K Revision and Expansion]

447.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

447.2 Purpose of the proposal: to replace the existing appendix K with an expanded version.

447.3 The JSC appreciated the work of the ALA task force. However, because responses expressed concerns about several "general" designators that actually encompassed other designators or were the same as an element, same/overlapping definitions, same terms with different reciprocals, more than one reciprocal, and presence of examples, the JSC did not approve the proposal.

447.4 The ALA task force will develop revised proposals, taking into account the concerns expressed by the JSC responses.
ACTION=ALA task force

448 Other relationships: 6JSC/CILIP rep/3 [RDF representation of RDA relationship designators: a follow-up discussion paper; and five appendices]

448.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the responses of the JSC constituencies. Appendices 1-4 contain methodologies and output data tables; appendix 5 has recommendations for Fast Track and other internal JSC processes.

448.2 Purpose of the discussion paper: to report on the actions taken on the recommendations of 6JSC/CILIP rep/2 discussed at the November 2012 JSC meeting and to present additional recommendations for discussion.

448.3 The JSC discussed and approved the six recommendations in the Element set issues section of the paper. Dave Reser, per the CCC suggestion, will check for definitions in FRBR to be added for high-level categories in appendix J. John Attig asked Gordon Dunsire if the verbal labels in appendix 4 would be added to RDA Toolkit; Gordon replied that they would be added sometime in the future.
ACTION=LC rep

448.4 Gordon Dunsire reviewed the other sections of the discussion paper. The recommendation (p. 13) related to "cataloguer-friendly" and "user-friendly" labels will be referred to the JSC Technical Working Group. The

recommendation (p. 15) about publishing an RDF representation of the alignment between RDA Toolkit Appendix I and MARC relators will be referred to ALA Publishing's RDA Toolkit Technical Group; also referred to that group are the issues related to the synchronization of RDA Toolkit and the RDA namespace. Kevin Marsh will contact LC's Network Development and MARC Standards Office about a liaison.
ACTION=ACOC rep, Gordon Dunsire

448.5 The JSC discussed the recommendations in appendix 5. [The instructions are numbered at the end of the appendix but are not presented in that order in the appendix itself; the notes below refer to the numbering used at the end of the appendix.]
-- #1 and #2: work has been completed;
-- #3: Judy Kuhagen will review what work is still needed;
-- #4: Judy will propose revisions to appendix J definitions;
-- #5: work has been completed except for a needed correction for "evaluated in (expression)"
-- #6: Judy will make the corrections;
-- #7: Gordon Dunsire will submit Fast Track entries for these corrections;
-- #8: work has been completed;
-- #9-#13: ALA will incorporate these actions in their future proposal for appendices J and K;
-- #14: no action will be taken now;
-- #15: Gordon will send a list to Judy for corrections;
-- #16: Judy will propose revisions.
ACTION: Gordon Dunsire, JSC Secretary, ALA rep

449 Vocabularies: 6JSC/Chair/9 [Element Set Discussion ("Notes on", "Details of", "Source Consulted", etc.)]

449.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper. No formal responses had been required from the JSC constituencies for the paper submitted October 20, 2013.

449.2 Purpose of the discussion paper prepared by Barbara Tillett and Deborah Fritz: to guide the discussion at the meeting about "data about data" and to note inconsistencies and missing elements in RDA.

449.3 Deborah Fritz and Troy Linker joined the discussion via the Internet.

449.4 In response to general question A in the paper (if the Details of instructions require elements in which to record the data) , the JSC said "yes." Gordon Dunsire said that a "Details of ..." instruction provides an alternative to using a vocabulary; Judy Kuhagen noted that sometimes the instruction allows for additional information. Gordon noted the discussion earlier in the week about three approaches (see Minute 446.6).

449.5 General question B asked if there should be consistency between "Notes on" instructions and "Details of" instructions; some JSC members felt there should be consistency and others were not sure. John Attig asked if Tom Delsey's distinction was important; he said that "Details of" instructions are about elements and "Notes on" instructions are about a sub-type or about information on a manifestation or item. Gordon Dunsire said that for non-core elements, some may not want to give a term from a value vocabulary but give details instead. Gordon asked if the JSC still agreed with the 0.12 restriction to use either an RDA internal vocabulary or another vocabulary; he noted that how to identify the external vocabulary was another metadata question.

449.6 The JSC referred the third question about the connection between these two types of instructions with the "authority" note type instructions (e.g., Source consulted) to the JSC Technical Working Group.

449.7 The JSC discussed the three possibilities in the paper for notes. Kevin Marsh and Gordon Dunsire said that they had a preference for the first possibility (how notes are grouped in ISBD). Gordon noted that the third possibility is not viable.

449.8 Gordon Dunsire said that the issues raised in the discussion paper would be forwarded to the JSC Technical Working Group. He noted that the authority data people would need to be consulted to ask if notes such as Scope of usage and Date of usage are metadata or meta-metadata.
ACTION=JSC Technical Working Group

450 Vocabularies: unresolved vocabulary issues

450.1 The JSC did not have time to discuss the unresolved vocabulary issues during the meeting. Judy Kuhagen will send information for email discussion after the meeting.
ACTION=JSC Secretary

451 Fast Track entries: unresolved entries

451.1 The JSC discussed the compilation of Fast Track unresolved entries sent to them before the meeting. They approved the following changes to appear in the February 2014 release of RDA Toolkit; the changes will be documented in 6JSC/Sec/11:
-- correct the references in 6.23.2.6 (final paragraph) and 6.23.2.12.2 (2nd paragraph)
-- add a new example in the 3rd example block of 3.5.1.4.3
-- add an entry for "organizer" to I.2.2
-- correct capitalization in 1st example in 2nd example block of 6.2.2.4
-- revise to make consistent the scope statements for parallel elements in chapter 2

-- revise the definitions for "leaf," "page," "portfolio," "sheet," and "volume (looseleaf)"
-- revise the Exception's last paragraph and its example in 6.14.2.3
-- add a new example box in 16.2.3.8
-- restore "paralleling" wording in 0.10.

451.2 The JSC noted that ACOC's Fast Track entry for an optional addition in 2.11.1.3 was being added to 6JSC/LC/25/rev/Sec final.

451.3 After the meeting, the JSC discussed and approved revised Fast Track entries. The following changes will appear in the February 2014 release of RDA Toolkit; the changes will be documented in 6JSC/Sec/11:
-- add an example in 1.7.3
-- revise 5th-6th paragraphs in 2.7.6.7
-- revise 3.13.1.1
-- revise wording and examples in A.10 and A.14
-- revise definition of "jacket"
-- revise definition of "jumbo braille".

451.4 LC will convert its Fast Track entry for 16.2.2.8 into a proposal for the 2014 JSC meeting.
ACTION=LC rep

451.5 ALA will consider further action related to Fast Track entries for 2.12.9.2, 2.12.17.1, 3.4.5.9, appendices I-K. Gordon Dunsire will consider the appendix J Fast Track entries as part of his work on that appendix.
ACTION=ALA rep, Gordon Dunsire

452 Other appendices: 6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1 and 2/JSC response/ISBDRG response [ISBD Review Group response to JSC Response to the two Discussion Papers from the ISBD Review Group; and Appendix D]

452.1 The JSC received and considered the ISBD Review Group response and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

452.2 Christine Frodl, the JSC representative to the ISBD Review Group, presented the Review Group's response and the revision of appendix D prepared by the Review Group. She also noted that the Review Group will be publishing the Alignment document that accompanied 6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1.

452.3 During the harmonization discussions between the Review Group and the JSC during the 2011 JSC meeting in Glasgow, the Review Group agreed to review RDA D.1. The Review Group noted in its response that the scope as described in RDA D.0 (mapping of RDA to ISBD) does not match what is in D.1 (mapping of ISBD to RDA). Alan Danskin volunteered to revise the text of D.0.
ACTION=BL rep

452.4 Gordon Dunsire said that the JSC could just point to the Alignment document or publish it itself. He recommended that a protocol be developed to maintain the synchronization in both directions; the JSC agreed. (For this protocol, see 6JSC/Chair/13 on the JSC website.) It would also be useful to be able in the future to point to a single document, rather than have the two groups maintain separate documents.

452.5 The JSC noted that the revision of appendix D was prepared using the RDA text prior to the July 2013 Update of RDA Toolkit (the latest version available to the Review Group when the revision was prepared); a few paragraphs were also missing, probably the result of a cut-and-paste omission. The revised appendix D.1 would need to be reviewed for any appropriate updating before replacing the content of D.1 in RDA Toolkit.

452.6 The JSC decided on the next steps:
-- update the revised appendix D.1
-- replace the existing D.1 with the revised D.1
-- review the published/posted ISBD alignment table and add wording to D.1 to refer to that mapping
-- prepare an RDA-to-ISBD mapping.

452.7 Gordon Dunsire said he would prepare the RDA-to-ISBD mapping because he had already done some of the necessary work. This task fits into the five-year review cycle of the ISBD.
ACTION=Gordon Dunsire

452.8 The JSC reviewed the comments about appendix D.1 in the Review Group response.
#1: They noted that the current structure of D.1 from ISBD to RDA was intended as a bridge for those people who know ISBD.
#2: They supported continued collaboration.
#3: They agreed that the goal is to point to a single document.
#4: They agreed to remove the content in D.1.3 and instead give a reference to Appendix A in the consolidated edition.
#5: They supported the future location of the D.1 information on the Tools tab of RDA Toolkit so it would be available without a subscription to the Toolkit.

452.9 The JSC asked Christine to prepare a draft response JSC review for Barbara Tillett to send to the Review Group.
ACTION: DNB rep, JSC Chair

452.10 For the response to the Review Group, see 6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/1 and 2/JSC response/ISBDRG response/JSC response on the JSC website.

452.11 [Although the JSC response indicates that the revised D.1 would be included in the April 2014 Update of RDA Toolkit, the JSC decided after the meeting to include it in a later release of the Toolkit in 2014.]

453 Other appendices: 6JSC/CCC/12 [Revision of Appendix D regarding capitalization practice]

453.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

453.2 Purpose of the proposal: to add an instruction about capitalization to D.1.2 and to raise concerns about appendix A.

453.3 Although only ALA did not support the proposal in the written responses, discussion around the table by other JSC representatives agreed with the ALA concern about adding capitalization information in appendix D rather than in appendix A. The JSC also agreed that appendix A should be reviewed and restructured to avoid the English-language bias.

453.4 Bill Leonard, on behalf of CCC, withdrew the proposal.

454 Other appendices: 6JSC/ALA/22 [Revision of A.29, Capitalization of Hyphenated Compounds; changes in Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition (2010)]

454.1 The JSC received and considered the proposal and the responses of the JSC constituencies.

454.2 Purpose of the proposal: to change A.29, and examples in various instructions, to be consistent with *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition's instruction for hyphenated compounds. The proposal acknowledges that the scope in *The Chicago Manual of Style* instruction is not the same as the scope of A.29.

454.3 The BL, CILIP, and LC responses did not support the proposal. John Attig, on behalf of ALA, withdrew the proposal.

454.4 The JSC did agree with the LC recommendation in its response to make two changes in capitalization: the caption for the 5th group of examples in 11.2.3.7 and the glossary entry for "Tonic-Sol-fa." For the final version of these two corrections, see 6JSC/Sec/12 /rev on the JSC website.

455 Other appendices: 6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/3 [ISBD Profile in RDA: Constructing Functionally Interoperable Core Records; and Profile]

455.1 The JSC received and considered the discussion paper and the accompanying profile. Formal responses from JSC constituencies were not required because the documents were submitted after the deadline for the meeting.

455.2 Christine Frodl, the JSC representative to the ISBD Review Group, presented the discussion paper and accompanying profile prepared by the Review Group.

455.3 The JSC acknowledged the work involved in the profile but noted that the document is out of date because its content precedes the July 2013 Update of RDA Toolkit. The JSC would not be able to make comments about any suggested changes by the November 30 deadline.

455.4 The JSC asked Christine Frodl to prepare a draft response, including suggestions about pointing to the May 2013 release of RDA Toolkit, for Barbara Tillett to send to the Review Group before the November 30 deadline.
ACTION: DNB rep, JSC Chair

455.5 For the response to the Review Group, see 6JSC/ISBD/Discussion/3/JSC response on the JSC website.

456 Other business

456.1 The JSC returned to some of the proposals (listed below) discussed earlier in the week to consider informal follow-up work prepared during the week. [The content of the follow-up work has been incorporated in the minutes at the earlier agenda item for each proposal.]
-- 6JSC/CCC/11: approved the revised approach suggested by Kathy Glennan and Bill Leonard
-- 6JSC/LC/25: approved the revision to incorporate the earlier ACOC Fast Track entry
-- 6JSC/ALA rep/6: approved the revised definitions
-- 6JSC/Music/2/rev/2: approved the revision with examples corrections to be sent by Kate James to Judy Kuhagen
-- 6JSC/BL/11: approved the LC revision
-- 6JSC/ACOC/7: approved the appendix I revision by Gordon Dunsire.

456.2 Christine Frodl said she was withdrawing 6JSC/DNB/1. [For further information, see Minute 429.]

457 Outcomes from November 2013 meeting

457.1 The JSC discussed topics to be included in the public announcement of the outcomes of this meeting. Judy Kuhagen will prepare a draft of a general announcement by November 25 for JSC comment so that it can be posted on the JSC website by early December.
ACTION=JSC Secretary

457.2 [In late November, Alan Danskin offered to expand the draft to include more information. The revised general announcement with a picture of the JSC was reviewed by the JSC and then posted on the public website December 11. The

posting of the table of documents, annotated with information about JSC action, was delayed until January 28, 2014, after final JSC approval in late January of revised proposals.]

457.3 At the end of the public session, the position of Chair of the JSC transferred from Barbara Tillett to Gordon Dunsire. Alan Danskin, on behalf of the JSC, thanked Barbara for her many years of service to the JSC and presented her with a gift from the JSC.

Executive Session 2:

458 Working groups

459 Mappings

460 JSC meeting minutes

461 BIBFRAME

Appendix 1: ALA Publishing's report

Appendix 2: Actions arising out of the November 2013 JSC meeting

End of Executive Session 2