

## **CILIP/BL COMMITTEE ON AACR**

Minutes of the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting held at the British Library, St Pancras on Wednesday 14 March 2007.

### **Approved**

### **Present:**

CILIP representatives:	Ann Chapman Stuart Hunt Neil Nicholson Hugh Taylor	(Chair)   (CILIP JSC rep)
BL representatives:	Robina Clayphan Alan Danskin Caroline Kent Heather Rosie	  (BL JSC rep)
Special Representatives:	James Caudwell Robert Davies Gordon Dunsire Anne Mellor	
Secretary:	Katharine Gryspeerdt	(BL)

### **1. Apologies for absence and welcome to new members**

Apologies were received from John Bowman and Graeme Forbes.

The Chair welcomed the new members to the Committee – Robert Davies and Caroline Kent

### **2. Minutes of the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, 9 August 2006**

The draft minutes were approved, subject to a minor correction to item 4.5, requested by GD. [Final version (v1.0) issued 14 March 2007 to the Committee and posted on the CILIP/BL website.]

### **3. Matters arising**

**3.1 *Ariadne* article** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 4.3) AC reported that she had written the feature article on RDA and it was published in the October 2006 (No.49) issue. She added that the Editor will be pleased to have further articles on the development of RDA for future issues of *Ariadne*.

**3.2 CILIP/BL Constitution/ committee members** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 7)

AC informed the Committee that she had invited Graeme Forbes and Robert Davies to the Committee as national library representatives under the revised constitution and both had accepted. Also Caroline Kent had been asked to be the remaining BL representative on the Committee and had accepted.

**3.3 JSC documents for discussion** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6)

See appendix to these minutes for a summary of the CILIP and BL responses to JSC documents submitted for discussion at the JSC meeting (October 2006).

#### **4. Camtools, wiki and discussion forum**

There was positive feedback about the new Camtools forum. AC thanked HT for setting up the Camtools. GD added that for discussing documents Camtools is easier to work with than emails. HT explained that the site is really a 'learning environment' tool with the minimum setting up and with many of the functions 'switched off'. The discussion forum, announcement page and mailing list appear to work satisfactorily. HT added that he has yet to investigate the possible existence and working of the search engine in the archive.

The following comments were raised for consideration for the development of Camtools:

- suitable headings to be chosen so that links can be picked up from the Announcements list.
- deadline dates to be put in topic headings.
- topics to be presented in reverse chronological order (newest to be displayed at top of list).
- closing down messages should also be posted for each discussion thread.

HT is planning to develop wiki format for replies by the next Committee meeting.

#### ***Actions***

HT to take into account comments raised at the meeting in further development of Camtools discussion forum.

GD reminded the Committee of the CILIP/BL website. He added that comments, suggestions and contributions are welcome.

## **5. Issues in ch. 4 and ch. 5**

### **5.1 'Major role' for statements of responsibility**

Initial discussion on Camtools.

There was further discussion about the concept of major roles, and the difficulty of finding statements of responsibility for a number of types of digital resource. The CILIP response would probably be based on GD's response on Camtools.

### **5.2 Terms indicating edition**

Initial discussion on Camtools.

There followed further discussion about the terminology 'edition'.

- 'edition' has been applied very broadly in both manifestation and expression levels (HR).

- the crucial factor for a new edition is whether there is a change of content rather than a change of carrier (GD).

- edition words are being debased by publishers e.g. ultimate edition, DVD edition (GD). New printings are often referred to as new editions by publishers. Cataloguers do not want to create a new record for a 'new edition' if it is the same as the previous edition but just a new printing (HT). Edition statements for pre-publications present big problems (AM).

- continental practice (where publishers routinely refer to reprints as editions) differs from UK practice.

### **5.3 Clarification of name of publisher**

No further discussion at the meeting – Camtools discussion sufficient (HT).

### **5.4 No publisher/place/date identified**

No further discussion at the meeting – Camtools discussion sufficient (HT).

### **5.5 'If considered to be important'**

Initial discussion on Camtools.

Comments:

- HT opened the discussion by suggesting that there is a case for keeping this phrase for mandatory elements to indicate a degree of optionality. However does the phrase matter or help in the case of non-mandatory elements?

- RC said this should be discussed in the context of application profiles. Attempting to construct both rules of content and application of the rules in communities is leading to much conflict and discussion. Is this a JSC role? (HT).

-GD argued that this should not be completely eliminated from RDA as some in some cases cataloguers need to be prompted. Although it is outside the scope of RDA it falls within the role of adoption. However without one the role of the other fades.

- the distinction between mandatory and non-mandatory elements should be removed as this is indicative of the conflicts between standardising content and application profiles (HR and JC).

- there needs to be an alternative in the content standard so that if certain information is not present in an item the cataloguer is guided as to what else to use instead (HR).

- mandatory elements are necessary for record sharing and to support the FRBR model (GD).

- need to refer to multiple standards (JC) View that there is a wealth of data associated with an item that is ignored by RDA (JC)

HT requested someone to write up the discussion on wiki to kick-start the discussion to enable an informal document to be produced for end of March for JSC discussion

### ***Actions***

BL members to collectively write up the discussion for the wiki.

## **5.6 In analytic**

Initial discussion on Camtools. All requested to add their views on this issue via Camtools.

## **6. Music (5JSC/ALA/4)**

HT explained that the document proposal has high level support in the US.

AD reported that he is in consultation with Music Library staff for the BL response.

Comments:

- there was support at the meeting for a broader definition of the term 'score' than in the present glossary to reflect current use of the term.

- there was some concern that the term 'score' does not work so well for collections of folk songs (HT).

### **Actions**

HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 19 March.

## **7. Additions to RDA based on MARC 21 elements (5JSC/ACOC rep/2)**

This report looks at the elements in MARC 21 that are not covered by RDA.

Comments:

- concern was expressed at the meeting that the review is only looking at MARC 21 and questions were raised about whether other standards e.g. Dublin Core would be considered.

### **7.1 Projected date of publication**

Comments:

- do we need to have this information/rule in RDA? (SH)  
 - concerned about creating records for non-existent/ not-yet-published resources (HR)  
 - what is the functional requirement of the projected publication date element? How does it fit into the FRBR structure? (GD)  
 - there are many forms of publication dates - multiple publication dates are listed in ONIX. (GD) Referring to 2.7.4.0.3.2, changes in availability constantly happen (AM).

To conclude (HT) - not sure RDA should venture into cataloguing resources that do not exist. However, if RDA does include not-yet-published resources it should also look at other types of potentially useful dates that could be mapped in as well.

### **7.2 Scale of graphic content**

Comments:

- the case for generalising, providing a general instruction covering all types of graphic content (e.g. maps, architect drawings, facsimile reprints), was mainly supported (GD, AC, RC). It was noted that specific instructions would be justified to describe some specific details of a resource.

- however concern was expressed at keeping specific instructions for cartographic material as this reflects application profiles of RDA.

### **7.3 Date/Time and place of an event note**

Recommendation 1 – the meeting agreed with this.

Recommendation 2 – the meeting also agreed with the recommendation that JSC discuss this but suggested JSC try to incorporate this into an existing general instruction.

#### **7.4 Preferred citation**

Comments:

- doubt was raised over the provision of this element. The meeting considered this element to be more relevant to the task of ‘obtaining’ rather than the FRBR task of ‘identifying’ and therefore is beyond the scope of RDA.

- the ACOC report proposal is prescribing encoding statement that communities do not necessarily want to follow. The format of a citation depends on the custodian’s scheme. (SH)

- a citation is used mainly for obtaining an item. It is local information (AC).

#### ***Actions***

HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 19 March.

### **8. Numbering for serials (5JSC/LC/10)**

Discussion originally posted on Camtools (JC). At its April 2006 meeting JSC decided that serial record numbering should be recorded, rather than transcribed, data elements. LC’s proposal recommends an alternative rule in RDA giving the numbering information as a note even if the description is based on the first and/or last note. This proposal was viewed at the CILIP/BL meeting as complicating the cataloguing of serials.

Comments:

- a master serial record should record first issue to last issue and this is crucial for interoperability – JC. There should be a clear instruction without option or alternative.

- the wording in the proposal’s examples is not helpful – it is not clear whether the information is based on having volume 1 or not. (JC, HR)  
Furthermore the wording is not set. There are problems with unstructured notes / loose information (GD, HR)

- why has this data element not been properly analysed? A start and an end date are needed for a published serial. How this is encoded for the user is not an RDA problem. (GD)

- the proposal appears to be concerned with the way information is displayed and so is beyond the scope of RDA (AD).

**Actions**

HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 19 March.

**9. Contact with specific constituencies  
Implementation and awareness issues – CILIP/BL role/support to CIG**

HT argued that although contact with specific constituencies is desirable attempts to involve them in discussions in the past (e.g. by HT and KG ) has generated little response. AD added that CIG has the same issue of trying to encourage response/discussion.

AC suggested a feedback mechanism via the CILIP/BL website. Interested parties should be referred to AC and non CILIP/BL people should be invited to comment as well.

GD to remind UKBIBS about RDA and the CILIP/BL website.

GD suggested a UK FAQs on RDA to cover:

- questions such as What is the BL doing about RDA? What is CILIP doing?
- promotion, localisation and technical issues.
- papers in the public area which are not very easy to find.

Suggestions for FAQs to be sent to GD for the CILIP/BL website. To be posted before the series of regional seminars on RDA – see below.

Forthcoming presentations/ meetings:

- Data Model meeting, 30 April and 1 May (RC).
- London Metropolitan University presentation, week beg 19 March (AC)
- German Libraries Annual Conference, Leipzig, 19-22 March, presentation (GD)
- East/West Midlands talks (SH)

The BL is planning its implementation of RDA, and likewise CIG. (AD) 3 phases are envisaged - awareness – current

- engagement – in the near future
- implementation

There will be a series of seminars – people from CILIP/BL will be needed to give presentations and regional venues (for 20 to 30 people) will also be needed . CIG can handle the administration of the programme. AD has a skeleton programme.

The first venue will be at the CIG AGM in London.

AC recommended using Camtools to finalise the programme.

**Actions**

Volunteers for presentations to AD. Also details of suitable venues.

Details of presentation programme to be posted on CILIP/BL website and also to be sent to Nathalie Schulz.

FAQ suggestions to be sent to GD for CILIP/BL website – to be posted prior to regional programme.

## **10. Product development update**

AD reported that M Bloss has communicated details of product developments recently by email.

- RFP to be issued 9 April 2007
- Contract wording by 16 July 2007
- Beta testing – September to December 2008
- Final content – 1 January 2009
- Release – March 2009

## **11. Any other business**

### **11.1 New draft of chapter 3**

Due to be issued 19 March with comments due by 16 July 2007 for discussion at JSC October meeting. It was noted that this timescale would not fit with proposed CILIP/BL Committee meetings so the Committee will need to comment electronically via Camtools to the JSC representatives (HT and AD) so the formal responses can be drafted and submitted to JSC by the deadline date.

### **11.2 Hillman/Coyle article published in D-Lib magazine, Jan/Feb 2007**

GD drew the Committee's attention to the recent article which he considered contains substantial errors and discussed many trivial issues. He added that no-one from RDA attended DC2006 and consequently the issues have not been clarified quickly.

## **12. Date of next meeting**

To be arranged for 2<sup>nd</sup> week in August 2007, based on available meeting rooms and to tie in with deadlines for responses to next batch of JSC documents.

The meeting closed at 15.40.

## APPENDIX

A summary of the CILIP/BL responses sent to JSC for discussion at the October 2006 meeting following the August 2006 CILIP/BL Committee meeting.

**Draft of Part A, chapters 6-7 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.1)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 25 and 22 September respectively.

**Rules for digital media (5JSC/ALA/2)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.2)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 18 and 11 September respectively.

**Breton initial articles (5JSC/LC/7)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.3)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 1 and 8 September respectively.

**Maori & Pacific Island languages, initial articles (5JSC/ACOC/2)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.3)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 1 and 11 September respectively.

**Irish initial articles (5JSC/CILIP/4)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.3)

BL response sent to JSC and posted on documents site 8 September.

**Bible uniform titles (5JSC/LC/8)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.4)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 14 and 8 September respectively.

**Internationalisation (5JSC/LC/5)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.5)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 14 and 8 September respectively.

**Addition to other agreements involving jurisdictions (5JSC/CCC/1)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.6)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 13 and 12 September respectively.

**Dimensions of binding (5JSC/CILIP/2)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.7)

BL response sent to JSC and posted on documents site 8 September.

**Accessible formats used by visually impaired people (5JSC/CILIP/3)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.8)

BL response sent to JSC and posted on documents site 8 September.

**Video format characteristics (5JSC/LC/9)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.9)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 16 and 12 September respectively.

**Persistent identifiers and URLs (5JSC/ACOC/1/Rev)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.10)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 1 and 11 September respectively.

**Specialist cataloguing manuals (5JSC/ALA/3)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.11)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 15 and 12 September respectively.

**Categorisation of content and carrier (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Categorization)** (mtg12, 9.8.06, item 6.12)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 18 and 12 September respectively.