

CILIP/BL COMMITTEE ON AACR

Minutes of the 12th meeting held at the British Library, St Pancras on Wednesday 9 August 2006.

Approved

Present:

CILIP representatives:	John Bowman James Caudwell Ann Chapman (Chair) Gordon Dunsire Stuart Hunt Anne Mellor Hugh Taylor	(CILIP JSC rep)
BL representatives:	Alan Danskin Heather Rosie	(BL JSC rep)
Secretary:	Katharine Gryspeerdt	(BL)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from Robina Clayphan and Neil Nicholson.

2. Minutes of the 11th meeting, 30 January 2006

The draft minutes were approved, subject to a few minor corrections requested by GD.
[Final version (v1.0) issued 9 August 2006 to the Committee and posted on the CILIP/BL website.]

3. Preliminary matters

It was noted that a number of JSC documents had been issued on 8 August and that the Committee had not had sufficient time to review them. It was decided it would be more appropriate to discuss these documents and formulate responses via e-mail in the following few weeks after the meeting.

4. Matters arising

4.1 Committee representation (mtg11, 30.1.06, item 3.3) Discussed under the review of the CILIP/BL Constitution – see item 7.

4.2 JSC documents for discussion (mtg10, 17.8.05, item 4.1)

JC was actioned to liaise with ARLIS regarding specialist documents. JC reported that the ARLIS Committee had not met yet. He has forwarded the documents and will feed comments into the review timetable.

Actions

(Carried forward from meeting of 17 August 2005) JC to liaise with ARLIS regarding specialist documents.

- 4.3** **Ariadne article** (mtg11, 30.1.06, item 4.11; mtg 10, 17.8.05, item 4.6)
AC reported that the news article had been published. She added that the Editor of *Ariadne* was still keen to publish a feature article on RDA – article author to be arranged.
- 4.4** **German Libraries Annual Conference** (mtg 11, 30.1.06, item 4.12)
GD reported that he had attended the conference in March 2006 and he has received details of the German Libraries Annual Conference in 2007. He added that he has been asked to repeat his paper at the Austrian Libraries Conference in September and has also been asked to join the Outreach Group.
- 4.5** **Report of JSC meeting, October 2005 – communications with library schools** (mtg 11, 30.1.06, item 5) GD reported that he had attended a meeting at Robert Gordon University where he gave an informal talk about RDA. He has been invited to return to the University to give a talk in November.
- 4.6** **Conference /workshop reports** (mtg 11, 30.1.06, item 9) – actions achieved.
Reports of the Oslo workshop and Zagreb conference have been made available on the CILIP/BL website.
- 4.7** **CILIP/BL website** (mtg 11, 30.1.06, item 10) GD reported that there had been no further communication regarding the CILIP/BL website URL issue. It was therefore recommended that this matter be regarded as closed.
- 5. Report of JSC meeting, April 2006**

HT referred the Committee to the report of the April meeting on the JSC website. The report is also available on the JSC public website and abbreviated versions have also been distributed to other organisations.

The main points of the report – change in overall structure of RDA; organisation of RDA; notes; mandatory elements; numbering of instructions; RDA and ONIX; RDA and MARC21.

GD added that he did not entirely agree with the reference in the report (section - overall structure of RDA) that the distinction between ‘descriptive’ and ‘access’ elements is unnecessary. He added that he would like to be able to use chapters 6 and 7 separately. However he did agree with the merging of the Parts proposed in the document.

6. JSC Documents for discussion

CILIP/BL Committee on AACR, Meeting 12, 9 August 2006: Minutes

6.1 Draft of Part A, chapters 6-7 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7)

The comments received to date on the draft of the chapters were circulated prior to the meeting.

A discussion of the draft followed.

- JB and others felt that the order of the chapters should be reversed – the chapter dealing with access points should come before the chapter on related resources, not after. There was some confusion concerning what this draft is about.

- JB questioned how names should be cited in chapter 7. The examples were presented using specific forms of name, which seemed illogical as this came before the chapter that deals with establishing those forms. Using specific forms would also endue with them an authority that they did not possess. He considered this to be a wider issue for JSC not just for the Examples Group.

- GD said there is confusion and lack of clarity regarding the FRBR terms in Chapter 6 for instance work/expression, item/manifestation. Some rules are obviously to do with manifestation yet this is not presented clearly in the text. Relationships are not clearly explained.

He added that a UK working group developing a Dublin Core application profile for e-prints and other resources created by research and scholarly communication has recently decided to base it on FRBR, resulting in a hierarchical data schema. RDA would be an important content standard for this and related initiatives when it is published.

RDA needs to be more clearly focussed on FRBR. Need relevant complete references to FRBR.

- AD referred to the problems in chapter 6 with the definition of the term 'citation'. There is also a proliferation of citations which is confusing. It is necessary to know how the term 'citation' is being used. GD agreed adding that a broad set of examples is needed to illustrate citations. HT said the term 'citation' is a problematical term anyway to be used by RDA because of its conflicting meanings. JB recommended the word 'citation' is not used.

The discussion then continued in more general terms about the status of RDA.

- HR commented that the document is some way from becoming a working practical tool and found it difficult to make further comments. She referred to the comment received and circulated from DDB (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Chair follow-up/1). An organisation is needed to make a final say and state how it is going to be applying the rules and suggests that the organisation will be LC. HR expressed concern about the proximity of the 2008 publication date and suggested it could be as late as 2010 before the rules are adopted.

JB added that changes should be frozen following the publication in 2008 to allow for a period of essential stability with RDA.

- GD said that no person or organisation will use the whole of RDA. Constituencies and communities should start now to review the rules they will be intending to adopt.

- HT reported that national libraries have committed to using RDA and are looking at implementation issues. He referred to the meeting of national libraries convened after the JSC April meeting. GD said that, while adoption of the rules would improve and ensure the consistency of metadata content, agencies and individual cataloguers would need to decide which sub-sets of the rules should be specified to ensure the completeness of metadata records for particular applications.

HR added there is a need to clarify what is required in national library records.

- SH said that in reality users batch order from commercial suppliers (e.g. OCLC) and so follow their lead, not national libraries.

- GD highlighted issues for the Product Development Group. The sooner a near final version of RDA is ready the better so that users can plan for adopting RDA. The product is not in a state at the moment where it can be sold to users. HT added that there is scope for sharing 'My RDA' versions across groups of libraries – perhaps sharing profiles?

- HT – the publishers of RDA should be able to sell or licence the product to not only major organisations but also to smaller organisations and standalone users. SH suggested that national libraries do not have the resources to sustain the product so it is necessary to have licence facilities available for other organisations with a large enough infrastructure.

- What is the business model for the RDA product? (GD) It is in JSC's interests to identify partners to facilitate the use of RDA.

- RDA is considered to be clearer than AACR2 (AD, JC).

Returning to the discussion of Draft Part A, chapters 6-7:

- It was suggested that the special rules, presented in this draft version as additional instructions, are removed from the main RDA and alternatively issued as specialist add-on products/tools. However JB did not accept this suggestion arguing that a separate 'music RDA' is not a practical solution for a cataloguer recording an item with a piece of music attached – the cataloguer would want to refer to a single RDA which would include the special rules relating to music.

- Are special rules needed or are they covered by the generality? (HT) He added that LC has been working on simplifying and compressing music rules.

GD said that the RDA/ONIX framework has additional provisions for music and art. There are fundamentally 4 sets – language, music, image, other.

There are special sections for music, art, legal material because these are active communities in the AACR environment (HT, GD). Need to question how far can remove special rules yet still retain the interests of these traditional communities.

- AM welcomed the sections on music as music material is regarded as 'difficult'.

- It is a failure of AACR and RDA that the rules are unable to cope with music and art (SH).

- Why are relationships categorised in so many different ways? (JB)

- Market research is needed to evaluate the demands for a printed product (HT). JB thought ALA Publishing is assuming too much about the users' ability in using electronic versions. However GD did not see much market for a full printed version, regarding various 'My RDA' versions as preferable. He referred to the relationship between the rules, the product and the way the product manifests itself. GD sees the success of RDA with new communities rather than with old communities. He would like to see draft versions of RDA products being released as soon as possible.

- Also need to acknowledge the money aspects of developing RDA e.g. the cost of meetings, travel, and time to review documents. (HT)

Summarising the discussion it was agreed that there are a number of issues causing concern. Members of the Committee are to send their comments on the special rules to their JSC representatives – separate e-mails are requested for each rule, down to the 2nd level e.g. 6.1, 6.2 as this will facilitate the compilation of the constituency responses. Responses also requested to support or disagree with comments made by other members of the Committee. Responses required by HT and AD by 11 September.

Actions

All to send comments to HT or AD by 11 September so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.2 Rules for digital media (5JSC/ALA/2)

GD opened the discussion with the following comments:

- the RDA/ONIX proposals may have some impact.
- referring to page 2 of the ALA document, format does not mean the same as extent.
- when defining file size, knowledge of local storage is needed.
- in 3.4.4.1 the order of the format and extent information is questionable and he suggested that PDF be at the beginning of the statement before pagination details. Relates also to other rules in the proposal.
- 3.4.0.12 – the examples should be explicit e.g. 50 mins each or 50 mins in total.
- 3.4.4.1 – ambiguous use of units in examples (bit/byte).

Other comments:

- commas are not needed to separate 'mins' and 'secs' as they are one measurement for a unit (JB).
- HT added that comments about examples should be referred to the Examples Group.
- a DAISY file is needed as an example as it is a complicated structure (AC)
- in 3.9.0.4 the examples on the last page are overblown (GD)

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 11 September so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.3 Breton initial articles (5JSC/LC/7) Maori & Pacific Island languages (5JSC/ACOC/2) Irish initial articles (5JSC/CILIP/4)

It was not clear why RDA needs lists of initial articles in various languages (HT). It was noted that the work will probably be required for MARC21 documentation anyway. GD added that the lists would be useful for other forms of communication as well. He cited the care needed when recording German articles.

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 28 August so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September. Comments on the Irish initial articles document (5JSC/CILIP/4) to be sent to AD only since the document is a CILIP proposal.

6.4 Bible uniform titles (5JSC/LC/8)

Comments:

- SH began the discussion arguing in favour of the terminology of Old Testament and New Testament. They are translations of faith – Jewish translations, Christian translations.
- JB questioned the proposal to spell out 'Old Testament' and 'New Testament'.
- Is the Bible a 'work' or is it considered it to be a 'collection'. (GD) He supported the alternative proposal of using 'Christian Bible', 'Jewish Bible' (Rule 25.17A).
- Uniform titles were originally to enable collocation in catalogues. However collocation is achieved anyway with online access. (AD)
- Removing 'OT' and 'NT' is relatively easy. It will be more difficult to convert to 'Christian Bible' or 'Jewish Bible'. (HT)

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 28 August so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.5 Internationalisation (5JSC/LC/5)

Starting the discussion on the document HT said the paper was self explanatory in terms of its history and direction.

Comments:

- GD – there was some confusion over carrier/ measurement terminology. He cited ‘3.5” floppy’ which he argued is a carrier term not a measurement term. There are no examples in the proposal and as a result the document is unclear.
- Need consistent units of measurements (AD)
- JB referred to ordinal numerals (X/10th). He had mentioned this in RDA Draft, Chapters 6-7. Headings documentation not yet prepared (HT).
- Rule proposal about the Holy See at the end of the document is too limited. Can it be generalised? (GD)

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 28 August so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.6 Addition to other agreements involving jurisdictions (5JSC/CCC/1)

Reference was made to this document at the meeting. There was no discussion.

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 28 August so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.7 Dimensions of binding (5JSC/CILIP/2)

Comments:

- punctuation is needed in last example in rule 3.5.1.2 (JC)

Actions

As this is a CILIP proposal document all to send any comments to AD only by 11 September so that the formal response can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.8 Accessible formats used by visually impaired people (5JSC/CILIP/3)

AC reported that some changes may need to be made to the proposal in the context of RDA/ONIX. She added that visually impaired people need considerably more information as standard.

Actions

As this is a CILIP proposal document all to send any comments to AD only by 28 August so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.9 Video format characteristics (5JSC/LC/9)

Comments:

- there is some conflict with Chapter 3. (HT)
- visually impaired people need extra narration - how does this fit in? (AC)
- HDTV is one of a number of standards for TV, not the only standard (GD)

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 11 September so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.10 Persistent identifiers and URLs (5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev)

Summarising the document HT reported that it was a revised version of the ACOC document, predating the last JSC meeting in April. It is necessary to check the CILIP and BL responses have been incorporated. He added that the document reads well and referred to the questions at the end of the document.

Actions

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 28 August so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.11 Specialist cataloguing manuals (5JSC/ALA/3)

The history of the document was explained (HT). It was noted that the manuals are listed by subject and that the document is U.S. biased. The UK and other countries are requested to make contributions to the lists. KG to contact specialist groups (ARLIS, IAML etc) for contributions.

The appropriateness of listing program-related manuals was discussed but it was considered that they would not provide the guidance the user would expect.

Actions

KG to contact specialist groups for contributions to the listing.

All to send any comments to HT or AD by 11 September so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.12 RDA/ONIX framework for resource categorisation (5JSC/Chair/10) Categorization of content and carrier (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization)

GD explained the background to the RDA/ONIX framework . The objective is to develop a framework for categorising resources in all media that will allow

publisher data to be interoperable with bibliographic data. ONIX is more detailed than RDA. The framework adopts a layered methodology. High level label can be attached to high level content, within which there can be primary and secondary attributes. He added that ONIX makes the distinction between content and carrier clear.

No constituency responses to 5JSC/Chair/10 document are required. The recommendations in Section 3 of the framework will be discussed at the JSC October meeting.

Responses to 'Categorization of content and carrier document' (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization) are required.

Actions

All to send any comments on 'Categorization of content and carrier document' (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization) to HT or AD by 11 September so that the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline of 18 September.

6.13 Review of examples (5JSC/Chair/1; 5JSC/Chair/2)

JB reported that he is in the working group which is looking at the examples in AACR2 evaluating them for RDA. The work is proving to be very time-consuming.

GD added that it is a pity that museums and archives are not represented and urged the group to reflect the interests of other parties.

No responses due.

7. CILIP/BL Constitution

The meeting noted the draft of the revised constitution circulated by AC to the Committee on 20 June 2006. The revised document was accepted by the Committee.

GD added that he had spoken to Graeme Forbes at NLS about being a representative on the CILIP/BL Committee and he had received a very positive response from him. It was agreed that AC will formally contact Graeme Forbes inviting him to the Committee and that she will also ask him for a contact name for NLW.

Names of new Committee representatives to be supplied to JSC Secretary by KG.

There is still one vacancy to be filled on the Committee – 3rd BL representative. AD reported that Andrew McEwan has expressed an interest in this. Details of BL representation to be confirmed.

Actions

AC to contact Graeme Forbes at NLS to invite him to the Committee and also ask him for a contact name of possible NLW representative.

AD to advise of remaining BL representative.
KG to send names of Committee to JSC Secretary.

8. CILIP/BL website

Comments on the website were favourable:

- News section was very useful (AC).

- There was some positive discussion about the publication of Committee meeting minutes on the website. GD to send workflow document to KG for private comment. KG to send GD electronic versions of the approved minutes of previous Committee meetings. GD said the Committee should note that the publication of the minutes on the CILIP/BL website would be subject to Freedom of Information in Scotland.

- HT said it would be useful to have a way via the website enabling users to contribute to the RDA development process.

- other suggestions for the website requested (GD) – CIG conference report and presentation , outreach details? All to send any details to GD.

Actions

GD to send workflow document to KG.

KG to send electronic version of minutes to GD.

All to send suggestions of information for website to GD.

9. CIG Conference – RDA update/demo

Only AC and AD will be attending the conference in September; AC will give an update on progress on RDA in the Standards Forum session and AD will give a demonstration of the proposed online product.

10. Wiki update

It was proposed that wikis become the means of communicating responses by the Committee to HT and AD instead of e-mail. GD offered to be the contact for managing this and agreed to investigate this further. It would need to be password controlled so as to restrict public access. Possible timescale – have system ready for next round of JSC responses, early 2007.

Actions

GD to investigate use of wikis for the Committee to allow exchanges about JSC documents by beginning of next year.

11. Any other business

There was none.

12. Date of next meeting

To be arranged for early 2007, based on deadlines for responses to next batch of JSC documents.

The meeting closed at 15.40.