

CILIP/BL COMMITTEE ON AACR

Minutes of the 11th meeting held at the British Library, St Pancras on Monday 30th January 2006.

Approved

Present:

CILIP representatives:	James Caudwell Ann Chapman Gordon Dunsire Stuart Hunt Anne Mellor Neil Nicholson Hugh Taylor	(CILIP JSC rep)
BL representatives:	Sally Strutt Robina Clayphan Lucy Evans Heather Rosie	(Chair/ BL JSC rep)
By invitation:	Sue Brown	
Secretary:	Katharine Gryspeerdt	(BL)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from John Bowman.

2. Minutes of the 10th meeting, 17th August 2005

The draft minutes were approved. [Final version (v1.0) sent out 1 February 2006.]

3. Preliminary matters

3.1 SS welcomed Sue Brown to the meeting. Sue was invited following discussions about communications issues at the previous Committee meeting.

3.2 Restructuring within British Library
SS explained that the restructuring underway in the Collection Acquisition and Description Department of the BL will affect the BL representation on the CILIP/BL Committee and that at present it is uncertain precisely how this representation will continue. The role of CILIP/BL Chair will become vacant, as SS has decided to leave the British Library, and SS suggested this be taken up by a CILIP representative. In the new CA&D structure LE is not expecting to be involved with CILIP/BL; however HR, RC and KG will continue with the

Committee; the BL will continue to provide the Secretary and to host meetings. A new BL rep to the JSC will be appointed and will need to join CILIP/BL if not already a member.

AM expressed regret over SS's imminent departure from the Committee and the BL.

3.3 **Committee representation**

GD asked if the BL's role within CILIP/BL includes representing other national libraries, NLS and NLW.

SB replied that it does not. The Constitution does not cover this.

GD added that NLS is heavily involved in discussing metadata standards and suggested that the Committee should review its representation in the light of RDA and developments in national libraries.

- 3.4 GD informed the Committee that he has been invited to participate in the Cultural Technology Group (Scottish Executive/CISAG), a group set up for libraries, archives and museums and looking at standards.

4. **Matters arising**

4.1 **Report on JSC meeting, April 2005** (mtg9, 6.6.05, item 4; mtg10, 17.8.05, item 3.2) – Communities in information work

At earlier meetings it had been suggested that any CILIP/BL member with contacts in relevant information communities outside of the mainstream RDA project should forward contact details to the Secretary, in order to engage these communities in the development of RDA. SS reported that no such contact details had been forwarded as yet, but were still welcome.

HT added that he has forwarded information on the RDA Part 1 draft to the specialists he had previously contacted with earlier JSC documents (AACR3 Part 1, draft – see mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.1).

- 4.2 **Examples Group** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 3.10) – NN reported that he has sent details of cataloguing issues concerning examples to JB.

- 4.3 **Authority control survey** (mtg9, 6.6.05, item 7.2; mtg10, 17.8.05, item 3.12) – LE updated the Committee on work so far. A survey of Amicus users showed that no user is doing 'pure' authority control. LE added that she has visited the Bodleian Library for discussions on authority control.

4.4 **JSC documents for discussion** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.1)

JC was actioned to liaise with ARLIS regarding specialist documents. JC was not present at the meeting at the time so a report of this action is to be carried forward to the next meeting.

Actions

(Carried forward from previous meeting) JC to liaise with ARLIS regarding specialist documents.

- 4.5 **Prospectus (5JSC/RDA/Prospectus)** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.6) – actions achieved. The revised Prospectus was issued via JSC documents site on 7

December 2005 – this revision included only minor changes to the original document.

- 4.6 Chapter 21 special rules – simplification (5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up)** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.8) – actions achieved. CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 27 August and 26 September 2005 respectively.
- 4.7 Archival and manuscript resources (5JSC/LC/3)** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.10) – actions achieved. CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 26 August and 19 September 2005 respectively.
- 4.8 Levels of description, levels of access, levels of authority control (5JSC/ACOC rep/1)** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.11) – actions achieved. CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 30 August and 3 October 2005 respectively.
- 4.9 Musical format information (5JSC/LC/4)** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.12) – actions achieved. CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 30 August and 19 September 2005 respectively.
- 4.10 CILIP/BL website** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 5) – see minutes this meeting, item 10. SB confirmed that the requirements for an annual report from CILIP/BL has been superseded by the availability of information via websites.
- 4.11 Ariadne article** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 6.1) – action achieved. The news article for *Ariadne* was drafted by the Secretary and the Chair and submitted for publication in October. The article was based on RDA rather than the CILIP/BL website. This was a change from the original action as the website address has yet to be agreed between the BL and CILIP and so has not been formally launched - see these minutes, item 10.
- 4.12 Conference in Zagreb, 17 November 2005** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 6.3) GD volunteered to attend this conference – see minutes this meeting, item 9.1. GD has also agreed to attend the German Libraries Annual Conference in March 2006.
- 4.13 JSC meeting, October 2005** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 6.4) – actions achieved.
- 4.14 Project Manager, RDA** (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 6.5) – SS reported that Marjorie Bloss has been appointed to the position of Project Manager.
- 5. Report of JSC meeting, October 2005**
SS informed the Committee that the JSC meeting in October was a lengthy one and not all items on the published agenda were covered. Immediately after the meeting there was a flurry of further activity. She referred to the ‘Outcomes ...’ document on the JSC website.

HT added that the whole process of RDA is very complex with a huge quantity of decisions involved, a number of which were made at the JSC meeting. He also referred to the JSC Policy document (5JSC/Policy/4/Rev).

There then followed some discussion on the procedure for commenting on RDA.

- HR asked how JSC is proposing to consider the comments on the draft documents. SS replied that there needs to be a point when the draft is finalised and further comments will not be 'considered' for that particular version of the Part. She added that constituencies have a review period and there is an RDA list as a discussion forum. JSC is intending to pick up themes from this discussion list. HT agreed with the JSC use of the RDA discussion list and said that comments tended to fall into one of 3 categories:

- concerns raised by a number of people e.g. inaccuracies. These issues would form part of the constituencies' responses.
- queries relating to minute details. It was not the intention to incorporate these in the constituencies' responses.
- comments relating to examples. These would be referred to the Examples Group.

- AM asked if any library schools are looking at RDA and whether positive feedback is being sought from this user group. SS replied that it is the intention to involve this group and added that the RDA Project Manager has offered to take RDA to such students for their assessment of the document's ease of use and comprehensiveness, as when Marjorie is herself an educator in librarianship.

- It is also important to seek the views of non-librarians. (RC)

- Communities need RDA although they may not know it! (GD) Many Dublin Core communities are reinventing RDA. He added that he is pleased with the attention paid to collection level description in RDA. There are still developments in this area that he might be involved in and he would consequently like an electronic draft version to facilitate this work. He highlighted a project in Scotland on repository research level material in universities – this community will need a standard and want to use the draft RDA to see how it works. GD added there are more risks involved in not applying RDA than in using it.

- GD suggested that drafts of RDA should be reviewed with particular communities in mind. RC supported this and said that the Dublin Core community are finding it quite difficult to review the Part 1 draft; the approach they have adopted is to create a functional requirements document detailing what the DC community need from RDA and then to look at a framework for how it would apply. This is a technique that could be used with other communities, to engage them in considering use of RDA.

6. RDA and demonstration of Web prototype version

It was noted (HT) that the actual publication of RDA is not a responsibility of JSC, that aspect is dealt with by the co-publishers (ALA, CLA and CILIP)

The functional requirements of the Web version are being looked at by a group including the RDA Project Manager, RDA Editor and ALA. The demonstration of the Web

prototype version was given to Focus Groups at ALA Midwinter earlier in January. The prototype does not have the application developed but does show functionality and general use.

SS and HT then gave a demonstration of the prototype to the Committee.

There is a choice of 3 versions – full, concise, customized. There are also 3 interfaces to choose from – search/browse, SmartSheet, Step-by-Step. The demonstration version shows a few drop-downs and hypertext links. It also shows mouse-overs.

The publishers are considering licensing the software so that users can customise worksheets for their own use e.g. working with Aleph.

A discussion on the prototype followed.

- RC queried the linking from external applications. Users should be able to link into URL, getting text directly.

- It is important to put key issues about the web version in writing so that these issues are not lost in the complexity of RDA developments (GD).

- It would be preferable to see the rule first in the Web display rather than the worksheet template (SH). However GD argued that an experienced user would not want this.

- In the Step-by-Step interface the rule numbers should be removed as the text is hyperlinked (RC). Adding rule numbers just duplicates information. This sort of amendment to the screen display can be done technically and quite easily (GD). Users could customise to suit community practices e.g. cataloguer and managerial levels. The prototype should be seen as an illustration of what might be possible and 2 options are desirable, RDA and local RDA.

- Several Committee members (HT, SH, RC) wanted to know what output would or could be produced from the Step-by-Step interface. Would it be capable of exporting a MARC record, or XML, and/or Dublin Core?

- SH was concerned that additional work would be created with the web interface version and result in less productivity.

- GD said he would expect 4/5 levels ranging from the general RDA, to national, to traditional community (museum/archive...), to institutional/ project level.

- An amount of knowledge of RDA would be needed before a user can use the online version (HR).

- Illustrated examples should be included (JC) e.g. title page facsimiles. SS said it is the intention to include these. The meeting again agreed the need for such examples to be part of RDA.

- Should the SmartSheet be a responsibility for JSC? (SH). Perhaps the SmartSheet could be a separate product, 'my-RDA' product (GD). The SmartSheet is a very good training tool (LE).

- Browse tracking should be supplied (GD). He also said publishers need to consider community databanks (wikis) to allow communities to participate and ensure that when RDA is published in 2 years the architecture is present to sustain these.

- There is a need to resolve the conflict in the accessibility of the end product (GD). Users will expect to get a certain amount free. Obtaining a rule reference via the web interface should be free but beyond this there should be a subscription to use the interface to its full potential and this should be on a cost recovery basis. SH cited Dewey where there is a similar set up – certain levels of the Dewey hierarchy are available free.

7. **Communications issues**

SS summarised the background to this item and the invitation issued to Sue Brown.

SB then described various links with CILIP and other organisations. CILIP has delegated its responsibility on cataloguing issues to the Cataloguing & Indexing Group (CIG). At the CIG Annual Conferences updates on major standards are presented by CILIP/BL and other organisations – the next conference will be in Norwich in September 2006 and would tie in with the JSC October meeting.

SB suggested re-running an open meeting with the help of CIG's membership of 2000 people – previous open meetings have resulted in about 50 attendees. CILIP could fund and host such a meeting.

SB then described the other more formal approaches. ARLIS, IAML(UK &Irl) and BIALL are 3 independent organisations which will have within their communities some enthusiasm for RDA. These organisations should be approached and invited to identify individuals and an informal meeting could then be set up, hosted by CILIP. It would be necessary to 'probe' the organisations for relevant names.

BRITMICS is another organisation to approach formally. It reports into CILIP.

Previously SB has not identified anyone in BRITMICS to participate in these issues.

Instead she recommended involving the BL Map Library (April Carlucci).

For serials there is UKSG. There is a UKSG conference in April but it was understood that this is fully subscribed (SH) so it would not be possible to attend and seek responses on RDA from this serials community. Will need to target this group by letter.

Follow-ups are essential by letter and phone. SB said this would be time-consuming.

SB continued on the possibility of published news articles – *Aslib Managing Information*, *Update* and *Gazette*. Readership varies and needs to be considered.

The national libraries could be mailed. For greater impact this is better done via CILIP rather than the national executive committees.

She added that health information organisations also need to be considered. There is a robust health libraries group within CILIP. Also archivists, including records management, should be involved – the group is active internationally in education.

SB referred to the CILIP website for contacts of organisations.

Actions

Sue Brown agreed to follow up some of the contacts she mentioned in her summary above.

There then followed some discussion about the communication of the development of RDA to the information community.

- SB emphasised the importance of communication to promote PR and expert discussion rather than to invite further detailed comments. A problem with RDA is that it is being 'sold' before it is finished. An implementation and PR strategy is needed from JSC and CoP. It is necessary to let people know that RDA is happening and this should be communicated both formally and informally.
GD added there is no funding for this communication.

- There should be more asking rather than telling (RC). It should be recognised that communities can contribute to the development.

- Reference (SH) was made to the work with publishers, citing RDA and ONIX.

- Are the people interested in the content of RDA the same people interested in the RDA product? (HT). GD argued that the most important people are the managers, strategists and decision makers and these would be interested in the product. It is essential to target this group with a proper implementation strategy. He said we should be less concerned with the strategy for targeting the users of the content.

- GD reported that he will be talking about RDA to cataloguers at NLS in the next couple of months, coinciding with restructuring of the cataloguing department there. There is also a joint NLW/NLS conference 16-19 May (Celtic Connections in Wales) and GD said this will be another opportunity to talk to national library representatives about RDA.

He added that NLS had approached CDLR to run a workshop in Spain in September at a European Conference on Digital Libraries. He will use this as an opportunity to promote RDA.

GD will also be attending IFLA and as he will not be presenting a paper he will be free to promote RDA among the delegates.

- The Irish library community is also important – Trinity College Dublin, University of Ulster (SB).

- Will the BL will be adopting RDA? (GD). SS confirmed it would be. HR added that as we take many of our records from LC, and follow LC, the BL's position on RDA is to a large extent dependant on LC's stance on RDA.

-Where/what is the coordinating body for adopting RDA in the UK? (GD).

- Will a document be available showing the differences between RDA and AACR2? (RC). HR replied that no such document is planned as yet. However, a kind of "Where's that rule" document has been mooted as a potential by-product.

- RDA will result in more efficient cataloguing departments. RDA is consistent. (GD)

- The positive arguments of RDA should be presented in a published article. Benefits should be highlighted. Otherwise RDA may look heavy going and hard to sell. (RC)

8. JSC Documents for discussion

HT began by summarising the timetable – comments on the documents are due to be submitted to JSC by 27 March 2006. New proposals arising from the draft of Part 1 are to be submitted to JSC by 13 February. Also some papers, for which comments are due in time for the April meeting, are not due to be issued to the constituencies until 13 February.

8.1 Draft of Part 1 (5JSC/RDA/Part 1)

GD opened the discussion enthusiastically. He was very positive about the draft – RDA is flexible while also allowing for consistency. His one criticism was the continued use of square brackets, which is not necessary, is ambiguous, and detracts from the cleanliness of the code. [] should be an element for MARC coding. He recommended square brackets be removed from RDA – AM agreed.

The meeting noted John Bowman's general comments which concerned examples, circulated before the meeting. JB also gave his views on the comments from Helen Buhler and Peter Walker sent to the CILIP/BL Secretary prior to the meeting.

Rule 2.9.5.3 – JC considered this rule to be ambiguous.

Rule 2.12.1.1. – needs clarification (GD)

Rule 4.9.0.1 – definitions need to be tightened up (GD)

6.0 – FRBR terminology – what is an item? Make this very clear. (GD)

D1.3.2 – numbering problem, and “In analytic” problem. (GD)

Editors for serials – JC recommended that this is dropped.

Rule 2.3.5 Earlier/later title – the presentation of this rule was difficult to comprehend (JC).

Rule 2.6.5 – the information is complicated; put on separate lines (JC). GD argued the case for the information being on separate lines as this is needed for computer manipulation/searching.

Reference was made to comprehensive vs. analytical description and HR commented that in a few areas the code could be better. She cited rule 2.5.0.5 – presumably this relates to comprehensive description? Also Rule 2.10 – presumably this is to be used only if doing an analytical description? HR said the user needs to be certain that the information they started off with will lead to the right result. A fail-safe is needed.

LE said her comments related mainly to the demo version – see item 6 above. However she referred to comments being put on the RDA list. She highlighted the issue over the suggestion that the statement of responsibility can be dropped – there is concern that this could result in loss of useful information e.g. illustrator.

H Buhler submitted comments to CILIP/BL Secretary along these lines as well. GD said it should be made clear that application of such options could result in poorer records.

HT said the distinction between the meaning of 'optionally' should be made clear – either more detail than present; or alternative information. GD added that a user might break the relationship between description and access by following the 'optionally' information and this should be explained.

The Editor needs to pick up references in Part 1 at a later date. (GD)

AM expressed concern about Rule 2.3.0.5 Introductory words, etc.

The meeting also noted the comments from Walker and Buhler which would be considered in the formal responses to JSC.

Actions

All to send more detailed comments to HT, SS and the rest of the Committee so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 20 March.

8.2 Draft of Part 1, Chapter 3, Technical description (5JSC/RDA/Part 1/Chapter 3)

SS said this should be reviewed alongside the report on content and carrier terms (5JSC/Chair/6/Chair follow-up). She also reported that JSC has reached agreement with CoP for the funding of a joint project with ONIX. This will be a 3 month project reporting in April 2006 for discussion at the JSC April meeting. The project aims to develop a framework for material identifiers which will be adopted in both RDA and ONIX. Tom Delsey and Godfrey Rust (from Rightscom) will be in the project team along with 2 others; GD has agreed to act as 'rapporteur/facilitator'.

GD commented on 3.6.3.5 Manuscripts. Digital material needs to be included.

8.3 RDA – Objectives and principles (5JSC/RDA/Objectives and principles)

[Secretary's apologies – there was an error in program summary sent to CILIP/BL Committee members before the meeting – this item has been put on the public JSC website for individual comments; JSC constituencies are not requested to comment]

8.4 JSC Policy and procedures statement (5JSC/Policy/4/Rev)

No comment was raised at the meeting.

9. Conference/ workshop reports

9.1 Oslo workshop

SH reported on the workshop. He gave a 90 minutes talk to some 150 delegates, all but 3 of whom were Norwegian cataloguers. Their cataloguing standard is based on AACR and there was a great deal of interest in RDA. A common question was 'why the main entry has not been removed'. SS requested a brief written report from SH about the workshop for JSC purposes.

Actions

SH to produce short summary on workshop.

9.2 Zagreb conference

GD attended the conference in November 2005. In his presentation at the conference GD omitted the controversy over Part 1, AACR3. He commented that he was a little uncertain about what to do with the non-constituency comments. He found views tended to be age-related with positive responses coming from the younger cataloguing managers. Delegates are finding it increasingly expensive to develop their own national cataloguing rules to changing standards. GD said he would put his presentation plus extra notes on the CILIP/BL website. His presentation is also published in the conference proceedings.

Actions

GD to put conference presentation on the CILIP/BL website.

10. CILIP/BL website

GD reported that a link has been set up between the CILIP/BL site and the BL site. He added that the person responsible for the BL web pages has copied pages from the CILIP/BL site - this could create problems since GD would update the CILIP/BL page but the BL version would then be incorrect as it would not be updated automatically and this needs to be addressed by the BL. There is also an issue with the URL and as soon as this is resolved GD will launch the website. GD reported that he is continuing to act as ad-hoc editor for the CILIP/BL website.

Actions

SS to advise GD on BL response to website issues.

11. Date of next meeting

To be advised.

The meeting closed at 16.25.