To: Renate Behrens, Chair, RDA Steering Committee

From: Anne Welsh, RSC Secretary

Subject: Proposal to revise Guidance: Aggregates and Guidance: Diachronic

Works following from RSC/TechnicalWG/2024/2/rev/Decisions

This document collates in tabular form the responses received from voting members of the RSC to RSC/EOO/2025/1, viz.:

- RSC/EOO/2025/1/EURIG
- RSC/EOO/2025/1/ExamplesEditor
- RSC/EOO/2025/1/NARDAC
- RSC/EOO/2025/1/ORDAC
- RSC/EOO/2025/1/TranslationsTLO
- RSC/EOO/2025/1/WCEO

er of
L
er of

Note 1: Although the Latin America and the Caribbean Representative is attending the July Meeting, and is a voting member, the Latin America and the Caribbean RDA Group (RDA ALyC) itself was not established in time to discuss RSC/EOO/2025/1 and submit a formal response. Therefore, the total number of respondents in the summary document is 6 but the total number of voting members of the RSC recorded in the minutes at the end of full discussion will be 7.

Note 2: EURIG queries the use of "metadata description set":

"The use of "metadata description set" to refer both to the entirety of what a metadata description set can encompass and the specifics of a metadata description set describing aggregates is likely to confuse catalogers. When the intention is to the description of aggregates the term should explicitly say so."

The RSC Secretary requests that voting member of the RSC be clear on whether they want her to implement the wording proposed by the EOO or change the terminology, and, if the latter, where they would wish her to amend it.

Note 3: EURIG's concerns in **Note 2** may or may not be allayed by the suggestion made by <u>NARDAC</u>:

"We suggest that there may be some benefit to using an expanded form throughout this revision, "well-formed metadata description set <u>of an aggregate</u>" as more in keeping with common usage of "description" throughout the Toolkit.