

CILIP/BL COMMITTEE ON AACR

Minutes of the 14th meeting held at the British Library, St Pancras on Tuesday 14 August 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	 (BL JSC rep)
Special representatives:	John Bowman Robert Davies Gordon Dunsire Anne Mellor	
Secretary:	Katharine Gryspeerdt	(BL)

1. Apologies for absence and welcome to new members

Apologies were received from James Caudwell, Graeme Forbes and Heather Rosie.

2. Minutes of the 13th meeting, 14 March 2007

The draft minutes were approved, subject to a minor correction to item 1, requested by AC. [Final version (v1.0) issued 14 August 2007 to the Committee and posted on the CILIP/BL website.]

3. Matters arising

Data Model meeting held 30 April and 1 May (mtg13, 14.3.07, item 9) – RC to report to the Committee under item 6 of this meeting's agenda.

4. Recent decisions and activity following JSC April 2007 meeting

CILIP/BL Committee on AACR, Meeting 14, 14 August 2007: Minutes

HT referred to the 'Outcomes, April 2007' document on the JSC website. He added that there are regular teleconferences between the JSC representatives and with the editor. Much of the activity over May, June and July has been in connection with development following the Data Model meeting in April/May to ensure there is support within the JSC guidelines for enthusiastic organisations. HT continued by reporting that JSC target dates are being met with only a few minor exceptions.

Comments:

- it would be useful to know about JSC deadline dates after the present one in September 2007 (AC).

- as the RDA publication date approaches it would be very helpful to have a more detailed breakdown of dates, including other constituencies' key RDA implementation dates - effectively a master diary (GD).

- in October 2007 there will be a meeting between national libraries on RDA implementation issues. Also on the BL website there will be specific information about what the BL is doing regarding RDA (AD). AC suggested a link from the CILIP/BL site to the relevant BL web page.

Actions

HT volunteered to post request to JSC and Sue Brown at CoP for a unified publicly available roadmap leading up to RDA implementation, extended to include other relevant constituency dates.

5. Responses due 17 September 2007

5.1 Revised draft of chapters 6 and 7 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7)

HT reported that there had been limited response to this document on CamTools but that it was early days. A deadline of 11 September was set for discussions to enable the response to be drafted and submitted to JSC in time.

Comments relating to Chapter 6:

- the chapter is not necessary and could be condensed to one sentence (JB), along the lines of 'As there is no distinction between primary and secondary access points make any access points deemed to be important'. A view supported by SH.

- JB questioned the decision that the examples of names should be based on authorized forms in authority files. He argued this should not be the case since forms in authority files change, or ought to change, and also using authority files gives a false appearance of legitimacy to the forms of the examples.

- it is necessary to show the structural relationships between the FRBR entities (GD).

- most of the detail in Chapters 6 and 7 could be hidden by the product. Want to see content of the chapters retained in RDA (GD)
- Chapter 6 is very repetitive but this is possibly due to the linear presentation which would not be apparent with an online product (AC).
- the content is too excessive whatever the presentation (SH).
- special sections (6.7 to 6.9) have been left as separate categories – would be very convoluting to incorporate in higher level text (HT). JB suggested that there are too many distinctions e.g. 6.7.1.1 and 6.7.1.2. However GD argued these distinctions are needed as users are not necessarily aware of them.
- 6.4.1.1.1 – why are the various contributors not numbered further individually? Restrictions in number of levels used in the rules? (GD)
- 6.4.1.1.1 - the contributors list is not structured/ controlled (HT)
- it is not clear how the Dublin Core community and ONIX feedback (p.5 covering letter) would lead to more levels of granularity. The signs are that the thinking is all self-contained in RDA but it should be seen to borrow from other communities. Should not relate to just one list, look at MARC related ones + mooted task for JSC relating terms linked to ONIX (AD).
- reference made to LC draft paper examining relationships in Ch 6 and 7.
- the way chapter 6 is broken down obscures possible access point needs. The examples are inadequate and confusing (JB, GD). Examples should be real and displayed in full, authoritative form.
- consideration should be given to hyper-links for examples rather than being displayed with specific rules.(GD)
- the request for further examples in the covering letter implied that the rest of the document has been accepted (SH). HT replied that this is not the situation but JSC would like feedback on specific areas.
- Chapters 6 and 7 represent the best way of managing both general and special concepts. The JSC discussions on special rules resulted in retaining them. (HT)
- the publishers are still persuaded that there is a sizeable print market. The examples need to work in the context of print. GD – a different data set will be needed for print and web-base. Believes there will be a market for derivatives of print-based product – this would give assurances that others are using the same product rather than an individual user writing up own version.

Actions

Discussion to continue on Camtools wiki. Deadline 11 September.
HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 September.

Comments relating to Chapter 7:

- some of the text seems circular (AC)

- chapter 7 is difficult to understand. Seems to be more complex than needs to be (AM)
- the range of potential relationships is extensive and needs to be displayed. The underlying structure needs to be seen to be supporting relationships.
- need to register terminology on namespace with clear uri set in context of global standard. Reference made to FRBR Review Group. Important to register first.
- the text is semantically incoherent e.g. 7.4.1.1.1c.1 microfilm reproduction [of] / facsimile of (JB)
- need example for big item e.g. large format story books (AM)
- large print edition (7.4.1.1.1c.1) is not actually an edition (GD)
- ‘unstructured description’ (also 7.4.1.1.1c1) also needs to be explained as being free text phraseology. (GD)

Actions

Discussion to continue on Camtools wiki. Deadline 11 September.
HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 September.

5.2 Additions to ‘Other agreements involving jurisdictions’ (5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up, 5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up)

HT explained the background to the document history and the ALA follow-up document.

Comments:

- support for ALA document. ALA’s position is very persuasive (SH).
- ALA’s position is reasonable and valid (AC).
- ALA’s proposal is simplest for user (HT).

Actions

Discussion to continue on Camtools. Deadline 24 August.
HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 September.

5.3 Uniform titles (5JSC/CILIP rep/1)

It was noted that the ‘textbox’ in the CILIP report has yet to be approved by IME ICC. Report of IME meeting due 21 August.

There followed discussion of the purpose of uniform titles (mainly GD, HT). RDA is clear – transcribe as per the title page and then add other titles as access points (GD) – tie in for uniform titles at 7.1.4.0. IME ICC approach is to use title in the language of the catalogue.

Comments:

- less mainstream items tend to be known in their own language; more mainstream in the language of the catalogue (AC)
- ability to switch all headings to English from information in data on data ('Part C') (GD). This then becomes an encoding issue (RC)
- support for HT's paper (GD, AD)

Actions

Discussion to continue on Camtools. Deadline 11 September.
AC and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 September.

5.4 Introductory words (5JSC/CILIP/5)

There has been some discussion on CamTools but nothing further to add at the meeting.

Actions

Discussion to continue on Camtools. Deadline 11 September.
AD to draft and submit formal BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 September.

6. Implementation and awareness issues

6.1 Data Model meeting

RC reported on this meeting held 30 April and 1 May 2007.
Recommendations from the meeting can be found on the BL website (www.bl.uk/services/bibliographic/meeting.html). Funding is being sought for the work items identified at the meeting. There is the problem that there is not a central pot of funding for standards development.
An RDA Special Session has been arranged at DC2007 in Singapore. DC specifications for the creation and declaration of application profiles and a tool for creating application profiles in wikis should be available in September 2007.
GD informed the meeting that he is Co-Chair with Diane Hillman of the DC Resource Description Access Task Group. As a result he has been elected to DC Advisory Group. He will be giving a talk with Diane Hillman in the RDA session at DC2007 in Singapore.
More public indication of progress is possibly likely after big events.

6.2 CIG Standards Forum

AD informed the meeting about the forum to be held at CILIP on 26 September. Speakers for RDA – AC (background of RDA), GD (content and development), AD (implementation). Bookings are going well with both morning and afternoon sessions half full. There will be more forums around the country. Currently negotiating a venue in Manchester. A list

is being maintained of unsuccessful applicants to advise them of future meetings.

6.3 Other presentations

GD updated the Committee on his programme of presentations, indicative of a growing interest in RDA – details available on the CILIP/BL website. Contributions received from the DAISY Conference in Helsinki in June 2007 – the Committee agreed it was appropriate to feed these, or comments received in a similar fashion, into CILIP constituency responses.

7. Product development update (AD)

The contract for the product has just been awarded but not yet officially announced.

8. Any other business

8.1 JSC dates (HT)

Draft Part B to be issued 1 December 2007 for constituency review, responses due 1 March 2008. A radical rewrite is not expected. Proposals on Part B due 4 February 2008. Responses on any proposals due 17 March 2008. Any other documents from JSC due by 4 February with responses by 17 March 2008.

Next JSC meeting due mid April 2008.

CILIP is likely to be hosting the JSC October 2008 meeting, possibly at CILIP HQ.

8.2 CamTools upgrade (HT)

Scheduled for 14 August. May include new discussion tool. [Upgrade rescheduled for 16 August]

9. Date of next meeting

To be arranged for mid February 2008, after the JSC deadline date for new proposals, etc., of 4 February and before beginning March.

The meeting closed at 15.00.

APPENDIX

A summary of the CILIP/BL responses sent to JSC for discussion at the April 2007 meeting following the March 2007 Committee meeting.

Music (5JSC/ALA/4) (mtg13, 14.3.07, item 6)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 19 March 2007.

Additions to RDA based on MARC 21 elements (5JSC/ACOC rep/2) (mtg13, 14.3.07, item 7)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 19 and 13 March 2007 respectively.

Numbering for serials (5JSC/LC/10) (mtg13, 14.3.07, item 8)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 19 March 2007.