

CILIP/BL COMMITTEE ON RDA

Minutes of the 15th meeting held at the British Library, St Pancras on Tuesday 12 February 2008.

Approved

Present:

CILIP representatives:	Ann Chapman	(Chair)
	Stuart Hunt	
	Neil Nicholson	
	Hugh Taylor	(CILIP JSC rep)
BL representatives:	Robina Clayphan	
	Alan Danskin	(BL JSC rep)
	Heather Rosie	
Special representatives:	John Bowman	
	Gordon Dunsire	
	Graeme Forbes	
	Anne Mellor	
Secretary:	Katharine Gryspeerdt	(BL)

1. Apologies for absence

Apologies were received from James Caudwell, Robert Davies and Caroline Kent.

2. Minutes of the 14th meeting, 14 August 2007

The draft minutes were approved. [Final version (v1.0) issued 12 February 2008 to the Committee and posted on the CILIP/BL website.]

3. Matters arising

- 3.1** JB asked about the status of special representative on the CILIP/BL Committee. AC explained the background – originally the Committee was made up of CILIP and BL representatives but when it expanded special representatives were invited to bring in additional expertise. This split in representatives was clarified in the revision of the Committee's constitution in September 2006. The presentation of the new split of representatives was viewed favourably – AM.

- 3.2** Availability of unified roadmap leading up to RDA implementation, extended to include other relevant constituency dates (mtg 14, 14.8.07, item 4) – HT reported that he had posted this request to JSC and that the Project Manager was supposed to be moving it forward, although nothing seemed to have happened since. Action was left with HT and AD.
- 3.3** **CIG Standards Forum** (mtg 14, 14.8.07, item 6.2) - AC reported that the Forum was held on 26 September 2007. The event was very successful and will be repeated in Manchester in April 2008.

4. Representation of the UK community view

AC informed the Committee that Malcolm Jones from IAML (UK & Irl) had met with Guy Daines and was critical about UK representation of RDA and his/IAML (UK & Irl) view of RDA. The matter was referred to AC by Andrew Coburn (Chair, CIG). AC and Andrew Coburn put together a response which has been sent by email to Malcolm Jones – they supplied information on the CILIP/BL Committee, who was on it, how they are elected, their roles, the website, the availability of minutes, and mentioned that a number of organisations, including IAML (UK & Irl), have been consulted in the past about RDA with limited feedback.

HT added that before this exchange of views had been circulated he had agreed to talk to IAML (UK & Irl) in May. He added that a response from IAML (UK & Irl) to the LC proposal for rule revision for music (5JSC/RDA/12) would be helpful – see item 8.1. HT said he did not receive any comments from IAML (UK & Irl) about the special rules paper in 2005 or the draft of Part 1, both of which had been the subject of specific contacts with IAML.

Actions

AC to email Malcolm Jones to invite comments from IAML (UK & Irl) on the LC music proposal (5JSC/LC/12). The invitation should make clear that the unfortunately brief period for response is the result of the deadline for reply which was set by JSC (comment, GD).

5. LC Working Group on the future of bibliographic control

AD explained the background. LC is not expected to respond to the Working Group's recommendations until April 2008 and there is no indication of what the outcome will be. Work on RDA will continue until a decision has been made by LC. HT added that there are internal tensions over RDA within LC.

6. RDA Draft – Sections 2-4, 9 (5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9)

6.1 Comments on specific issues indicated in draft document

- 5.8 Status of preferred access point – adequacy of values

Comments:

- the values suggested (fully established, memorandum, provisional and preliminary) are adequate (AC, AD)
 - need to align the RDA values (preferred access points) with NSDL metadata registry (GD)
 - suggest 'memorandum' is dropped as its usage would be transitory (HT)
 - could the same argument be applied to 'provisional' and 'preliminary'?
- (GF) Access point is either OK or to be treated with caution.

- 6 Identifiers – which identifiers required for works and expressions

Comments:

- the term 'required' is ambiguous (GD). Identifier attribute is required/mandatory when creating record (including authority) for expression, work, family, person or corporate body.
- the question really is what examples, in addition to those suggested in the draft (ISMWC and ISTC), should be explicitly given (GD).

- 6.24 Preferred title for a legal work – use of 'etc'

There are 2 options – do away with such collective titles; define 'laws' 'treaties' and 'protocols' to mean the range of resources currently defined in the instructions.

Comments:

- 'etc' does not add any value (AD). Favour dropping 'etc' (AC).
 - uncertain value of such collective titles (AD).
 - on balance, preference for 2nd option (AD).
 - consider 'etc' as legacy from AACR1 when used 'Laws, Statutes, etc.'
- AACR2 replaced this with 'Laws, etc' (JB)

- 6.28.1.3 General instructions on theological creeds, confessions of faith, etc – distinguish between one and more than one body

Comments:

- this is an unnecessary complication. Acceptance by a church or denominational body might change over time. See no need to distinguish. This issue relates to use rather than actual creation of resource. (AD, GF, AC)

- Section 3 - which identifiers to be required

Comments:

- this is really another request for examples (GD).
- ISPI is now ISNI (RC)
- this is an attempt to anticipate possible future reference numbers for future digital repositories. Future-proofing of systems – better to do now than retrospectively convert later on (GD)

- 8.10 Status of preferred access point – adequacy of values

Comments:

- values are adequate (AD)

- 9.8 Gender – adequacy of values

Comments:

- when JSC met in October 2007 it was probably not aware of the ISO standard. Interest has been generated in the RDA discussion list. (HT)
- why is this information needed? (GF)
- some national authority files record this information e.g. Bibliothèque Nationale (AD).
- this information can be helpful to distinguish between 2 people with the same name (AC)
- this information can also be useful for users of recordings for the visual-impaired. (AC).
- when used can aid compatibility with other systems (GD)

- Internationalization of RDA –request for additional titles of nobility, terms of rank etc.

Comments:

- nothing to discuss.

- Chapter 9 instructions requiring further review by the JSC (pg 11 of background document)

Reference also made to comments from Rare Books Group and ARLIS received prior to Committee meeting (on CamTools wiki).

Comments relating to 9.2.5.1.3/AACR2 rule 22.4B2 (comma in uninverted names entered under ‘surname’):

- argue that comma not helpful (JB)
- comma can lessen ambiguity in a few cases (HT)
- comma indicates separate family name/given name (GD)
- comma is only appropriate when the name has been inverted. The comma is a display issue and therefore should not be part of the instructions (AD).

Comments relating to 9.2.14.1.3/AACR2 rule 22.8A1 (comma separating given name from epithet):

- general view that the comma should be removed.

Comments relating to 9.2.5.4.1 (should names consisting of a surname and term of address be formulated in direct order e.g. ‘Miss Read’ instead of ‘Read, Miss’ as at present):

- bibliographic record would show the preferred form; variant access points would be derived from the authority records (HR + GD).
- general view that it does not matter. However, staying with the status quo would save retrospective conversion.

Comments relating to 9.2.21.2, 9.2.22.2 (initial articles in phrases used as the names of persons):

- why in context of phrase headings only? (HT)
- initial articles can be difficult in foreign languages – uncertain of implications of revising instructions (HR).
- can be difficult to determine whether initial article is part of heading or not for some corporate bodies (JB)
- file without the article, display with (HR).
- this is a transcription issue- should transcribe as appears. Should either drop all initial articles as an agency decision or retain them all. The formulation process should be done by machine not cataloguer (GD).
- to summarise (HT), the aim is for consistency where possible – keep initial articles or drop all. Continue to have preference to allow coding to deal with filing issues.

Comments relating to 9.4 (B.C. and A.D. or B.C.E. and C.E.):

- this is a display issue with known calendar of use (AD).
- this should be down to decision-making by the authority control agency (GD).
- in interests of internationalization should use B.C.E. and C.E. (GD) Alternative displays could be machine generated.

Comments relating to 9.5.0.8.1, 9.7.0.4.1/AACR2 rule 22.16D1, AACR2 22.13A (titles/terms of address for people of religious vocation; saints):

- saint issue is complicated. Needs to be reviewed and made more consistent (JB).
- this is very much a western view (GD).
- looking at issue in terms of the 3 models – Model 1 being fully compatible, all identifier controlled – this issue would not matter; Model 2 being system based producing a user form of OPAC display – this issue would matter to legacy communities; Model 3 being flat traditional – this issue would be relevant to other communities. It all depends on the community adopting RDA (GD)
- ‘saint’ is an honorific title, not part of the name (AD).

- 10.4.0.3 Recording type of family – suggestions for additions to values list
Terms listed – family, clan, royal house, dynasty.

Comments:

- family can mean blood relations and ‘inherited’ family (SH).
- there is ambiguity in the values (AD). The values overlap and are confusing (GD). More consideration is needed e.g. distinguish between clan and family. Cataloguers will make mistakes which will lead to inconsistencies.
- some of the values have been used by NACO as qualifiers (AD).
- could not apply these values to DC structure (GD)
- this area needs further development. Refer to FRAD. Not have prescribed terms in RDA but put as examples instead. (GD)
- use terms applied by the groups concerned (GF).
- use values to disambiguate (GF).

- the usefulness of a list of terms is doubtful. Suggest list is rooted in current practice (AC).

- Chapter 16 Identifying places – which identifiers to be required

Comments:

- this also appears to be a request for examples e.g. Getty place names thesaurus (AD).

6.2 General comments on the draft RDA

- the RDA draft looks neat, easily interpretable, readable, flexible for the 3 models. (GD)

- there is inconsistency between draft 6.1.1.2.2 and 6.23.1.14, background document, pages 8/9. Conflict: provision to include name of more than one collaborator in the access point representing the collaborative work (6.1.1.2.2); however, treaties are considered collaborations and first part of access point representing work is corporate body named first on resource embodying the treaty (6.23.1.14) (GF). Comment to be detailed on CamTools wiki – GF.

- number of small points (JB) including: - confusing with Arabic numbers being used for sections and chapters. JB to add comments to CamTools wiki.

- RDA is designed for Model 1 but only really being applied in Models 2 and 3 at present (GD). Problem that all starting from bibliographic records when ideally should be starting from work level record. Need to have work label and identifier for potential reuse (HR).

There then followed some discussion between GD and HR about expression, manifestation and work titles.

- GD expressed concern about the increase in ‘prescriptiveness’ in RDA. It should be more flexible by leaving more up to decision making/national agencies.

- Examples were discussed at the last CILIP/BL committee meeting. It was suggested that examples would be labelled (GD). Single linear examples are not helpful. CILIP’s thoughts on examples were subsequently included in 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/CILIP response.

Actions

Discussions on RDA draft Sections 2-4, 9 to continue on Camtools wiki. Deadline 10 March.

HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 March.

7. Online product functionalities

HT updated the meeting - a press release for the contractor of the online product had not yet appeared. Such an announcement would have taken the wind out of the sails re this issue. Updated text of Don Chatham’s presentation at ALA Midwinter’s session of the Committee on Cataloguing: Description and Access (CC:DA) has been made available for sharing among JSC constituencies. The constituencies have just one chance to suggest

changes to the functional specifications – comments due to be submitted by the end of February. It is not known whether CogniLore has signed the contract for the online development.

Actions

Post-meeting note - JSC Secretary is collating responses from JSC members and CILIP comments will be forwarded to her late on 25 February.

8. Other JSC documents for comment

8.1 Rule revision for music (5JSC/RDA/LC/12)

Document received just prior to Committee meeting. The document seems to be an attempt to plug the gaps in AACR2. (HT)

Actions

IAML (UK & Irl) to be approached for comments – see item 4, actions.

Discussion to continue on CamTools wiki. Deadline 10 March.

HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 March.

8.2 Designation of roles in RDA

Document received just prior to meeting.

Comments:

- questioned designation of some roles listed under expressions e.g. animator (HT).
- what is the difference between compiler and compilation editor (AM). Compiler is the creator (GD).
- same person can have multiple roles – creator of work, performer of expression (GD).
- all controlled vocabularies in RDA will have synonyms, translations (GD).

Actions

Discussion to continue on CamTools wiki. Deadline 3 March.

HT and AD to draft and submit formal CILIP and BL responses to JSC by the deadline of 17 March.

9. Any other business

9.1 Relationships with other communities

- IFLA FRBR Review Group (at meeting in Durban, August 2007) set up small project group to define appropriate namespaces for FRBR (entity-relationship) in RDF. The group has started work (GD).

- The DCMI/RDA Task Group, of which GD is co-chair, has been set up following the Data Models meeting in London. The Group has set-up a wiki and intends to start substantive work in the near future. The Group is seeking funding (GD).

- RDA at IFLA 2008
Satellite conference on RDA to be held 8 August - date needs to be advertised (GD). Maximum attendees for satellite conference – 300.

- Dublin Core international conference, September 2008
RC reported there was much interest in RDA at the last DC conference, Singapore, August 2007. It was agreed to schedule a special session, in addition to the tutorial being arranged by Diane Hillmann, on RDA at the 2008 conference.

Actions

RC and GD to arrange special session on RDA at DC Conference in September 2008.

9.2 Next JSC meeting

To be held in Chicago, 13-22 April 2008.

9.3 RDA update

Online version to be premiered at IFLA. To be released 2009.

Complete draft RDA due 2.7.08. Constituencies' responses due 2.10.08.

9. Date of next meeting

To be arranged after CIG conference (3-5 September 2008) and before 23 September 2008 to tie in with JSC deadline of 2.10.08.

The meeting closed at 15.00.

APPENDIX

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

Revised draft of chapters 6 and 7 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev) (mtg14, 14.8.07, item 5)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 17 and 14 September 2007 respectively.

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) (mtg 14, 14.8.07, item 5)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 31 August and 10 September 2007 respectively.

Uniform titles (5JSC/CILIP rep/1) (mtg14, 14.8.07, item 5)

CILIP and BL responses sent to JSC and posted on documents site 13 and 10 September 2007 respectively.

Introductory words (5JSC/CILIP/5) (mtg14, 14.8.07, item 5)

BL response sent to JSC and posted on documents site 10 September 2007.