

**JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE FOR DEVELOPMENT OF RDA**

**MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2007 MEETING**

**ALA Headquarters, Chicago, USA**

**15-20 October 2007**

**[Note: does not include Executive Sessions]**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS****Executive Session 1**

<b>170</b>	<b>Session on RDA authoring software</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>171</b>	<b>Liaison with the co-publishers of RDA</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>172</b>	<b>RDA Project Manager's report</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>173</b>	<b>Communication with other resource description communities</b> 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-ALA rep-BL rep-CCC rep/1	<b>6</b>

**End of Executive Session 1**

<b>174</b>	<b>Approval of the agenda</b> 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-ALA rep-BL rep-CCC rep/1 5JSC/Restricted/ALA rep/1/Rev	<b>7</b>
<b>175</b>	<b>Minutes of the previous meeting held 16-20 April 2007</b> 5JSC/M/129-169 5JSC/M/Restricted/129-169	<b>7</b>
<b>176</b>	<b>Actions arising out of the JSC Meeting April 2007</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>177</b>	<b>RDA Strategic plan and Scope and structure</b> 5JSC/Strategic/1/Rev 5JSC/RDA/Scope/Rev	<b>8</b>
<b>178</b>	<b>General Introduction for RDA</b> 5JSC/RDA/Prospectus/Rev/4	<b>9</b>
<b>179</b>	<b>RDA Part B – General issues</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>180</b>	<b>Draft of RDA Introduction to Part B</b> 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Introduction	<b>11</b>
<b>181</b>	<b>Restructuring RDA</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>182</b>	<b>Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 8 – General guidelines on access point control</b> 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 8	<b>16</b>
<b>183</b>	<b>Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 9 – Persons</b> 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 9	<b>20</b>
<b>184</b>	<b>Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 10 – Families</b> 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 10 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1	<b>34</b>
<b>185</b>	<b>Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 11 – Corporate bodies</b> 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 11	<b>37</b>
<b>186</b>	<b>Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 12 – Places</b>	<b>44</b>

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 12

- 187 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 13 – Works, expressions, manifestations, and items** **47**  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 13

- 188 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 19 – Other information used in access point control** **52**  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 19

- 189 Addition to "Other agreements involving jurisdictions"** **55**  
5JSC/CCC/1  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response  
5JSC/CCC/1/BL response  
5JSC/CCC/1/ACOC response  
5JSC/CCC/1/CILIP response  
5JSC/CCC/1/ALA response  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/CILIP response  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/BL response  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/LC response  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/ACOC response  
5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/CCC response

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 15

- 190 Bible Uniform Titles** **56**  
5JSC/LC/8  
5JSC/LC/8/BL response  
5JSC/LC/8/CILIP response  
5JSC/LC/8/CCC response  
5JSC/LC/8/ALA response  
5JSC/LC/8/ACOC response  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/CILIP response  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/BL response  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/LC response  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/ALA response  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/CCC response  
5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/ACOC response

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 16

- 191 Wrap up of Part B issues** **57**

- 192 Revised draft statement of objectives and principles for RDA (including IME ICC 5.2.4 Forms of Uniform titles)** **59**  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Objectives and Principles/Rev/3

5JSC/CILIP rep/1  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/ALA response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/BL response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/LC response

	5JSC/CILIP rep/1/CILIP response	
	5JSC/CILIP rep/1/ACOC response	
	5JSC/CILIP rep/1/CCC response	
<b>193</b>	<b>RDA Part B Internationalization</b>	<b>60</b>
	5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2	
<b>194</b>	<b>Examples in Part B</b>	<b>60</b>
<b>195</b>	<b>Revised draft of RDA - Part A – Introduction</b>	<b>60</b>
	5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Introduction/Rev	
<b>196</b>	<b>Revised draft of RDA - Part A – Chapter 1</b>	<b>61</b>
	5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Chapter 1/Rev	
<b>197</b>	<b>Appendices A-C (Capitalization, Abbreviations, Initial Articles)</b>	<b>67</b>
	5JSC/Chair/9/Chair follow-up/3	
<b>198</b>	<b>Revised draft of RDA - Part A – Chapter 2</b>	<b>70</b>
	5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Chapter 2/Rev	
<b>199</b>	<b>Removal of “Introductory words” instruction</b>	<b>77</b>
	5JSC/CILIP/5	
	5JSC/CILIP/5/BL response	
	5JSC/CILIP/5/LC response	
	5JSC/CILIP/5/ACOC response	
	5JSC/CILIP/5/CCC response	
	5JSC/CILIP/5/ALA response	
<b>200</b>	<b>Linking words in alternative titles</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>201</b>	<b>Numbering for serials: alternative instruction</b>	<b>78</b>
	5JSC/LC/10	
	5JSC/LC/10/ALA response	
	5JSC/LC/10/CCC response	
	5JSC/LC/10/BL response	
	5JSC/LC/10/CILIP response	
	5JSC/LC/10/ACOC response	
	5JSC/LC/10/LC follow-up	
<b>202</b>	<b>Analysis of the proposed CONSER standard record vis à vis RDA</b>	<b>79</b>
	5JSC/Editor/1	
	5JSC/Editor/1/Chair follow-up	
<b>203</b>	<b>Examples in part A</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>204</b>	<b>RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A – Constituency Review of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7</b>	<b>84</b>
	5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev	
	5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/LC response	
	5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/BL response	
	5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/1	
	5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/ACOC response	

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/CCC response  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/CILIP response  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/2  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/3  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/4  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/5  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/ALA response

<b>205</b>	<b>Data presentation (including Punctuation within elements)</b>	<b>89</b>
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

## **Executive Session 2**

<b>206</b>	<b>Communication with other resource description communities (continued)</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

<b>207</b>	<b>Formal recognition of individuals and groups contributing to the development of RDA</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

<b>208</b>	<b>Scope of JSC Web sites and document distribution</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	---------------------------------------------------------	-----------

<b>209</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	---------------------	-----------

<b>210</b>	<b>Plans for future teleconferences</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	-----------------------------------------	-----------

<b>211</b>	<b>JSC program of work</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	----------------------------	-----------

<b>212</b>	<b>Statement of policy and procedures for JSC</b> 5JSC/Policy/4/Rev	<b>92</b>
------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------

<b>213</b>	<b>JSC meetings policy document</b> 5JSC/Policy/6	<b>92</b>
------------	------------------------------------------------------	-----------

<b>214</b>	<b>Outcomes from October 2007 meeting</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	-------------------------------------------	-----------

<b>215</b>	<b>Any other business</b>	<b>92</b>
------------	---------------------------	-----------

**End of Executive Session 2**

**Minutes:** of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Committee held at ALA Headquarters, Chicago, USA, 15-20 October 2007.

**Present:** Deirdre Kiorgaard, Australian Committee on Cataloguing, in the Chair  
 John Attig, American Library Association  
 Marjorie Bloss, RDA Project Manager  
 Alan Danskin, British Library  
 Tom Delsey, RDA Editor  
 Nathalie Schulz, Secretary  
 Margaret Stewart, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing  
 Hugh Taylor, CILIP: Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals  
 Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress

Observers in attendance:

Renette Davis, University of Chicago Library  
 Judith A. Kuhagen, Library of Congress  
 Kevin M. Randall, Northwestern University Library  
 Patricia Sayre-McCoy, University of Chicago Library  
 Helen F. Schmierer, University of Illinois at Chicago Library  
 Joan Schuitema, University of Illinois at Chicago  
 Tracey Snyder, University of Chicago Library  
 Julie Stauffer, University of Chicago Library  
 Kathy Winzer, Robert Crown Law Library, Stanford University

## **Executive Session 1**

### **170 Session on RDA authoring software**

170.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

### **171 Liaison with the co-publishers of RDA**

171.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

### **172 RDA Project Manager's report**

172.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

### **173 Communication with other resource description communities**

173.1 Received and considered the following document:  
 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-ALA rep-BL rep-CCC rep/1

173.2 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

## **End of Executive Session 1**

**174 Approval of the agenda**

- 174.1 The following documents were added to the agenda (5JSC/A/6):  
5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-ALA rep-BL rep-CCC rep/1 (agenda item 4)  
5JSC/Restricted/ALA rep/1/Rev (agenda item 37)
- 174.2 The minutes reflect those agenda items and document series that were discussed.

**175 Minutes of the previous meeting held 16-20 April 2007**

- 175.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/M/129-169  
5JSC/M/Restricted/129-169
- 175.2 The minutes were approved with the following corrections:
- 175.2.1 5JSC/M/147.6.6 and 5JSC/M/Restricted/147.6.6: Change the action for the LC representative to: “arrange to include all JSC members on IME ICC mailing list to participate in discussion and voting.”
- 175.2.2 5JSC/M/147.11.1 and 5JSC/M/Restricted/147.11.1: penultimate sentence, change “further discussion of Appendix” to “further discussion of the Appendix”.

**176 Actions arising out of the JSC Meeting April 2007**

- 176.1 The JSC discussed the following outstanding actions from the April 2007 meeting:
- 176.2 Chair: Discuss with the ISBD Review Group how multiple occurrences of an element fit into an ISBD display (5JSC/M/166.1.9).
- The Chair said that this was still to be done.  
**Action=Chair**
- 176.3 Project Manager: Prepare FAQ on cataloguing using RDA (5JSC/M/166.1.3).
- The Project Manager said that she was planning to review all of the FAQs.  
**Action=Project Manager**
- 176.4 Editorial Team: Provide more information on when square brackets will be used (Sources of information conference call (5JSC/M/141.16.1)).
- The Secretary noted that a document had been prepared for discussion later in the meeting.
- 176.5 Editorial Team: Once chapter 13 has been redrafted look at questions from Examples Group 2 (5JSC/M/166.1.6).
- The Secretary said that she would undertake this task after the meeting.  
**Action=Secretary**

- 176.6 ALA representative: discuss with Jennifer Bowen the best way to respond to Jim Agenbroad's email (5JSC/M/147.21.5).

John Attig noted that the original email had been sent to the ALCTS Task Force. He suggested that he send an acknowledgement that the issue had been discussed by the JSC. He said that he would share draft wording with the Chair.

**Action=ALA representative**

- 176.7 ALA: draft language that might be used in various contexts (the Scope and Structure document, the General Introduction, the introductory sections of individual chapters) to explain the organization of RDA and its relation to the models (from the Conference call on 31 May 2007).

John Attig said that ALA was now looking at this as an implementation/orientation exercise, so the offer should be considered withdrawn.

## 177 RDA Strategic plan and Scope and structure

- 177.1 Received and considered the following documents:

5JSC/Strategic/1/Rev  
5JSC/RDA/Scope/Rev

- 177.2 ALA representative comments on RDA Scope and Structure

177.2.1 The Chair noted that the ALA representative had made 5 informal comments regarding the Scope and Structure document. She said that comments 1 (controlled access point), 3 (metadata about metadata), and 4 (subject access) would be discussed later in the meeting.

177.2.2 The Editor said that he had implemented the suggestions to make more references to the RDA Element Analysis and the RDA to FRBR Mapping (comment 2).

177.2.3 John Attig said that as mentioned previously (5JSC/M/176.7), ALA had withdrawn its offer to supply draft wording on the organization of RDA and its relation to the models (comment 5).

- 177.3 ALA representative comments on RDA Strategic plan

177.3.1 The Editor said that in response to the ALA concerns about the intended audience for adoption of RDA, it had been made clear in the latest revision to the Prospectus that what was intended was an "effective level of alignment" with the metadata standards used in other communities. The JSC agreed that the strategic plan should also be updated. John Attig said that he would prepare draft changes to the strategic plan wording for discussion at the meeting (Note: see 5JSC/Strategic/1/Rev/2 for the revised strategic plan).

**Action=ALA representative**

177.3.2 Barbara Tillet noted that in strategy 4, the date for release of RDA needed to be changed to 2009.

**Action=Chair**

177.3.3 John Attig asked whether, in light of the work on the RDA element set to result in well-formed metadata, anything along these lines should be included in the strategic plan. The Chair suggested that the JSC wait to discuss this at the April 2008 meeting.

**Action=JSC (Discuss additions to strategic plan)**

- 177.4 The Chair suggested that the ALA comments on the Objectives and Principles be discussed with that agenda item (see 5JSC/M/192.2).

## 178 General Introduction for RDA

- 178.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/RDA/Prospectus/Rev/4
- 178.2 The Chair noted that the Editor would be preparing a draft of the General Introduction for JSC review in early January 2008. She added that the JSC would discuss the draft by email and teleconference, concluding discussions by the end of February.
- 178.3 The Editor said that the Scope and Structure document had been written largely for the DCMI audience, but that much of the content would be reworded for the General Introduction. He referred to the outline for the General Introduction in the latest draft of the Prospectus:

0.0.0 Purpose and scope

0.0.1 Intended audience

0.0.2 Relationship to other standards for resource description and access

0.0.3 Principles governing resource description and access

0.0.4 Conceptual models underlying RDA

0.0.5 Organization

0.0.6 Presentation of instructions and examples

0.0.7 Adaptation of RDA guidelines and instructions on language, script, transcription, etc.

He noted that these topics had been largely decided at the April 2005 meeting. The Editor asked the JSC to confirm that these were the topics they wanted to include.

- 178.4 The Chair noted that in the document the Secretary had prepared on “Things to remember in the development of RDA” listed some very specific issues for the General Introduction. The Editor noted that two relatively new issues that needed to be included in the General Introduction were the encoding of RDA data and the implementation scenarios. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

- 178.5 The JSC discussed what to include in the General Introduction about the maintenance of RDA. Barbara Tillett suggested that it could be helpful to have a paragraph advising people whom to contact if they had comments. The Editor said that he would not draft text for this but it could be something the JSC added later. John Attig suggested that this could go into a preface. The Chair suggested that whether or not RDA first release should have a Chair’s preface be discussed and confirmed at a later date.

**Action=JSC (Discuss whether there will be a Preface)**

- 178.6 The Editor said that he envisaged that 0.0.2 would be largely a reference to the list of other standards that was being prepared by ALA. He noted that 0.0.3 would focus on the IME ICC *Statement* and the RDA objectives and principles document. He added that section 0.0.4 would be based on the Scope and Structure document. He suggested that 0.0.7 be broadened to cover Internationalization.

**Action=Editor**

- 178.7 The Chair noted that at one stage the JSC had considered having an external person review the General Introduction. She added that this was no longer on the table as the suggestion had not been supported by the CoP. The Chair said that the General Introduction would follow the general guidelines for writing RDA, e.g., it would be written in plain English. The Editor said that it would not be a textbook, i.e., it would not explain the models on which RDA is based. It was noted that the General Introduction should include only things of permanent relevance, not those that are only important during the transition period from AACR2 to RDA.
- 178.8 Barbara Tillett asked whether metadata for AACR2 rule numbers would be included in the RDA online product. The Editor replied that it had been included with the intention of generating a “Where’s that rule” product.
- 178.9 Hugh Taylor asked when the draft revised Prospectus and Outline would be issued. The Editor said that it would be issued with the draft of Part B. The JSC decided not to distribute the document on “Things to remember in the development of RDA”, but to use it as an internal checklist.

## **179 RDA Part B – General issues**

- 179.1 The Chair said that as listed on the agenda, a number of documents would be referred to during the discussion of the Part B chapters including 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2 (RDA Part B Internationalization) and 5JSC/Editor/2 (RDA Database Implementation Scenarios). She added that Examples Group 2 also had some questions regarding the content of the instructions in their “Preliminary comments on Part B”.
- 179.2 The Editor noted that at the April 2007 meeting the JSC had briefly discussed the September 2006 Editor’s draft of Part B. He added that this draft was essentially a reformatted version of AACR2 chapters 22-26, with a few changes to terminology. The Editor said that in April the JSC had also discussed the strawman for 13.1, which contained instructions on the choice of primary access point that had been moved from chapter 7. He noted that one decision made at the meeting was to include instructions on other identifying elements in the appropriate chapters. He added that it had also been agreed that additions to names, etc. would be treated as elements in their own right.
- 179.3 The Editor said that the drafts of Part B chapters being discussed had been prepared since the April meeting and incorporated non-substantive editorial changes. The remaining substantive comments had been included in the covering memo of each chapter. He noted that suggestions made in 5JSC/Restricted/LC Rep/2 had also been included in the cover memos.
- 179.4 The Editor had also prepared an element analysis table for Part B, and had made revisions to this based on the July 2007 draft of FRAD. He added that he had been sent a list of changes to FRAD agreed at a meeting during IFLA 2007, including the removal of co-ordinates and other geographic information as attributes of place. Barbara Tillett noted that these elements were moving to FRSAR. The JSC agreed to discuss this issue with chapter 12 (see 5JSC/M/186.13). The Editor noted that it had been necessary for him to include in the element analysis some elements that were not in FRAD such as “signatory to a treaty”.
- 179.5 John Attig commented that another change from what the JSC had seen at the April meeting was that chapter 13 had been split into chapters 13-18. The Editor said that if

these instructions had been slotted into Chapter 13 it would have made it unwieldy. He noted that the JSC had agreed that instructions on legal works, musical works, religious works, and official communications would not be included in an Appendix. He added that the JSC needed to discuss related comments in the responses to 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev.

## 180 Draft of RDA Introduction to Part B

180.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Introduction

180.2 The Editor noted that the Introduction to Part B was the first place where terminology, required elements, and language preferences were encountered. Barbara Tillett said that it would be very important to explain any changes in terminology to the constituencies.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

180.3 John Attig said that he had a comment on one of the changes in terminology noted in the cover letter: “entry element” replaced by “first element”. He said that this use of “element” did not match elsewhere in RDA. The Editor said that he had been unable to find another word. Barbara Tillett suggested that “first portion of the name” be used. The Editor said that it would actually be the “first portion of the element”. The JSC agreed when reviewing the instructions to see if “portion” could be used.

180.4 The Editor led a discussion of the issues in the cover letter for the Introduction to Part B.

180.5 0.2.1. Relationship to other standards for access point control

180.5.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the paragraph at 0.2.1.1 be deleted. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 0.2.1.1.).

The JSC agreed to move this paragraph to the General Introduction, and to do the same with 0.1.1.1.

**Action=Editor**

180.5.2 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the comments about the elements in Part B not be structured around GARR be deleted. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 0.2.1.2.)

The Editor said that the JSC needed to discuss whether GARR would have any visibility in RDA (see 5JSC/M/182.22). Barbara Tillett suggested that 0.2.1.2 contain a reference to MARC 21 Authorities and Unimarc Authorities. After discussion, the JSC decided that 0.2.1 was not required, as relationships to other standards will be covered in the General Introduction and Appendices.

**Action=Editor**

180.6 0.2.2 Functional objectives and principles of access point control

180.6.1 Cover letter: A question has been raised about the need to acknowledge a variance with FRAD user tasks. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 0.2.2.1.)

The Editor said that the variance was in terms of the language used. He added that FRAD was written from the cataloguer’s point of view, while RDA objectives and principles had been written from the user’s point of view as in FRBR.

Barbara Tillett asked why there was no entry for “find”. The Editor said that chapter 6 covered this. Barbara Tillett replied that this was a different sort of “find”, and that you still needed to be able to find the entity. The JSC agreed to include “find” at 0.2.2.1, in terms of finding data about the person, etc, not the resource. The JSC decided to mention the variance with FRAD terminology (and with any other standards) in the General Introduction, and to include this in the cover letter for Part B.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

- 180.6.2 Cover letter: It has been suggested that additional parenthetical examples be added to 0.2.2.1 c). (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 0.2.2.1 c).)

The JSC agreed to include “real name vs. pseudonym”. The Editor said that he would change “preferred or variant access point” to “preferred access point” to be consistent with FRAD.

**Action=Editor**

- 180.6.3 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the paragraph at 0.2.2.6 be expanded to cover additional Group 1 entities. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 0.2.2.6.)

The Editor suggested that the use of “naming the work” in Chapter 7 be reconsidered as what was meant was providing a preferred access point. He added that naming as a verb was different from the element “Name”. The JSC agreed that the use of “name” in 0.2.2.6 (Language preference) was appropriate.

**Action=Editor**

- 180.6.4 Cover letter: It has been suggested that parenthetical examples be added to 0.2.2.8. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 0.2.2.8.)

The Editor noted that 0.2.2 was currently in accord with the RDA objectives and principles, and any changes would also need to be made in that document.

The Editor noted that this principle (Common practice) was allowing for practices in a particular field. For example, in the legal field, people expect to see a court case cited by the defendant. The Chair suggested that the phrase “should follow common citation practice” be replaced by something such as “should reflect conventions used in the country, language, and sphere of endeavour”. The JSC agreed to discuss the principle further after the status of the special instructions for law, music, etc., was discussed. (Note: this was not discussed).

**Action=Editor**

- 180.6.5 Cover letter: JSC needs to assess the statements made at 2.2.5 and 2.2.6 in relation to the IME ICC Statement of Principles.

The JSC agreed to discuss this later in the meeting (see 5JSC/M/192.4).

- 180.7 0.2.4 Structure of Part B

- 180.7.1 Cover letter: A question has been raised about the contents of appendix E. (See Barbara Tillett’s question at 0.2.4.6.)

The JSC agreed to discuss this later in the meeting (see 5JSC/M/182.22).

- 180.8 0.2.5 Required elements

- 180.8.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the paragraph at 0.2.5.1 should refer to undifferentiated access points. (See Barbara Tillett's question at 0.2.5.1.)

The Editor said that 0.2.5 had been copied from the Introduction to Part A. In that context, it was acceptable to refer to what was applicable to the resource, but for access points, it was more an issue of what could be readily ascertained. The JSC agreed that the language should be changed, and instructions added on what to do when elements cannot be readily ascertained (e.g., leave a name as undifferentiated).

**Action=Editor**

- 180.9 0.2.7 Language preferences

- 180.9.1 Cover letter: The text at 0.2.7.1 will have to be reviewed after decisions have been made on the proposals in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2

The Editor suggested that the JSC discuss the following general recommendation in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2: "Change "in English," "English-language form," "English-language reference sources," etc., to "in the language of the cataloguing agency," "a form in the language of the cataloguing agency," "reference sources in the language of the cataloguing agency," etc., in all instructions. The JSC agreed, and decided to change "cataloguing agency" to "agency creating the data" and to use this term consistently in RDA.

**Action=Editor**

Margaret Stewart said that the Strategic plan said that RDA was designed to be used in an "English language context" and this would need to be changed. The JSC agreed. Margaret Stewart noted that most examples for Part A were in English, and that there was not time to change this. Barbara Tillett suggested that examples in other languages be solicited with the first release of RDA. Margaret Stewart commented that in the case of the French translation of RDA, all of the examples would be translated into French.

**Action=Chair (Strategic plan)**

- 180.10 The Chair asked if there were any other comments on the Introduction to Part B.

- 180.11 Barbara Tillett said that she had expected to see a general brief statement on the purpose of authority control, and why it is so important (e.g., to improve precision in searching). The Editor said that you would then need to have a statement about why description is important. He added that he viewed the section on functional objectives as fulfilling this need. The Chair said that she thought a broad general statement would be useful. Hugh Taylor said that he did not see this as necessary, but did not think it would do any harm. John Attig said that he wanted to see what the statement would say before making a decision. The JSC agreed that Barbara Tillett would draft a general statement for the JSC to evaluate. It was noted that a statement would also be needed for Part A.

**Action=LC representative**

- 180.12 The Chair suggested that the word "cataloguers" be removed from 0.2.0.2. JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

- 180.13 Hugh Taylor noted that 0.2.0.4 contained the note "[Add text re archival practices.]" The Editor said that he would remove both this, and the equivalent note in the Introduction to Part A. It was suggested that something could be included in the General Introduction.

**Action=Editor**

- 180.14 The Chair said that an explanation of the relationship between preferred and variant access points, including the difference between them, and how they help to achieve the objectives could be given either in the Introduction or at 8.1.3. The Editor said that they would both have equal value in terms of the “find” objective. The Chair said that she would raise the issue later if necessary.
- 180.15 The Chair said that she had a comment regarding 0.2.2.3: “Differentiation. The access point control data should serve to differentiate the entity represented by a preferred or variant access point from other entities represented in the file.” She said that “represented in the file” was ambiguous. The JSC decided to delete the phrase.  
**Action=Editor**
- 180.16 Barbara Tillett asked if “Consistency” should be added as a principle. She added that she thought there were other differences to the IME ICC draft *Statement*. Barbara Tillett volunteered to identify the differences so that the JSC could discuss them later in the meeting (see 5JSC/M/192.4).  
**Action=LC representative**
- 180.17 The Editor said that he had accidentally left information about options out of 0.2.6, and that he would rectify this. The Editor noted that 0.2.7 would be revised in light of the decisions on internationalization.  
**Action=Editor**

## 181 Restructuring RDA

- 181.1 The Editor circulated a document containing a suggested new structure for RDA (Note: for a later version of this document see 5JSC/Editor/4). The Editor said that the impetus for proposing the new structure came from reading constituency comments on the revised chapter 3 and revised chapters 6-7. He noted that ACOC was concerned that the structure of RDA is too closely based on current database structures of linked bibliographic and authority records (scenario 2), when the ultimate aim is a relational / object-oriented database structure (scenario 1). In addition, ALA had concerns regarding the alignment of RDA with FRBR and FRAD, and LC had queried the inclusion of relationships between works and expressions in Part A, Chapter 7.
- 181.2 The Editor said that the current two-part structure was closely tied to implementation scenarios 2 and 3 (Note: see 5JSC/Editor/2 for details of the implementation scenarios). He explained that the new structure contained nine parts. He added that Parts 1-4 were to do with recording attributes and Parts 5-9 with recording relationships. He noted that the document he had prepared showed how each chapter related to the FRBR/FRAD user tasks and entities.
- 181.3 The Editor said that he had built in a part for recording the attributes of the Group 3 entities (concept, object, event, and place). He said that this would assist in answering the request to include subject access as a required element. He noted that except for “Place” these would be placeholder chapters, as would those in the part on recording relationships between concepts, objects, events, and places.
- 181.4 The next morning, the Chair asked the JSC members for their opinion on the new structure. The JSC members said that they were in favour of the new structure because it was more “future-proof”, and it reflected FRBR and FRAD better than the current structure.

- 181.5 The Editor suggested that what he had called “parts” in his initial outline be referred to as “sections”. The JSC agreed. Barbara Tillett said that she would prefer two large sections, one on attributes, and one on relationships. The Editor suggested that this would make the numbering too unwieldy.
- 181.6 Hugh Taylor asked what impact the new structure would have on the draft chapters that the JSC had already seen. The Editor went through the outline of chapters and explained the relationship of each to the existing structure. The Editor noted that there would need to be a new section 5 on primary relationships. During the discussion, the JSC deferred decisions on the placement of the special instructions currently in chapters 14-18 (see 5JSC/M/191.1), and the chapter breakdown of section 7. The JSC agreed to include a mapping of previously released chapters to the new structure in the cover letter for the “Part B” chapters that were to be issued for constituency review.  
**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**
- 181.7 The Project Manager asked what difference the new structure would make to applying the RDA instructions. The Editor said that it would be no different from the current structure, in that you needed to view the instructions through the template of the encoding scheme, e.g., MARC 21 or ISBD. He noted that if you started imposing a record structure through the order of the elements there were issues of flexibility and extensibility. He said that the new structure was intended to correct this. The Editor said that Appendices D and E would be available as pre-packaged templates in the online product. The Chair noted that Appendices D and E would be discussed later in the meeting.
- 181.8 The Chair asked the observers present for their reactions to the new structure. Kathy Winzer said that she thought it made sense and would answer many of the concerns raised by ALA. She said that as a member of Examples Group 2 she was concerned about what this would mean in terms of their early November deadline. The Editor said that the examples themselves would not change, just where they were placed. Kevin Randall said that although at first glance the new structure looked more complicated, he also liked it. Judy Kuhagen said that some people would be concerned by the number of chapters. Hugh Taylor suggested that it be emphasized that 10 chapters in the new structure would be placeholders. Judy Kuhagen asked about the chapter on “Place”, and whether this would cover places as jurisdictions or places as geographic areas. The Editor said that chapter 11 would have instructions on what to do to use the name of the place as the surrogate for the name of a jurisdiction, or as additions to names. Helen Schmierer said that she was in favor of the new structure as it would show practical results out of FRBR, and because it followed the logic of the way that people did cataloguing. She added that in addition, it would be easily understood by other communities.
- 181.9 The JSC agreed to proceed with the new structure, in the knowledge that it would need to be confirmed with the Committee of Principals. The Chair said that a forward plan would be prepared to show the impact of the change on the RDA timeline. She added that if the new structure did go ahead there would be a revised Prospectus and a document justifying the change.  
**Action=Chair**

**182 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 8 – General guidelines on access point control**

182.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 8

182.2 The Editor noted that in the new structure, some of chapter 8 would remain in chapter 8 (General guidelines on recording attributes of person, family, and corporate body), and some would move to chapter 5 (General guidelines on recording attributes of work and expression). The Editor led a discussion of issues raised in the cover letter to chapter 8.

182.3 8.0 Purpose and Scope

182.3.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that a paragraph be added explaining that the elements may be recorded in an access point control record or in bibliographic records, and why access point control is useful. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 8.0.)

The Editor noted that it had already been agreed that Barbara Tillett would draft a paragraph for the General Introduction (5JSC/M/180.11).

182.4 8.1.3 Access points

182.4.1 Cover letter: The section has been reworked to reflect the revised terminology used throughout Part B. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 8.1.3.)

The Chair noted that the need for a definition of “controlled access point” had been raised in the ALA representative’s comments on RDA Scope and Structure. The Editor said that “access point”, “preferred access point”, and “variant access point” had been defined at 8.1.3. John Attig asked if these definitions would move to the chapter on general guidelines on recording relationships between Group 1 and Group 2 entities. The Editor agreed that they would move there and in that context would also say what functions they serve. He added that the comment from ALA would be dealt with in a different way than originally suggested.

**Action=Editor**

182.5 8.1.4 Related entities

182.5.1 Cover letter: The section has been reworked to reflect the revised terminology used throughout Part B. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 8.1.4.)

The Editor noted that this section would move to the general guidelines on recording relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies.

**Action=Editor**

182.6 8.3 Variant access point

182.6.1 Cover letter: The section has been reworked to reflect the replacement of “see reference” by “variant access point” throughout Part B. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 8.3.)

The Editor said that an explanation of how these variant access points and related entities ended up as see and see also references had been built into the Introduction to Part B. He said that this would now be dealt with in the introductions to the appropriate sections.

**Action=Editor**

- 182.6.2 Cover letter: General guidelines on explanatory references have been included under 8.3.1 and 8.3.2, with references to 19.7. (See Barbara Tillett's comment at 8.3.4.)

The Editor said that the instructions on explanatory references would move to the general guidelines chapters of the section on recording relationships.

**Action=Editor**

- 182.7 8.5 Required elements for access point control

- 182.7.1 Cover letter: The section on required elements has been left blank pending review and decisions on required elements for Part B (see 5JSC/ACOC rep/1)

The Editor noted this would be discussed later in the meeting (see 5JSC/M/191.3).

- 182.8 8.6. Language and script of preferred and variant access points

- 182.8.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding an option to the instruction at 8.6.1 to record the transliterated form of the access point in addition to the form that appears on the source. (See the recommendation at 8.5.1 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC discussed the suggestion. Barbara Tillett noted that the issue is not whether the agency creating the data is capable of recording the original script. The JSC agreed to include an alternative to allow the agency to choose the transliterated form as the preferred access point.

**Action=Editor**

- 182.8.2 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed rewording the instruction at 8.6.2 to allow substitution of a transliterated form even if the name or title could be recorded in the form that appears on the source. (See the recommendation at 8.5.2 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.) (See also Barbara Tillett's comment at 8.5.2.)

It was agreed that this had been covered by the previous discussion.

- 182.8.3 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the instruction at 8.6.1 be expanded to cover variations beyond those that appear on sources. (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 8.5.1.)

Barbara Tillett and Judy Kuhagen explained that the suggestion originated with the IME ICC *Statement* (5.1.2), which refers to a "well-accepted name" and does not mention reference sources. The JSC decided not to make any change to 8.6.1.

- 182.8.4 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the instruction at 8.6.3 be reworded: "record additions ... in the language of the catalogue". (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 8.5.3.)

The Editor said that 8.6.3 referred to applicable instructions in chapters 9–18, and some of these told you to record additions "in the vernacular". The JSC decided not to make a blanket change, as this would mean a difference from AACR2, but to consider each instance separately (see 5JSC/M/183.6.1).

- 182.9 8.7.1. Capitalization

- 182.9.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that “transliterated” be inserted before “name or title” in the instruction at 8.7.1.1a.1. (See Alan Danskin’s comment at 8.6.1.1.a.)

Alan Danskin explained that for Arabic and Hebrew capitalization was only an issue for transliteration. The JSC agreed to make the change.

**Action=Editor**

- 182.10 8.7.4. Numbers expressed as numerals or as words

- 182.10.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that instructions on inclusive numbers be added to the general instructions on numbers for Part B. (See Marg Stewart’s comment at 8.6.X.)

The Editor suggested that the general instruction from 1.7.2 (Consider inclusive dates and other inclusive numbers to be a single unit; record them in full.) be repeated where appropriate. He noted that this would apply in cases where dates were not recorded as separate elements, e.g., dates of incumbency and sessions of legislative bodies. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

- 182.11 8.7.4. Hyphens

- 182.11.1 Cover letter: A change has been suggested in connection with the instruction at 8.7.4.3. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 8.6.4.3.)

The JSC decided that 8.7.4.3 (Omit a hyphen that joins one of a person’s forenames to the surname) should be deleted as it violates the principle of representation. It was noted that this was a change from AACR2 (22.1D2).

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

- 182.12 8.7.5. Spacing of initials and acronyms

- 182.12.1 Cover letter: The appropriateness of the instruction at 8.7.5.1 has been questioned. (See Marg Stewart’s comments at 8.6.5.)

Margaret Stewart noted that 8.7.5.1 (based on 24.1A) says: “Do not leave a space between a full stop, etc., and an initial following it.” She added that this instruction is contrary to the existing practice of NACO libraries for personal names, which is to add spaces after the full stops. The JSC decided that the NACO practice would be written into the instructions for personal names and families. The provisions of 24.1A will be included in the chapter 11 on corporate bodies.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

- 182.13 8.7.6. Abbreviations

- 182.13.1 Cover letter: It has been noted that the instruction at 8.7.6.2 b) may have to be revised, pending a decision on 5JSC/LC/8.

The JSC noted that a final decision on 5JSC/LC/8 was yet to be made (see 5JSC/M/190).

- 182.14 The Chair asked if the JSC members had any other comments they wished to raise regarding the draft chapter 8.

- 182.15 Barbara Tillett said that she was concerned about the last phrase in 8.1.1.3: “The term family refers to two or more persons related by birth, marriage, adoption, or similar legal status, or who otherwise present themselves as a family”. She noted that some corporate bodies use the term family. The JSC agreed to discuss this with chapter 10 (see 5JSC/M/184.5).
- 182.16 Barbara Tillett said that she had some comments regarding 8.1.4.2: “The term related person refers to a person who is related to the person, family, or corporate body that is the subject of the access point control data (e.g., a collaborator, a member of a family, a founder of a corporate body). Related persons include separate bibliographic identities established by the person who is the subject of the access point control data.”
- 182.16.1 Barbara Tillett said that “subject of the access point control data” was an awkward phrase. The Editor replied that with the new structure this phrase would not be used.  
**Action=Editor**
- 182.16.2 Barbara Tillett said that she did not think that “collaborator” should be included. The Editor replied that it was taken from FRAD. Barbara Tillett said that it was used there in a different way. The JSC decided to remove “collaborator” and that it was not necessary to replace it with another example of a person-to-person relationship.  
**Action=Editor**
- 182.17 Barbara Tillett asked if the caption for 8.2.2 (Preferred access points representing works) would change with the reworking of the chapter. The Editor replied that works and expressions would be handled together.
- 182.18 The Chair said that she liked the way that the see references were handled at 8.2.2.4 (“... that expression (see 13.1.2), manifestation (see 13.1.3), or item (see 13.1.4)”), as opposed to how they were done at 8.2.0.2 (“e.g., see 9.1.1 (preferred access points for persons)”).
- 182.19 John Attig asked for clarification of the term “a name used by the person” as found in 8.3.1.1 a). He asked whether this would apply in the case of a statement of responsibility used in a book published after the author’s death. The Editor said that it was based on the FRAD provision “the name by which the person is known”. The JSC discussed the three parts of 8.3.1.1 and asked the Editor to make the difference between the three types of variant name more prominent.  
**Action=Editor**
- 182.20 Barbara Tillett suggested that 8.3.1.4 be removed as it is too prescriptive (Do not record a name or title as a variant name or title if it is so similar to a preferred name or title or to another variant name or title as to be unnecessary.). The JSC agreed.  
**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 26.1H)**
- 182.21 Barbara Tillett said that she was concerned about this phrase in 8.3.1.6: “Add to the variant name any of the elements used as additions to preferred names (see 8.2.0), as necessary to differentiate the variant access point from other identical or similar access points.” She noted that the current practice was not to make variations unique, and she did not want people to think this was required. Other members of the JSC said they saw value in making additions to differentiate variant access points. The JSC decided to replace “as necessary” with “if considered important to differentiate” or similar phrase.  
**Action=Editor**

- 182.22 Barbara Tillett suggested that 8.3.1.9 (If a see reference generated from a variant access point does not give adequate guidance to the user of the catalogue, make an explanatory reference giving more explicit guidance (see 19.7)) could be moved to the appendix on display. The Editor said that it was more than display, as you would need to create the data. After discussion, the JSC decided that the appendix on the presentation format for access point control data would contain the instructions on display in AACR2 chapters 22-26. It was noted that this would be for the convenience of people who were used to AACR2. The JSC noted that they did not want RDA to use GARR, and did not have the time or desire to develop a separate presentation format.  
**Action=Editor**
- 182.23 Barbara Tillett said that she had the same concern about differentiation at 8.3.2.3 as she had at 8.3.1.6. The JSC agreed to make the same change.  
**Action=Editor**
- 182.24 John Attig said that he was concerned that according to 8.3.2.2 all variants for names of works should be in the same form. He added that there were some cases in current practice where there was a reference from the title only, and it was not preceded by the name. The Editor replied that what was in chapter 8 was a distillation, and the full instructions were in chapter 13.
- 182.25 Barbara Tillett suggested that 8.4.1.4 (When generating a *see also* reference ...), and 8.4.2.4 and 8.4.2.5 would be covered by the Appendix on display. The JSC agreed.  
**Action=Editor**
- 182.26 John Attig said that he was concerned about the use of “subdivision” in 8.7.1.1 (Capitalize the first word in the first element and in each subdivision and addition in a preferred or variant access point.). The Editor explained that this was a replacement for “sub-heading” and that the term was used as it would be in a thesaurus. The JSC decided that this would need to be explained in the cover letter for Part B.  
**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

### 183 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 9 – Persons

- 183.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 9
- 183.2 The Editor led a discussion of issues raised in the cover letter to chapter 9.
- 183.3 Scope
- 183.3.1 Cover letter: The coverage of the chapter with respect to language and script of the name (both in the general instructions (9.2-9.3) and in the “additional” instructions (9.24) needs to be reviewed in the context of overall scope of RDA. (See Alan Danskin’s comments at 9.9.0 and 9.9.0.1.1.)

The JSC discussed whether there could be a reference to IFLA *Names of Persons* instead of specific instructions in RDA. The JSC decided not to do this as *Names of Persons* had not been updated since 1996 and so is not always authoritative. The JSC decided to retain the AACR2 instructions for personal names in certain languages for consistency with current practice, but to move them all to an Appendix. This might be re-visited if *Name of Persons* is updated after RDA’s release.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

183.4 Sources of information

- 183.4.1 Cover letter: The general instructions on sources of information at 9.0.2.1 and 9.0.2.2 (repeated at 9.2.0.2 .1 and 9.2.0.2.2) need to be reviewed (see Barbara Tillett’s comments at 9.0.2.1 and 9.0.2.2). Instructions on sources of information given under 9.3-9.23 will also have to be reviewed after decisions are made on the general instructions under 9.0.2.

The JSC decided to change “Determine the name by which a person is commonly known from the preferred sources of information (see 2.2.1) for works by that person issued in his or her language.” to “Determine the name by which a person is commonly known from resources associated with the person issued in his or her language.” The decision was made because the instruction went beyond what was found in IME ICC. This change will be made everywhere that the phrase occurs in chapters 9-11. The Editor noted that the issue of language preference still needed to be discussed. The JSC further decided to combine 9.0.2.1 and 9.0.2.2 into one paragraph giving an order of preference of a) resources associated with the person, b) reference sources. (Note: see 5JSC/M/183.46 for later decisions.)

**Action=Editor**

183.5 Required elements

- 183.5.1 Cover letter: The labelling of elements and element sub-types as either “required” or “optional” has been omitted pending review and decisions on required elements for Part B (see 5JSC/ACOC rep/1)

The Editor noted this would be discussed later in the meeting (see 5JSC/M/191.3).

183.6 Terminology

- 183.6.1 Cover letter: In general, changes in terminology have been made as suggested by Barbara Tillett. However, the suggested replacement of “in the vernacular” by “in the original language” is problematic, as the term “vernacular” has a number of meanings, depending on the context in which it is used. JSC needs to review the use of the term “vernacular” and make decisions on appropriate substitutions in the following instructions: 9.2.2.2.4a.1, 9.2.2.2.4a.2, 9.2.2.2.4b.2, 9.2.8.1.2, 9.5.0.5.1, 9.5.0.8.1, 9.24.2.1.1, and 9.24.10.3.1)

The Editor said that he would recheck all of the instructions.

**Action=Editor**

183.7 Punctuation

- 183.7.1 Cover letter: A number of instructions specify the punctuation to be used within an element (e.g., the comma preceding parts of a name following a surname recorded as the first element). However, there are no instructions given under 9.1.1 on the punctuation to be used when adding a person’s title, dates, fuller form of name, or other distinguishing term to the name when constructing a preferred access point. JSC will need to decide whether instructions on preceding or enclosing punctuation for such elements used as additions to the name in an access point should be included in appendix E.

The Chair confirmed that the JSC was willing to put into Appendix E those aspects of presentation that were being carried forward from AACR2 (including punctuation).

**Action=Editor**

Barbara Tillett said that she wanted to raise the issue of why there were elements and sub-elements as opposed to parts of the preferred name. The Editor said that if something was an attribute in FRBR or FRAD it was an element in RDA. He added that this was why date associated with the person was a separate element. Barbara Tillett suggested that in the transitional period from AACR2 to RDA, date (and other elements) should be considered as sub-elements of the preferred name. The Editor said that to treat the access point as one element would embed a bias towards certain implementation scenarios. He said that with separate elements it would be possible in the future to assemble a preferred name “on-the-fly”. He added that the Appendix on presentation would show examples of a pre-assembled access point.

183.8 9.0.1. Purpose and scope

183.8.1 Cover letter: The appropriateness of the reference to non-European languages at 9.0.1.2 has been questioned. (See Alan Danskin’s comments at 9.0.1.2.)

The Editor noted that the decision had already been made to move language-specific instructions to an Appendix (5JSC/M/183.3.1). He said that the issue was whether they should be characterised as “non-European” languages. The JSC decided that the reference to the Appendix would refer to “names in specific languages”.

**Action=Editor**

183.9 9.0.2. Sources of information

183.9.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the instruction at 9.0.2.3 should make it clear that that the coverage of names in non-roman scripts is not complete. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 9.0.1.2.) (See also Alan Danskin’s comment at 9.9.0.)

The JSC decided to defer the discussion on language and script (see 5JSC/M/185.9.11).

183.10 9.1.1.1. General guidelines on constructing preferred access points for persons

183.10.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the “However ...” clause be deleted from the instruction at 9.1.1.1.5. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 9.8.7.3.)

The JSC discussed 9.1.1.1.5 which is based on AACR2 22.18A. It lists a number of cases where the fuller form of the name is not added to a heading, i.e., “unused forenames to access points that contain forenames; initials of names that are not part of the access point; unused parts of surnames to access points that contain surnames”. The JSC decided to remove the provisions because they are unnecessarily complex. The decision was made with the understanding that this would be a prospective change and it would not be necessary to change existing headings.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

183.10.2 The Chair noted that Examples Group 2 had queried the lack of a hyphen in the example “Smith, John, 1924” at 9.1.1.1.3 as it was an open date.

The JSC agreed that there should be a hyphen, and it would be justified by the Appendix on display.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

183.11 9.2.1.1. Choosing among different names for the same person

183.11.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the idea of separate identities be introduced at 9.2.1.1. (See Deirdre Kiorgaard's comment at 9.1.1.1-9.1.1.2.)

Barbara Tillett said that she agreed with the Chair, and noted that this concept from AACR2 would be included in IME ICC. The JSC decided to add a definition of "person" to 9.0.1 and include the concept of "persona" (and to do the equivalent for chapters 10 and 11). The JSC also decided to add a new paragraph at 9.2.0.3 explaining that there can be more than one person even when there is only one human being.

**Action=Editor**

183.11.2 Cover letter: A question has been raised as to whether the instructions under 9.2.1.1 can be harmonized with those at 9.2.1.2.1e.1. (See Deirdre Kiorgaard's comment at 9.1.1.1 and 9.1.1.2.1e.1)

The Chair asked for the rationale for the difference between the two instructions. The Editor noted that one was dealing with the predominant name and the other with pseudonyms. The JSC decided that the instructions for pseudonyms at 9.2.1.2.1e.1 were pragmatic and did not need to be harmonized.

183.12 9.2.1.2. Pseudonyms

183.12.1 Cover letter: The meaning of "contemporary" in the instruction at 9.2.1.2.1d.1 has been questioned. (See Barbara Tillett's comment at 9.1.1.2.1d.)

The JSC decided to collapse the instructions for pseudonyms, as the distinctions no longer need to be made. The revised instruction will read: "If a person uses one or more pseudonyms, or his or her real name as well as one or more pseudonyms, choose the name associated with each identity as the preferred name for that identity" (Note: see also 5JSC/M/185.19.1). [Post meeting note: This decision was later substantially modified by the JSC, and that later decision is reflected in the December 2007 draft of Sections 2-4,9.]

**Action=Editor**

John Attig suggested that the examples currently under 9.2.1.2.1e.1 would need to be researched. He said that he would prefer that the "Author of Mr. Sponge's sporting tour" example not be carried forward.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

183.13 9.2.1.3. Change of name

183.13.1 Cover letter: The instruction at 9.2.1.3.1 ("unless there is reason to believe that an earlier name that will persist as the name by which the person is better known") has been questioned, and a different instruction has been suggested. (See Barbara Tillett's comment at 9.1.1.3.1.)

Barbara Tillett said that she did not want to pursue the issue.

183.14 9.2.2.2. Language

- 183.14.1 Cover letter: The instructions at 9.2.2.2.1 and 9.2.2.2.4a.1 do not conform to the current draft of the IME-ICC Statement of International Cataloguing Principles. (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 9.1.2.2.1 and 9.1.2.2.4a.1.)

It was noted that the emphasis in IME ICC 5.1.3 is on the language of the users of the catalogue. John Attig commented that 9.2.2.2.1 ("If the name of a person who has used more than one language appears [in] resources associated with the person in different language forms, choose the form corresponding to the language of most of the resources as the preferred name.") was consistent neither with the IME ICC or with current practice to give preference to the original language. The JSC discussed the issue, and agreed to return to it later in the meeting (see 5JSC/M/185.10.1).

- 183.14.2 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed converting the A.D. date reference in the instruction at 9.2.2.2.4a.2 to a C.E. date reference. (See recommendation 6 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC decided not to make the change, as it would only partly achieve internationalization and there would still be a bias towards the Western calendar (see also 5JSC/M/183.27.1).

- 183.14.3 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed changing "English form" and "English-language reference sources" in the instruction at 9.2.2.2.4b.1 to "a form in the language of the cataloguing agency" and "reference sources in the language of the cataloguing agency", respectively. (See recommendation 3 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The Editor noted that the generic decision had already been made (5JSC/M/180.9.1). He asked about the Roman alphabet bias. The Chair confirmed that names would be established in the language and script preferred by the agency.

**Action=Editor**

- 183.15 9.2.2.3. Names written in a non-roman script

- 183.15.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has suggested rewriting the instructions under 9.2.2.3 to record the name in the script in which it is found with an option to record it in a transliterated form. (See the recommendation at 9.1.2.3 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

Discussed earlier in the meeting (5JSC/M/182.8.1).

- 183.15.2 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed changing "English-language reference sources" and "English-language form" in the instructions at 9.2.2.3.1a.1 and 9.2.2.3.1a.2 to "reference sources in the language of the cataloguing agency" and "a form in the language of the cataloguing agency", respectively. (See recommendation 3 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

Discussed earlier in the meeting (5JSC/M/180.9.1).

- 183.15.3 Cover letter: Questions have been raised about the background to the instruction at 9.2.2.3.1b.5 and whether it can be deleted. (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 9.1.2.3.1b.5.) (See also the recommendation at 9.1.2.3.1b.5 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC agreed to delete 9.2.2.3.1b.5 as it is unnecessary “case law”: “In case of doubt as to which of two or more languages written in the Arabic script should be used for the romanization, base the choice on the nationality of the person or the language of the area of residence or activity. If these criteria do not apply, choose (in this order of preference): Urdu, Arabic, Persian, any other language.”

**Action=Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 22.3C2)**

183.16 9.2.2.4. Spelling

183.16.1 Cover letter: A revision to the instructions at 9.2.2.4.1 and 9.2.2.4.2 has been suggested, to choose the form found on the first resource catalogued in all cases. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 9.1.2.4.1.)

The JSC agreed that preference would be given to the spelling found in the first resource catalogued. It was noted that in a shared cataloguing situation this would be the first one in the shared file. [Post meeting note: This decision was later modified by the JSC to “the form found in the first resource received”.]

**Action=Editor**

183.16.2 Cover letter: Questions have been raised about the placement and application of the instruction at 9.2.2.4.3. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 9.1.2.4.3.)

The Chair noted that this was moot based on the previous discussion.

183.17 9.2.3.1. General guidelines on recording names containing a surname

183.17.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed making the use of the comma optional after the surname if the surname is the first part of the name. (See the recommendation at 9.2.0.2.2 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

Although the JSC agreed in principle that to remove this provision (from AACR2 rule 22.4B2) would bring the form of name in line with cultural practice, the change will not be made in the first release of RDA. This is because change to existing headings will be very costly, as names would have to be assessed on an individual basis to see if the first part of the name is in fact a surname.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

The JSC decided that it would be useful to have a list of the changes deferred for consideration after the first release of RDA on the JSC Web site. The Secretary suggested that it could be linked to from the section on “Submitting proposals to revise AACR”.

**Action=Secretary**

183.18 9.2.3.3. Part of the name other than the first treated as a surname

183.18.1 Cover letter: Could the caption at 9.2.3.3 be changed to read: “Part of the name functioning as a surname”?

The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

183.18.2 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed clarifying the terminology in footnote 6, and including the footnote as a reference within the instruction at 9.2.3.3.1. (See the

recommendation at 9.3.1 footnote 6 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The Editor noted that the instructions referred to in the footnote would be moving to an Appendix. The JSC agreed to include the following reference as instruction 9.2.3.3.2: “For additional guidance for names in the Arabic alphabet and certain Indonesian and Malay names see Appendix X.”

**Action=Editor**

183.19 9.2.3.4. Persons known by a surname only

183.19.1 Cover letter: The instructions derived from AACR2 rule 22.15A have been reworded and transferred from the section on additions to names in the September 2006 draft (at 9.8.4.1.1 and 9.8.4.1.2) to the general guidelines on recording names containing a surname (at 9.2.3.4.1 and 9.2.3.4.2). The instruction derived from AACR2 rule 22.1C (included in the basic instructions on choosing the preferred name at 9.1.0.3.3 in the September 2006 draft) has been deleted. JSC needs to confirm that a word or phrase associated with a name of a person known by a surname only should be treated as an integral part of the name.

The Editor noted that whatever was decided would have an impact on MARC 21 coding, i.e., whether subfield \$c was used. The JSC agreed that a term of address associated with a person known by a surname only would be consistently treated as an integral part of the name.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of MARC 21 issues); Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

Barbara Tillett asked why these names were inverted at all, as this was a card catalogue convention. She added that in effect, the associated word was being treated as a forename. The Editor asked how you would distinguish a phrase incorporating a surname from a surname with a term of address. John Attig commented that forenames with additions were treated as phrases, e.g., “Poor Richard”. It was noted that according to 9.2.16, “Dr. X” was treated as a direct order phrase, but that according to 9.2.3.4 “Dr. Seuss” was inverted. Although it was acknowledged that direct order would not always be desirable, the JSC agreed to add this to the list of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

183.20 9.2.3.5. Married woman identified only by her husband’s name

183.20.1 Cover letter: The instructions derived from AACR2 rules 22.15B1 and 22.15B2 have been reworded and transferred from the section on additions to names in the September 2006 draft (at 9.8.4.2.1 and 9.8.4.2.2) to the general guidelines on recording names containing a surname (at 9.2.3.5.1 and 9.2.3.5.2). The instruction derived from AACR2 rule 22.1C (included in the basic instructions on choosing the preferred name at 9.1.0.3.3 in the September 2006 draft) has been deleted. JSC needs to confirm that a term of address for a woman identified only by her husband’s name should be treated as an integral part of the name.

The JSC agreed that a term of address associated with a married woman identified by her husband’s name would be consistently treated as an integral part of the name.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of MARC 21 issues); Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

- 183.20.2 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed generalizing the instruction relating to Hungarian names to apply to any language having such enclitics. (See the recommendation at 9.8.4.2.2 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC agreed to generalise 9.2.3.5.2 to “Include an enclitic attached to the name of a married women”.

**Action=Editor**

- 183.21 9.2.4.2. Preferred or established form known

- 183.21.1 Cover letter: Is it appropriate to specify references sources “in the person’s language or country of residence or activity” in the instruction at 9.2.4.2.1?

The JSC decided that no change was required.

- 183.22 9.2.5.1. Articles and prepositions

- 183.22.1 Cover letter: Is it appropriate to specify references sources “in the person’s language or country of residence” in the instructions at 9.2.5.1.1 and 9.2.5.1.2?

The JSC decided that no change was required.

- 183.22.2 Cover letter: Is it appropriate to specify following the instructions for English if English is one of the languages used by the person in the instruction at 9.2.5.1.3? (See Deirdre Kiorgaard’s comment at 9.3.3.1.)

The Chair said that she did not want to pursue the issue.

- 183.23 9.2.8.1. General guidelines on recording names containing a title of nobility

- 183.23.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding terms of rank in other countries to footnote 11. (See the recommendation at 9.4.0.1.2 footnote 10 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC decided to ask for suggestions for additions to the list in the cover letter for Part B.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

- 183.24 9.2.9. Titles in the United Kingdom peerage that include a territorial designation

- 183.24.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding instructions for other jurisdictions having titles of nobility. (See the recommendation at 9.4.1 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC decided to ask for suggestions for additions in the cover letter for Part B. The Chair said that the JSC would need to decide what to do with the advice it received.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

- 183.25 9.2.12.1. General guidelines on recording names containing neither a surname nor a title of nobility

- 183.25.1 Cover letter: The “Judas Iscariot” example under 9.2.12.1.2 has been questioned. The practice of using a comma to precede words or phrases associated with the name has also been questioned. (See Barbara Tillett’s comment and questions at 9.5.0.1.2)

The JSC decided that the “Judas Iscariot” example would be omitted, as it is misleading.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

The JSC agreed that it might be more appropriate not to precede words or phrases associated with the name with a comma. The JSC decided to consider this after the first release of RDA.

**Action= Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

- 183.26 9.2.13. Names including a patronymic

- 183.26.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding references to Romanian names and to other instructions in which patronymics are mentioned. (See the recommendation at 9.5.1.1 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The Editor said that he would add a reference to the Appendix that would name all of the relevant languages.

**Action=Editor**

- 183.27 9.4.0.3. General guidelines on recording dates associated with persons

- 183.27.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed converting the B.C. date reference to a C.E. date reference in the instruction at 9.4.0.3.1. (See recommendation 6 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC decided to change the instruction to refer to the calendar preferred by the agency, and to move the existing 9.4.0.3.1 to the footnote. The Editor noted that in chapter 2 there was still a bias towards the Julian and Gregorian calendars. It was noted that the calendar used could be indicated in the record by means of “data about data”. [Post meeting note: 9.4.0.3.1 (“Record dates in terms of the Christian era. Add *B.C.* when appropriate. Record dates from 1582 on in terms of the Gregorian calendar.”) was not moved to the footnote. The JSC needs to decide what is appropriate to include in RDA.]

**Action=Editor; JSC (Discuss calendar in chapter 2 and “data about data”; Discuss instructions on adding “B.C.” to dates)**

The JSC agreed that although it would be more culturally sensitive to use “B.C.E.”, the dates would still reflect the Christian calendar. The JSC decided to consider the wider issues after the first release of RDA.

**Action= Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

- 183.28 9.4.2.3 Recording date of death

- 183.28.1 In response to a request for clarification from Examples Group 2, the JSC agreed to change 9.4.2.3.1 to begin: “Record the date of death of a deceased person ...”

**Action=Editor**

- 183.28.2 The Editor noted that although FRAD only had one element for “dates associated with the person”, he had split this into separate sub elements. The Chair confirmed that this was acceptable. It was suggested that this be included in the cover letter for Part B.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

183.28.3 The JSC decided to change 9.4.2.3.2 to read: “If the person’s actual, probable, or approximate year of death is unknown, record *not known*”. The Editor said that he would make the same change for date of birth. He noted that this could be suppressed in the construction of an access point.

**Action=Editor**

183.29 9.4.3.3. Recording period of activity

183.29.1 Cover letter: The second example under 9.4.3.3.1 does not appear to be covered by the instruction.

The Editor noted that the second example contained a single date, so it was not a period of activity. The JSC agreed to change the instruction to read: “If the person’s date of birth and date of death are both unknown, record a date or range of dates indicative of a period of activity ...”

**Action=Editor**

183.30 9.5.0.4. Titles of royalty

183.30.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed changing “in English” in the instructions at 9.5.0.4.1a.1, 9.5.0.4.1b.1, 9.5.0.4.1c.1, and 9.5.0.4.1c.2 to “in a form in the language of the cataloguing agency”. (See recommendation 3 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The Chair noted that the general decision to use the language preferred by the agency would apply. The JSC agreed that the instruction would read: “For the person with the highest royal status within a state or people, record the person’s title and the name of the state or people both in the language preferred by the agency preparing the data if there is a satisfactory equivalent in that language.” John Attig asked if it should be “language and script”. The Editor suggested that you could assume that people would be following the general instructions on script, which had two alternatives. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

183.31 9.5.0.5. Titles of nobility

183.31.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding information about titles of nobility in other jurisdictions to footnote 14. (See the recommendation at 9.8.1.1 footnote 6 [sic] under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC decided to ask for suggestions for additions in the cover letter for Part B.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

183.32 9.5.0.7. Bishops, etc.

183.32.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed changing “in English” in the instructions at 9.5.0.7.1 and 9.5.0.7.2 to “in a form in the language of the cataloguing agency”. (See recommendation 3 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC agreed to follow the decision made previously. The Editor noted that the instruction at 9.5.0.7.2 actually specified English terms such as “Archbishop”. The JSC decided that these would be retained, and any translations of RDA could replace them as needed.

**Action=Editor**

## 183.33 9.5.0.8. Other persons of religious vocation

183.33.1 Cover letter: According to the instructions under 9.5.0.8 (derived from AACR2 rule 22.16D1), a term of address for a person of religious vocation is to be treated as a title of the person, not as a part of the name. JSC needs to determine whether to continue to treat such terms of address as a separate element in all cases, or to include them as an integral part of the name when the name consists only of a given name, similar to the terms covered under 9.2.12.

The JSC decided to continue to treat terms of address for a person of religious vocation as additions to the name. However, because of the inconsistency with 9.2.12, the JSC added this to the list of issues for consideration after the first release.

**Action= Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

183.33.2 Cover letter: Is the instruction at 9.5.0.8.1 specifying the use of spellings found in English-language dictionaries valid?

The JSC agreed to change this to refer to the language preferred by the agency.

**Action=Editor**

183.33.3 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding information about non-Christian religious orders or generalizing the instruction to apply to any religious order. (See the recommendation at 9.8.5.4.3 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC decided to ask for suggestions for additions in the cover letter for Part B.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

## 183.34 9.7.0.4. Saints

183.34.1 Cover letter: According to the instructions under 9.7.0.4 (derived from AACR2 rule 22.13A), the term “Saint” is to be treated as a designation associated with the name, not as a part of the name. JSC needs to determine whether to continue to treat the term as a separate element in all cases, or to include it as an integral part of the name when the name consists only of a given name, similar to the terms covered under 9.2.12.

The JSC agreed that “Saint” would continue to be treated as an addition to a name. The JSC decided that the examples were not required, as they just repeated what was in the instruction. The Editor said that he would make it clearer earlier in the instructions that “Saint” is not part of the name.

**Action=Examples Group 2; Editor**

## 183.35 9.7.0.6. Distinguishing term for a person known by a given name, etc.

183.35.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed deleting the instruction under 9.7.0.6. (See the recommendation at 9.8.8.1 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC agreed that the instruction at 9.7.0.6 (For a person who is known only by a given name, etc., record a suitable brief distinguishing term) could be deleted as it was covered by 9.16 (Field of activity of the person), 9.17 (Profession / occupation) and 9.5.0.7 (Bishops, etc.).

**Action=Editor**

183.36 9.7.0.7. Distinguishing term for a person whose name includes a surname

183.36.1 Cover letter: The “Jr.” example under 9.7.0.7.1 has been questioned. JSC needs to decide whether terms such as “Jr.” should be treated as distinguishing terms (i.e., as a separate element) or as an integral part of the name. (See Barbara Tillett’s comment at 9.8.8.2.2.)

It was suggested that people who use terms such as “Jr.” identify themselves this way and users may look for them with the term included. The JSC decided that in RDA there would be no instruction to omit terms such as “Jr.” when making additions to distinguish names. It was noted that this would also mean a change to 9.2.4.8.2. The decision was made with the understanding that changes will be prospective not retrospective. The JSC agreed to move an example using “Jr.” to the basic rule.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes – 22.15C)**

183.37 9.7.0.8. Distinguishing term for a person whose name consists of a phrase or appellation not conveying the ideas of a person

183.37.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed changing “in English” in the instruction at 9.7.0.8.1 and 9.5.0.7.2 to “in a form in the language of the cataloguing agency”. (See recommendation 3 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC confirmed the general decision.

**Action=Editor**

183.38 9.8 Gender

183.38.1 The Chair noted that Examples Group 2 had queried the implications of the instruction: “Record the gender by which the person is identified ...” The JSC decided to change this to: “Record the gender the person identifies with ...” The definition of gender was changed to “Gender is the gender with which a person identifies.”

**Action=Editor**

183.38.2 The Editor explained that the list of values for gender was taken from UNIMARC Authorities. The JSC agreed to issue the draft with the values “female”, “male”, “other”, and “not known” and to ask for comment in the cover letter of the draft of Part B.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

183.39 9.15.0.3. Recording language of the person

183.39.1 Cover letter: Should the instruction include a reference to a controlled list of terms for languages?

The JSC decided that RDA will refer to the ISO 639-2 list of language names and JSC would develop an RDA list after the first release.

**Action= Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

183.40 9.24.0. Basic instructions for names in certain languages

183.40.1 Cover letter: The references to language and script in the instruction at 9.24.0.1 have been questioned. (See Alan Danskin’s comment at 9.9.0.1.1.)

It was noted that it had already been agreed to move the specific instructions to an Appendix (5JSC/M/183.3.1).

183.41 9.24.1-9.24.10. Additional instructions for names in certain languages

183.41.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that all the instructions under 9.24.1-9.24.10 be omitted. (See Alan Danskin's comment at 9.9.0.)

It was noted that it had already been agreed to move the specific instructions to an Appendix (5JSC/M/183.3.1).

183.42 9.24.1. Names in the Arabic alphabet

183.42.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the references in footnote 18 should either be hyperlinked or moved to a separate listing of reference sources and posted on the JSC web site. (See Barbara Tillett's comment at 9.9.1 footnote.)

The JSC agreed that the references should be included in the list of resources being prepared by ALA. John Attig said that he would include this in the charge for the ALA group

**Action=ALA representative; ALA**

183.43 9.24.6.7. Titles

183.43.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the lists of titles, etc., in footnote 22 should be moved to a new appendix. (See Barbara Tillett's comment at 9.9.6.7 footnote.)

The JSC decided that all lists of titles of honour, etc. would be included in an Appendix.

**Action=Editor**

183.44 9.24.8. Roman names

183.44.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed converting the A.D. date reference in the instruction at 9.24.8.1 to a C.E. date reference. (See recommendation 6 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

In line with the previous decision (5JSC/M/183.27.1), the JSC confirmed that no change would be made.

183.45 The Chair asked if the JSC members had any other comments they wished to raise regarding the draft chapter 9.

183.46 Sources of information

183.46.1 Barbara Tillett said in 9.0.2.1 that statement of responsibility in associated resources needed to be given priority. The Editor noted that the previous day the reference to 2.2.1 had been eliminated (5JSC/M/183.4.1).

183.46.2 The JSC decided to include the following preferred order at 9.0.2.1 and 9.2.0.2: a) preferred sources of information (see 2.2.1) in resources associated with the person; b) other sources within the resource; c) other sources.

**Action=Editor**

183.46.3 The JSC agreed that the existing 9.0.2.2 would be deleted.

**Action=Editor**

- 183.46.4 The JSC agreed that there should be a new 9.0.2.2 which paralleled 9.3.0.2 (Take variant names from resources associated with the person and/or from reference sources.).  
**Action=Editor**
- 183.47 9.2.2.3 Names written in a non-roman script
- 183.47.1 John Attig queried the following sentence at 9.2.2.3.1b1: “Add vowels to names that are not vocalized.” The JSC decided that the phrase should be deleted as it would be covered by the transliteration scheme.  
**Action=Editor**
- 183.48 9.2.4.2 Preferred or established form known
- 183.48.1 John Attig asked what “established” meant in this context, did it mean common usage, or how the name was set up in an authority file. The Editor noted that the caption was taken from AACR2 (22.5C2). The JSC decided to use the caption “Established usage” with the understanding that this was either established by the person, or by reference sources, as both were covered by the instruction.  
**Action=Editor**
- 183.49 9.4.1.3 Recording date of birth
- 183.49.1 John Attig noted that 9.4.1.3.2 said to “record the date of birth in the form *[year] [month] [day]*” He asked if there should be an indication of language. The Chair suggested that the JSC follow any previous decision made for chapter 2, and if none had been made, discuss the issue.  
**Action=JSC (Discuss form of date of birth)**
- 183.50 9.19 Identifier for the person
- 183.50.1 Margaret Stewart said that she thought that this element would be confusing for people. The Editor said that it had been included to make provision for the future and allow for party identifiers. The JSC considered whether 9.19 would cover record identifiers and decided to leave it open until later in the meeting when the JSC would discuss whether record control numbers were considered identifiers. (Note: this was not discussed during the meeting.)  
**Action=JSC (Discuss record identifiers)**
- 183.50.2 The JSC agreed to include explanatory text in the cover letter for Part B.  
**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**
- 183.50.3 Kathy Winzer asked about what examples should be included. The Chair said that it would depend on the decision made about record control numbers, but the Group did not need to force an example.

**184 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 10 – Families**

- 184.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 10  
5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1
- 184.2 The Chair noted that the last time instructions for families had been discussed LC had expressed some reservations. She added that 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1 had been prepared to assist in addressing the issues.
- 184.3 John Attig said that he had sent the document to Larry Creider at the University of New Mexico who has a long-standing interest in the topic. He added that an article by Creider was soon to be published in *Library Resources and Technical Services*, and that he would send the citation to the JSC. The Chair noted that an ACOC member, Philip Hider, is also about to publish an article on family names.  
**Action=ALA representative**
- 184.4 Margaret Stewart explained that 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1 consisted of two parts, a discussion guide, and a revised version of chapter 10. She then led a discussion on the issues raised in the guide.
- 184.5 10.0.1.1 Definition of family
- 184.5.1 Barbara Tillett said that she was concerned about the phrase “who otherwise present themselves as a family” used in the definition in the revised chapter: “A family is two or more persons related by birth, marriage, adoption, or similar legal status, or who otherwise present themselves as a family.” She added that there were a number of corporate bodies (including performers) that presented themselves as a family. The Editor noted that the phrase came from FRAD.
- 184.5.2 John Attig said that a related issue is that families have flexible or ill-defined boundaries. He added that resources focused on different parts of a family tree. He said that the JSC would either have to make arbitrary decisions about where to draw the boundaries, or live with the ambiguity. Barbara Tillett noted that instructions for families were originally introduced to accommodate the archival community, but in the archival community families were defined in each archive independently. John Attig agreed that it was resource dependent.
- 184.5.3 The Chair said that the issue of corporate bodies that use the term “family” in their name was still to be resolved. Hugh Taylor asked what the phrase “otherwise present themselves as a family” was meant to accommodate. The Editor suggested that it would cover same-sex partnerships that did not have a legal status. The Chair said that she thought it meant that if members of a family did not present themselves as a family they would be treated as individuals.
- 184.5.4 Barbara Tillett said that she did not think that the JSC had the time to resolve the problems with the definition. The JSC decided to continue the exercise of discussing the issues. Hugh Taylor said that he thought there was a need for instructions on families. The Chair said that she thought that families were even more important with the new structure for RDA. Barbara Tillett suggested that there could be a placeholder. Alan Danskin said that he thought that families should be included for compatibility with other communities. Margaret Stewart said that if the issues could be worked through in a realistic time frame,

she would like to include instructions on families in RDA. John Attig said that he would also like to include families, but there were big issues that needed to be dealt with.

184.6 10.0.1.2 Related standards

184.6.1 Margaret Stewart noted that a selection of standards for possible inclusion had been given in the revised draft. The JSC decided that these standards should be included in the list being prepared by ALA, and a reference made to that list.

**Action=ALA; Editor**

184.7 10.0.2 Sources of information, and 10.2.0.2 Sources of information (Preferred name), and 10.2.1.1 Preferred name - Predominant name

184.7.1 Margaret Stewart suggested that the JSC discuss the wording at 10.0.2.1: “Determine the name by which a family is commonly known from (in order of preference): a) preferred sources of information (see 2.2.1) for works by that family in their language; b) reference sources issued in the language or country of residence or activity of the family.”

184.7.2 The Editor noted that in chapter 9 “works by” had been replaced by “resources associated with” and other changes had been made. The JSC agreed that the wording should parallel that in chapter 9 (5JSC/M/183.46).

**Action=Editor**

184.7.3 John Attig noted that in the discussion guide there was a question (originating from ALA) about using finding aids as reference sources. He added that he thought finding aids were covered by reference sources, and that nothing needed to be added to the footnote.

184.8 10.1.1 Preferred access point

184.8.1 Margaret Stewart said that the issue was how to distinguish identical family names. Barbara Tillett said that she did not think the draft instructions went far enough. Alan Danskin said that you needed to say what kind of attributes can be used to differentiate, and that as many as are required should be used to make the name unique. John Attig noted that 10.1.1.1.3 told you what to add, but it did not relate back to the definition of family, specifically what groups you are trying to distinguish. The Editor suggested that this could be resolved by referring to identities as was done in chapter 9.

184.8.2 The Chair said that as a personal comment, she did not think that a large number of family names would be established initially, and that this issue should not prevent the JSC moving forward. John Attig said that he would be satisfied with what was in the 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1 draft and an identities section.

184.8.3 The Editor noted that use of “another distinguishing term” had been included in the 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1 draft. He added that this referred to 10.7 (Family History), and he did not think that it was legitimate to include family history in an access point. The Chair commented that in a previous version of the chapter, 10.7 had covered other distinguishing terms. The Editor said that FRAD defined the following attributes for family: type of family, date of family, place associated with family, and history of family.

184.8.4 Margaret Stewart noted that NCA said: “If a family is associated with a particular trade or occupation over several generations, include this information in the epithet.” Barbara Tillett commented that you could also distinguish by giving the name of the progenitor. The Editor suggested that if date and place did not provide enough information, the user

could read the full family history. He added that a burden was being put on the access point, but in scenario 1, there would be a link to the entire access point control record. John Attig said that he agreed that the principle of differentiation did not have to be met entirely by the access point.

184.9 10.2.1.2 Change of name

184.9.1 Margaret Stewart noted that as the draft was written, the latest name of a family would be used, rather than earlier and later forms being established separately. She suggested that it was a question of whether there were different identities or one that changes over time. John Attig noted that the issue of one identity with variants was slightly different.

184.9.2 After discussion, the JSC agreed to revise 10.2.1.2 as suggested in 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1: “choose the new name as the preferred name for use with resources issued under that name.”

**Action=Editor**

184.10 10.2.4 Titles of nobility

184.10.1 Alan Danskin noted that titles of nobility moved between families over time, e.g., the Earls of Moray. The Editor suggested that titles of nobility be demoted from preferred names to variant names, and that there be a new element added for hereditary titles that were passed down through a family. The JSC agreed. Barbara Tillett asked if it could be expanded beyond the United Kingdom to make it more international. The Editor said that the instruction at 10.2.4.1.2 referred to chapter 9 instructions and it had been agreed to broaden those instructions the previous day (5JSC/M/183.24).

**Action=Editor**

184.11 10.4 Type of family

184.11.1 The Chair said that the JSC was being asked to confirm that it agreed with having “Type of family” as a separate element as it was in 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 10. The JSC agreed.

184.11.2 The Editor confirmed that type of family would be the first addition to an access point. He asked what would happen about punctuation used in display, as there was no precedent in AACR2. The Chair commented that RDA is not concerned with presentation, and that what was in AACR2 was only being carried forward when there was no other presentation format. The JSC decided not to include anything for additions to family names in the Appendix on display. John Attig asked what would be used in examples of complete access points. The Chair said that the examples could show a variety of punctuation.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

184.11.3 Barbara Tillett suggested that the caption could say that an element could be used as an addition to access points. The Editor said that this would be embedding a record structure which relied on the presence of access points. He suggested that he could add an instruction such as “For use of this element as an addition to an access point, see 9. 1 (etc.)”. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

184.11.4 The JSC decided to make the list of terms for type of family a controlled list. The JSC agreed to invite suggestions for additions in the cover letter for the draft of Part B.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

184.11.5 The Chair said that she would like to see definitions for terms such as “clan” as it was not only used for Scottish clans. The Editor commented that it had been agreed earlier in the meeting that it would not be possible to have definitions for all terms in controlled lists in the first release of RDA (5JSC/M/Restricted/172.3.5).

**Action=Glossary Editor (Part B)**

184.12 Family names based on personal names

184.12.1 Margaret Stewart said that the JSC needed to consider whether RDA should provide for family names based on personal names. John Attig noted that this was not a FRAD attribute. Margaret Stewart commented that it was allowed in RAD for prominent members of a family. The JSC agreed to add an additional element for prominent member of the family.

184.12.2 The JSC agreed that the order for additions to family names would be: type of family; date associated with the family; place associated with the family; prominent member of the family. It was agreed that “type of family” would always be added, and the others used as needed for differentiation.

**Action=Editor**

184.13 Family names not based on surnames

184.13.1 The JSC decided that this would not be pursued for the first release of RDA.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

184.14 The JSC decided to include instructions for families in RDA, and to continue to work on the definition of “family”. The Editor suggested that the CCC representative and ACOC representative look at definitions of “family” outside of archival standards. It was also agreed to check the definition of “family” in the next draft of FRAD.

**Action=CCC representative and ACOC representative; JSC**

184.15 Barbara Tillett expressed her appreciation for the work expended by the ACOC representative and CCC representative in preparing 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1. The other JSC members agreed.

## **185 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 11 – Corporate bodies**

185.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 11

185.2 The Chair explained that each section of the chapter would be discussed in turn, and that the Editor would raise any issues from the cover letter that required resolution.

185.3 11.0 Purpose, scope, etc.

185.3.1 Barbara Tillett said that she thought it would be useful to explain in this section that some attributes are additions to the name, and others are part of the authority record. The Editor noted that it had been agreed during the discussion of chapter 10 to have references back to the instructions on constructing access points (5JSC/M/184.11.3). He said that he would do the same for this chapter.

**Action=Editor**

185.3.2 The Editor said that he would add a definition of corporate body to the chapter.

**Action=Editor**

## 185.4 11.1 Constructing access points for corporate bodies

185.4.1 Barbara Tillett said that it needed to be made clear that 11.1.1.2-11.1.1.3 and 11.1.1.5-11.1.1.7 were only to be applied to resolve a conflict. Hugh Taylor said that because of the optional addition at 11.1.1.4 this would not always be the case: “Add such a word or phrase to any other name if the addition assists in the understanding of the nature or purpose of the body.” It was noted that the caption at rule 24.4C in AACR2 was missing from RDA: “Two or more bodies with the same or similar names”. The JSC agreed to elevate 11.1.1.3 to its own heading and make 11.1.1.2-11.1.1.7 sub points underneath it.

**Action=Editor**

## 185.5 11.1.1.2. Place associated with the body

185.5.1 The Editor said that the LC representative had suggested that an exception that was formerly at 11.2.2.1.3 be deleted. He added that with the restructuring of the instructions on additions to names of corporate bodies under 11.1.1, the exception per se had been deleted. The Editor explained that the result was that a term indicating type of jurisdiction would only be used as an addition to the name of a government other than a city or town, and would not be used when a place name is used as an addition to the name of another body. He said that what was being added was a place rather than a jurisdiction. The JSC confirmed that this was acceptable.

## 185.6 11.2.0.8. Terms indicating incorporation and certain other terms

185.6.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed changing the instruction at 11.2.0.8.2 so as not to transpose the term indicating incorporation, etc. (See recommendation at 11.1.0.5.2 and 11.1.0.5.3 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.).

Barbara Tillett explained that this instruction (originating with AACR2 24.5C2) went against the principle of “take what you see”. Judy Kuhagen said that it was making names in other languages follow English language order. She added that publisher-supplied metadata would be unlikely to follow this convention. It was noted that 11.2.0.8.1 (from AACR2 24.5C1), which says to omit certain terms, was problematic for similar reasons. The JSC discussed the issue, and decided that it might be confusing to catalogue users if this change was only made prospectively. The JSC decided to consider changes to all of 11.2.0.8 after the first release of RDA.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

## 185.7 11.2.0.6 Initial articles

185.7.1 John Attig said that he wanted to confirm that initial articles were to be omitted. It was suggested that this was actually a presentation issue, but that many library systems cannot handle the existing MARC 21 option to use the “non-sort begin” and “non-sort end” characters. The JSC decided that the instruction would remain as a concession to the current state of library management systems.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA; List of vendor issues)**

## 185.8 11.2.0.9 Number, frequency, or year of convocation of a conference, etc.

- 185.8.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that in 11.2.0.9.1 “Omit from the name of a conference, congress, meeting, etc.” either the “etc.” should be clarified or a reference added to instructions for exhibitions, fairs, festivals. As 11.2.0.9.2 dealt with these other events, the JSC decided to remove the “etc.” from 11.2.0.9.1.

**Action=Editor**

- 185.9 11.2.0.10. Transliteration

- 185.9.1 Cover letter: Is the reference to non-roman script in the instruction at 11.2.0.10.1 appropriate in the context of internationalization?

The Editor suggested that any references to non-roman script could be changed to “written in a script that differs from the preferred script of the agency creating the data”. The JSC agreed. It was noted that the examples at 11.2.0.10.1 were incorrect, and should include the original script. The JSC decided that Pinyin would be used for all transliterated Chinese in the examples.

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 2**

- 185.10 11.2.1.3. More than one language form of the name

- 185.10.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed deleting the alternative instruction at 11.2.1.3.2 on the grounds that it won’t be needed if instructions are revised throughout to replace “in English”, etc., with “in the language of the cataloguing agency” (see recommendation at 11.1.1.3 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.). However, the alternative instruction at 11.2.1.3.2 relates to the instruction at 11.2.1.3.1, which specifies the form in the official language of the body, and therefore would not be affected by the LC rep’s general recommendation.

The JSC discussed how the RDA instructions related to IME ICC 5.1.3 “When names have been expressed in several languages, preference for the authorized heading should be given to a heading based on information found on manifestations of the expression in the original language and script; but if the original language and script is one not normally used in the catalogue, the heading may be based on forms found on manifestations or in reference sources in one of the languages and scripts best suited to the users of the catalogue.” It was noted that the official language might be different from the original language. The JSC agreed to retain the alternative instruction at 11.2.1.3.2. The Chair suggested that the difference to IME ICC be noted.

**Action=Secretary (IME ICC differences)**

- 185.10.2 Cover letter: The phrase “resources issued by the body” in the instruction at 11.2.1.3.4 has been replaced by “resources associated with the body”. Is that change appropriate in this context?

The JSC agreed with the change.

- 185.10.3 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed deleting the preferred order of languages and the specification of English alphabetic order in the instruction at 11.2.1.3.5, and replacing them with an instruction to choose the form in the language presented first on the resource. (See recommendation at 11.1.1.3.4 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.).

The JSC decided that the instruction at 11.2.1.3.5 would be rewritten to refer to the language that appears first on the first resource catalogued. [Post meeting note: This decision was later modified by the JSC to “the form found in the first resource received”.]

**Action=Editor**

- 185.10.4 John Attig said that it appeared that the alternative at 11.2.1.3.2 was actually an alternative to all of 11.2.1.3. The Editor said that this was the case. The Chair noted that the issue of placement of alternatives had been discussed previously. She suggested that the impact of applying an alternative on subsequent instructions be noted as a training issue.

**Action=Secretary (List of training issues)**

- 185.11 11.2.1.5. Conventional name

- 185.11.1 Examples Group 2 question: 11.2.1.5.1a.1 has the caption “Ancient and international bodies.” It might be helpful to change this to “Ancient or international bodies”. Royal and Select Masters (one of the examples) are certainly not ancient, and barely international! The current caption could be misread as implying that the bodies covered by the rule are both ancient and international.

The Editor said that if the caption were changed, it would look as though the instruction applied to bodies such as the United Nations. It was noted that the caption in RDA had been carried over from AACR, and matched the instruction. The JSC decided not to make the change now but to note the issue for follow-up post RDA’s initial release.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

- 185.12 11.2.3.2 Subordinate and related bodies recorded subordinately

- 185.12.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that the caption specify that these are non-governmental bodies. She added that the caption at 11.2.6.2 was clear: “Government bodies recorded subordinately”. The JSC asked the Editor to make it clear at the general guidelines at 11.2.3.1 that there are separate instructions for subordinate government bodies and subordinate religious bodies.

**Action=Editor**

- 185.13 11.2.3.3 Direct or indirect subdivision

- 185.13.1 Barbara Tillett suggested some revised wording for 11.2.3.3.2. The Editor noted that many of these references had complicated wording. The JSC decided that there would be a general reference along the lines of “For variant forms involving ... see 11.3.5.” It was agreed that this change would be made wherever appropriate.

**Action=Editor**

- 185.14 11.2.7.2 Heads of state, etc.

- 185.14.1 Examples Group 2 question: 11.2.7.2 instructs catalogers to use the English form of the title of a sovereign, president, other head of state, etc., unless there is no equivalent English term. The instruction is carried over from AACR2 24.20B1, but some Examples Group members wonder why this term isn’t always given in the language of the head of state, as is the title of a head of government. The preferred name for a subordinate government agency, legislative body, armed force, embassy, constitutional convention, court, etc. is also given in the official language of the country.

It was noted that changing 11.2.7.2 to use a term in the language of the head of state, etc., would mean significant changes to existing established headings. The JSC decided that the instruction would refer to the language of the agency instead of English. It was agreed that in terms of examples in RDA, English would be considered the language of the agency.

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 2**

- 185.14.2 Examples Group 2 question: In part A, 6.7.1.3 is a rule for “Head of state, chief executive, or ruling executive body” and there is one example of a head of state and one of a ruling executive body. However, we find no equivalent rule in chapter 11 for “chief executive” or for “ruling executive body.” Conversely, we note that although there are rules in 11.2.7 for “Heads of governments,” there is nothing in 6.7 that refers to this term. We note that this problem is a carryover from AACR2, but we’d like to see RDA address the inconsistency between chapters 6 and 11.

The JSC decided that chief executives are equivalent to heads of governments. There was an extensive discussion about which instructions in chapter 11 should cover ruling executive bodies (e.g., juntas). It was suggested that they could be covered by the instructions on governmental bodies at 11.2.6, but there was not general agreement on this. The JSC agreed that if no solution were found prior to the release of Part B, this issue would be raised in the cover letter.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

- 185.15 11.2.7.3 Heads of governments

- 185.16 Cover letter: The spacing in the last example under 11.2.7.3.2 has been questioned (see Marg Stewart’s comment at 11.4.1.3.1). JSC needs to decide whether spacing should be specified in the instruction.

The JSC decided that in the example “New Zealand. Prime Minister (1999- : Clark)” the spaces would be removed from after the date, and no spacing would be specified in the instruction.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

- 185.17 11.2.10.1. Civil and criminal courts

- 185.17.1 Cover letter: The meaning of the clause “unless the omission would result in objectionable distortion” in the instruction at 11.2.10.1.2 has been questioned (see Marg Stewart’s comment at 11.4.4.1.2). JSC needs to decide whether the addition of an example would be sufficient to clarify the meaning, or whether the clause should be deleted.

The JSC agreed to delete the clause.

**Action=Editor**

- 185.17.2 Cover letter: The instruction at 11.2.10.1.2 refers to adding the name of the place served by the court “in a conventionalized form”. Should that be changed to “in the form prescribed in chapter 12”?

The JSC decided not to make the change, as the conventionalized form reflects the structure of the court.

- 185.18 11.3.1.3. Recording expanded names as variant names

- 185.18.1 Cover letter: The instruction at 11.3.1.3.2 (and again at 11.3.2.3.2 and 11.3.2.3.3) refers to filing conventions used in the catalogue. Is that instruction appropriate in the context of a shared environment? Is the term “catalogue” appropriate in the RDA context?

The JSC decided that it wanted to remove references to “filing conventions” and “catalogue” but to retain the instruction. The JSC asked the Editor to adjust the wording.

**Action=Editor**

- 185.19 11.3.3.3. Recording pseudonyms as variant names

- 185.19.1 Cover letter: Section 11.3.1.3 is a placeholder for the pseudonym relationship defined in FRAD as it applies to names of corporate bodies. JSC needs to assess whether this category of variant name is necessary in RDA. If so, examples of such relationships will need to be found.

The JSC discussed the issue, and agreed that pseudonyms are used by corporate bodies, and to parallel the approach taken in chapter 9.

**Action=Editor**

There was some concern about the existing definition of pseudonym in chapter 9: “A pseudonym is a name assumed by a person to conceal or obscure his or her identity.” The JSC decided that the definition would be better as: “A pseudonym is a name assumed by a person to create a separate identity.”

**Action=Editor; Glossary Editor (Part B)**

It was agreed that in the cover letter to Part B the constituencies would be asked whether in the case of corporate bodies a term such as “assumed identity” would be preferable to “pseudonym”.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

[Post meeting note: These decisions were later substantially modified by the JSC, and these later decisions are reflected in the December 2007 draft of Sections 2-4,9.]

- 185.20 11.3.4.3. Recording alternative linguistic forms as variant names

- 185.20.1 Cover: The instruction at 11.3.4.3.3 specifies the use of arabic numerals. Is that appropriate in the context of internationalization?

The JSC agreed to change the wording to: “If the name recorded as the preferred name begins with a number expressed as a word or contains a number expressed as a word in such a position that it affects the filing of the access point, and in the catalogue numbers expressed as words are filed differently from numbers expressed as numerals, record the form with the number expressed as a numeral as a variant name.”

**Action=Editor**

- 185.21 11.4.1.3. Recording the location of a conference, etc.

- 185.21.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that JSC should consider changing the instruction formerly at 11.2.4.4.1 so that the name of an institution used as an addition to the name of a conference would be given in the form established as the preferred name for the institution (see Barbara Tillett’s comment at 11.2.4.4.1). With the restructuring of instructions on additions to names of corporate bodies under 11.1.1, the instruction formerly at 11.2.4.4.1 has been replaced by a reference at 11.1.1.7.1 to instructions on

recording the location of a conference, etc., under 11.4.1. Under 11.4.1 there is a revised form of the instruction that was formerly at 11.2.4.4.1 (now at 11.4.1.3.2). JSC needs to decide whether that instruction should remain as it is (i.e., to record the name of the institution, etc., in the nominative case in the language and form in which it is found in the resource being described), or whether it should be revised to be consistent with the instructions under 11.7.0.6 on recording the name of an associated institution (i.e., to record the name of the institution in the form and language recorded as the preferred name of the institution).

Judy Kuhagen suggested that the original AACR2 instruction was designed to cover names of buildings. The JSC decided to delete 11.4.1.3.2 and replace it with a reference to chapter 12 and 11.7.0.6 (Associated institution). [Post-meeting note: The reference was not added, the JSC needs to decide what is appropriate to include in RDA.]

**Action=Editor; JSC (Discuss instructions for names of buildings)**

185.21.2 The Editor suggested that the instructions at 11.4.1.3.3-11.4.1.3.6 would be better placed with the instructions on constructing the preferred access point at 11.1.1. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

185.22 11.4.2.3. Recording location of headquarters, etc.

185.22.1 Cover letter: Is the exception at 11.4.2.3.4 appropriate in the RDA context, where place associated with the corporate body is treated as a separate element, independent of its use as an addition to a name when constructing an access point?

The JSC decided that this exception should also move to 11.1.1.

**Action=Editor**

185.23 11.4.2.4. Chapters, branches, etc.

185.23.1 Cover letter: Is the “unless ...” clause in the instruction at 11.4.2.4.1 appropriate in the RDA context, where place associated with the corporate body is treated as a separate element, independent of its use as an addition to a name when constructing an access point?

The JSC agreed that this instruction, and the instructions at 11.4.2.5 (Local churches, etc.) and 11.4.2.6 (Radio and television stations) with similar “unless” clauses, would be moved to 11.1.1. The Editor said that he would assess whether anything needed to remain at 11.4.2.4-11.4.2.6.

**Action=Editor**

185.24 11.6.0.3. General guidelines on recording type of corporate body

185.24.1 Cover letter: Section 11.6.0.3 is a placeholder for guidelines on recording the type of corporate body attribute defined in FRAD. JSC needs to determine what would be a suitable list of terms for categorizing corporate bodies by type.

The JSC considered options for the list of terms, including codes from MARC 21 fixed fields, and a list based on the categories of corporate bodies in chapter 11. The JSC decided that, because of issues to do with the granularity of the list, 11.6 would be left as a placeholder. [Post meeting note: A list of terms designating type of corporate body was added after the meeting, and can be found in the December 2007 draft of Sections 2-4,9.]

## 185.25 11.7.0.6. Associated institution

185.25.1 Cover letter: Is the “instead of ...” clause in the instruction at 11.7.0.6.1 appropriate in the RDA context, where place associated with the corporate body is treated as a separate element, independent of its use as an addition to a name when constructing an access point?

The JSC agreed that this had been covered.

## 185.26 11.7.0.7. Number of a conference, etc.

185.26.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed adding an option for numerals in the instruction at 11.7.0.7.1. (See recommendation 10 under General recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The Editor noted that the phrase “English form” would be changed in line with earlier decisions, i.e., “in the form preferred by the agency”. Barbara Tillett said that this covered the LC recommendation referred to in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.

**Action=Editor**

185.27 Cover letter: Is the optional addition at 11.7.0.7.3 appropriate in the RDA context? The AACR2 rule from which the instruction is derived does not provide a reference following “in a note”. Was the intent to record the information in a note in the bibliographic description for the conference proceedings? Is the use of an explanatory reference the most appropriate alternative for recording the information?

The optional addition said: “Provide an explanation of the irregularities in a note (see X.X.X) or an explanatory reference (see 14.X.X)”. The JSC decided that there would be an instruction on a new element at the end of the chapter for annotations on irregular conference numbering.

**Action=Editor**

## 185.28 11.8.0.3. Recording language of the corporate body

185.28.1 Cover letter: Should the instruction include a reference to a controlled list of terms for languages?

It was noted that the decision had already been made to use the ISO list of languages (5JSC/M/183.39.1).

**Action=Editor**

## 186 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 12 – Places

186.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 12

186.2 The Editor led a discussion of the issues raised in the cover letter for 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 12.

## 186.3 12.0.1 Purpose and scope

186.3.1 Cover letter: The scope of chapter 12 as described under 12.0.1 is more limited than the scope for chapters 9, 10, 11, and 13. The instructions in chapter 12 do not cover the

construction of preferred and variant access points for places *per se*, but only the establishment of place names for use in access points for corporate bodies (either as conventional names for governments or as additions to the names of corporate bodies). JSC needs to determine whether the scope of the chapter should be expanded to cover the construction of access points for places that could be used independently of chapter 11 (e.g., as access points for place of publication, etc.).

The Editor explained that the current scope of the chapter matched chapter 23 in AACR2. He added that to reflect FRBR and FRAD in RDA there was no need for access points for places, or relationships between places. It was noted that for jurisdictions an access point was being created for the government, not the place. The JSC decided not to expand the scope of the chapter in the first release of RDA. It was suggested that a 12.1 section on constructing access points to represent places be added as a placeholder.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

186.4 12.0.2 Sources of information

186.4.1 The Editor said that he wanted to confirm that the JSC agreed with the current text at 12.0.2.1: “Determine the name by which a place is commonly identified from (in order of preference): a) gazetteers and other reference sources published in English-speaking countries; b) gazetteers and other reference sources published in the country in which the place is located in the official language(s) of that country.” He noted that the reference to “English speaking” would change in line with earlier decisions. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

186.5 Additions to names of places

186.5.1 Cover letter: The instructions for additions to names of places derived from AACR2 rule 23.4 have been reframed to treat those “additions” as part of the preferred name (see 12.1.4-12.1.9). JSC will need to decide whether the reframing of those instructions is appropriate.

The Editor explained that this meant that the name of the place was “Madison Wisconsin”, not “Madison”. The JSC discussed the issue. The Editor said that if the additions were not treated as part of the name, there would need to be an element created for the name of the larger jurisdiction. He commented that there was no separate element for this in FRAD. It was noted that the result was the same as AACR2. The JSC decided to leave the instructions as they were in the draft, and not to consider the reframing as a change to AACR2. It was agreed that the inclusion of instructions on internal punctuation was appropriate.

186.6 Related places

186.6.1 Cover letter: FRAD does not cover relationships between places. Nor does AACR2 include any instructions on *see also* references for places. As a result, this draft of chapter 12 does not include instructions on related places. In conjunction with reviewing the scope of the chapter (see comments under Purpose and scope above), JSC needs to consider whether instructions on related places should be added.

Barbara Tillett noted that places were being removed from FRAD, and moving to FR SAR. The Chair noted that the decision had already been made not to change the scope of the chapter (5JSC/M/186.3.1).

186.7 12.1.0.5. Transliteration

- 186.7.1 Cover letter: Instructions on transliteration have been added under 12.1.0.5 to parallel the instructions on transliteration in chapter 11 under 11.2.0.10. Is the reference to non-roman script in the instruction at 12.1.0.5.1 appropriate in the context of internationalization?

The Editor noted that there had already been a decision to change references to non-roman script (5JSC/M/185.91).

**Action=Editor**

186.8 12.1.1. English form

- 186.8.1 Cover letter: JSC will need to assess whether the instructions under 12.1.1 (either as they stand currently or with the proposed revisions) conform to the current draft of the *IME-ICC Statement of International Cataloguing Principles*.

It was noted that the *IME ICC Statement* does not cover places.

186.9 12.1.4.2 Place names that require a term indicating type of jurisdiction

- 186.9.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that to make this consistent with 11.1.1.5, the instruction at 12.1.4.2.1 should begin “If a place name other than a city or town ...” The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

186.10 12.1.5. Places in Australia, Canada, Malaysia, United States, U.S.S.R., or Yugoslavia

- 186.10.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed generalizing the instructions under 12.1.5 to apply to any federation. (See recommendation at 12.2.1 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.).

The JSC discussed the issue and agreed that there are two options to achieve the ultimate goal of consistency: applying these instructions to other federated states, or no longer having an exception for these places. The JSC decided to consider changes to the instruction after the first release of RDA.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

186.11 12.1.6. Places in the British Isles

- 186.11.1 Cover letter: The LC rep has proposed retaining the instructions under 12.1.6 as a special instruction. (See recommendation at 12.2.1 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

The JSC agreed to retain the instructions as found in the draft.

- 186.11.2 Cover letter: The LC rep has also proposed changing the caption to “Places on the islands comprising the Republic of Ireland and the United Kingdom”. (See recommendation at 12.2.2 under Specific recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2.)

Alan Danskin said that the revised caption was not correct as the British Isles includes islands such as Jersey, which are not part of the United Kingdom. The JSC decided not to change the caption.

186.12 12.2.0 Basic instructions on variant names of places

186.12.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that 12.2.0.2.1 be expanded to parallel 11.0.2.1 and its footnote so that the found form on resources being catalogued can be included as variant names. The JSC decided to change the instruction so that variant names of places can be taken from any source.

**Action=Editor**

186.12.2 Barbara Tillett said that she was concerned that 12.2.0.3.1 and 12.2.0.3.2 referred to “a name found in reference sources that is significantly different”. The Editor noted that it had been agreed the previous day to delete the general instruction explaining significant differences (based on 26.1H) (5JSC/M/182.20). He noted that the “significantly” wording was also at 9.3.0.3, 10.3.0.3, and 11.3.0.3. The JSC decided not to change the wording, as “significant” gave an indication that cataloguer’s judgement is required. It was noted that the wording was present in AACR, and had not been queried in that context.

186.13 12.4.0.3 Recording other geographical information

186.13.1 Barbara Tillett asked if this element covered the Geographic Area Code (GAC). The Editor said that he had taken the element from FRAD. He noted that both this and “Coordinates” were no longer in FRAD. He explained that he thought that 12.4 would cover any textual information provided to help clarify the place. [Post-meeting note: The JSC later decided to delete the instructions under Other geographical information as well as those under Coordinates, and to keep those two elements just as placeholders to be developed in a later release.]

186.13.2 The Editor said that he thought that the GAC was more likely to be an identifier, which was covered at 12.5. The Chair said that she would make it clear to the Examples Group that they were not to be concerned if they could not find examples for some elements.

**Action=Chair**

**187 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 13 – Works, expressions, manifestations, and items**

187.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 13

187.2 The Chair said that rather than discussing the remaining Examples Group 2 comments at the meeting, she would draft a response for the JSC to review.

**Action=Chair**

187.3 The Editor led a discussion of the issues in the cover letter for 5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 13. The JSC members raised any comments regarding the chapter at the appropriate place in the discussion.

187.4 13.0.1. Purpose and scope

187.4.1 Cover letter: Questions have been raised about the scope and wording of the purposes listed at 13.0.1.3. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 13.0.1.3.)

Barbara Tillett said that as there was not much time for discussion she would only raise major issues, and this was not one of them.

- 187.4.2 Cover letter: A question has also been raised about the intended meaning of the phrase “treated as aggregate works” in footnote 1. (See Barbara Tillett’s comments at 13.0.1.3 footnote.)

Barbara Tillett said that this was not a major issue.

- 187.5 Cover letter: A question has also been raised about the criteria listed at 13.0.1.4 (see Barbara Tillett’s comments at 13.0.1.4). JSC also needs to review the criteria listed at 13.0.1.4 and the statement regarding the policy of the agency creating the data at 13.0.1.5 in light of the IME-ICC designation of the uniform title for the work/expression as an “indispensable access point”.

The Chair noted that if the JSC decided that the preferred access point for the work was required; the criteria at 13.0.1.4 would be irrelevant (see 5JSC/M/191.3.2).

- 187.6 13.1.1.1 Preferred access point representing a work – Works attributed to a single person, family, or corporate body

- 187.6.1 Barbara Tillett said that she did not think that it was appropriate to use the phrase “commonly cited” in RDA. She noted that it was found at 13.1.1.1.1: “If a single person, family, or corporate body is responsible for creating the work, and the work is commonly cited using the name of that person, family, or body, construct the preferred access point representing the work by combining (in this order) ...” The JSC agreed to delete “and the work is commonly cited using the name of that person, family, or body” from this instruction and others where it is present. The Chair asked the Editor to raise any cases where deleting the phrase was problematic.

**Action=Editor**

- 187.7 13.1.1.2 Preferred access point representing a work – Collaborative works

- 187.7.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that there needed to be exceptions for moving image resources and serials. The JSC agreed. Judy Kuhagen commented that depending on the decision on treaties, there might need to be another exception.

**Action=Editor**

- 187.8 13.1.1.3 Preferred access point representing a work – Compilations of works by different persons, families, or corporate bodies

- 187.8.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that 13.1.1.3.1 be deleted as compilers as creators are covered by 13.1.1.1. The JSC decided against this as it was considered clearer to have all instructions for compilations as a type of work in one place. The Editor suggested that 13.1.1.3.1 could be written in terms of when the compiler is considered the creator, and 13.1.1.3.3 in terms of when the compiler is not considered the creator. The JSC agreed. The Editor noted that the alternative at 13.1.1.3.2 only applied to compilers as creators. Barbara Tillett confirmed that “commonly cited” would be removed from the instruction.

**Action=Editor**

- 187.8.2 Barbara Tillett said that she thought that 13.1.1.3.4 was misidentifying the work (“If the compilation lacks a collective title, use the preferred access point representing the first work in the compilation as the preferred access point for the compilation.”). She added

that this instruction matched what was in AACR2. The JSC discussed whether a preferred title for the aggregate work should be devised, and decided against it. The JSC decided that there would be separate access points for each of the works in the compilation.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 25.6B3)**

187.9 13.1.1.7. Additions to preferred access points representing works

187.9.1 Cover letter: A question has been raised about the language in which additions should be recorded (see Barbara Tillett's comments at 13.3.1). Note that in the instructions referred to from 13.1.1.7 (i.e., 13.4-13.7) there are no specific instructions with respect to the language in which the element is recorded. The instructions under 13.6, however, do specify that the place of origin of the work is to be recorded in the form prescribed in chapter 12.

The Editor said that it was not possible to make a general statement about the language.

187.10 13.1.2. Preferred access point representing an expression

187.10.1 Cover letter: A question has been raised regarding the possibility of using the names of contributors as identifying elements in access points representing expressions. (See Deirdre Kiorgaard's question at 13.3.2.)

The Editor suggested that if "version" was added to chapter 13, the name of person, family, or corporate body associated with the expression could be used as a way of identifying the version. He noted that "version" was currently only used in headings for the Bible. The JSC agreed to add an element for "version" to chapter 13.

**Action=Editor**

187.10.2 Barbara Tillett suggested that, in order to keep things simple, there be a limit on the additions used to construct a preferred access point for an expression. For the draft to be issued for constituency review, the JSC agreed to the following order of additions to the preferred access point representing the work:

- a) a term indicating content type (see 13.11)
- b) the date of the expression (see 13.12).
- c) a term indicating the language of the expression (see 13.13)
- d) a term indicating the version (see 13.X)

**Action=Editor**

187.11 13.1.3 Preferred access point representing a manifestation

187.11.1 Barbara Tillett said that LC did not use all of the additions specified in 13.1.3. The Editor said that he had questioned the appropriateness of this section as it did not match FRAD. He suggested that all relationships to a manifestation or to an item would probably be recorded by using an identifier or a description. He added that in the new structure for RDA the only place where attributes of a manifestation would be listed would be in chapter 2. The JSC decided that 13.1.3 and 13.1.4 (Preferred access point representing an item), would be removed from the draft. The JSC agreed to include the reasons for the decision in the cover letter for Part B.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for part B)**

187.12 13.2.0.5. Initial articles

- 187.12.1 Cover letter: JSC will need to review the instruction under 13.2.0.5 in conjunction with its review of the appendix on initial articles.

The JSC decided that, in line with the decision that was made for initial articles used in names of corporate bodies (5JSC/M/185.7), initial articles would be removed from preferred titles.

- 187.13 13.2.1.2. Title proper of the original edition

- 187.13.1 Cover letter: It has been noted that the instruction at 13.2.1.2.1 b) is problematic with respect to serials. (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 13.2.1.2.1.)

Judy Kuhagen explained that some cataloguers in following AACR2 25.3B created a uniform title for a single manifestation just to remove a statement of responsibility. The JSC decided to remove everything from the "Omit" onwards in 13.2.1.2.1: "If no title in the original language is established as being the one by which the work is best known, or in case of doubt, choose the title proper of the original edition as the preferred title. Omit from such titles: a) introductory phrases (e.g., Here beginneth the tale of); b) statements of responsibility that are part of the title proper (see 2.3.0.4), if such an omission is permissible grammatically and if the statement is not essential to the meaning of the title." The JSC decided to revisit the decision after the discussion on introductory words. (Note: this was not discussed).

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

- 187.14 13.2.1.3 Simultaneous publication under different titles

- 187.14.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that the separate conditions listed under 13.2.1.3 be deleted and that the instruction be changed to use the title of the manifestation first received in all cases. (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 13.2.1.3.)

The JSC agreed to the change. Hugh Taylor commented that the existing AACR2 rule is unworkable.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes – 25.3C)**

- 187.15 13.2.3.1 Cycles

- 187.15.1 John Attig noted that there was an instance of "generally accepted title" at 13.2.3.1.1, which was similar to "commonly cited". The Editor said that he thought that this was a different situation. It was noted that the instruction matched AACR2. The JSC decided not to change 13.2.3.1.1.

- 187.16 13.2.4.3 Two unnumbered or non-consecutively numbered parts

- 187.16.1 Cover letter: A question has been raised as to what would be used as the preferred title for the resource as a whole. (See Barbara Tillett's comments at 13.2.4.3.1.)

The JSC discussed whether to include a statement specifying that a preferred access point should not be created for the aggregate work, and decided against it.

- 187.17 13.2.4.4. Three or more unnumbered or non-consecutively numbered parts

- 187.17.1 Cover letter: A question has been raised as to whether the rule of three or more will still apply in this instance, and whether the use of *Selections* will be retained. (See Marg Stewart's question at 13.2.4.4, 13.2.5.2, 13.3.2.4, etc.)

Barbara Tillett said that she would like to discontinue this practice. John Attig said that he agreed that the artificial grouping of "Selections" is not useful. The JSC discussed the issue, and the next day decided that "Selections" will not be used. Instead, the instruction will be to create access points for each of the parts/extracts, and/or to use only the preferred title for the work as a whole. The JSC agreed to extend this decision to cases where "Selections" is currently used as a collective uniform title. It was agreed that in that case information about the version could be added to the collective title "Works", etc.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 25.6B3)**

- 187.18 13.3 Variant title

- 187.18.1 Barbara Tillett suggested that the caption be changed to "Variant title of work" so that there was no confusion with chapter 2. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

- 187.19 13.3.2. Conventional title

- 187.19.1 Cover letter: The draft includes a placeholder for conventional title as a variant title, based on the FRAD relationship between a work and a "conventional name" by which the work is known. JSC needs to determine whether in the context of RDA a conventional title would ever be recorded as a variant title, or only as a preferred title. If it is decided to retain conventional title as a type of variant title, JSC needs to provide direction on what would be included in that category.

The JSC decided that the element for conventional title would be confusing to users of RDA and should be removed. It was also agreed to remove "conventional name" from other chapters.

**Action=Editor**

- 187.20 13.4.0.3. Recording form of work

- 187.20.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to decide whether form of work should be recorded as free text, or whether it should be recorded using a controlled list of terms.

The JSC decided that the form of work would be recorded as free text.

**Action=Editor**

- 187.21 13.13.0.6. Resources containing three or more language expressions of a work

- 187.21.1 Cover letter: The use of Polyglot in the instruction at 13.13.0.6.1 has been questioned. (See Marg Stewart's question at 13.3.2.3.)

The JSC decided that there were two situations, both of which should be reflected in the instructions. In the case of a multi-language single expression, there will be one access point with the languages listed. In the case of multiple language expressions of the same work there will be a separate access point for each language expression.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 25.5C1)**

**188 Draft of RDA Part B, chapter 19 – Other information used in access point control**

188.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 19

188.2 The Chair said that cover letter questions and JSC representative comments would be addressed at the same time.

188.3 The Editor explained that with the new structure for RDA this chapter would no longer exist. The Chair summarized that instructions on attributes would move to chapters 5, 8, and 12, and instructions on relationships would move to chapters 24, 29, and 33.

188.4 19.0.1 Scope

188.4.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that elements be added for information on analysis and classification of series (see Barbara Tillett's comment at 14.9). There are no corresponding attributes listed in FRAD. JSC needs to determine whether such an extension would be appropriate for RDA.

The JSC decided not to pursue this extension to RDA, as it is to do with local resource management, and is not included in FRAD.

188.5 19.0.2 Sources of information

188.5.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to review the general instruction on sources of information at 19.0.2.1 as well as the specific instructions on sources of information for elements covered in 19.2-19.7.

The JSC agreed with what the Editor had presented in the draft.

188.6 19.1. General guidelines on other information used in access point control

188.6.1 Cover letter: Section 19.1 has been included as a placeholder for general guidelines on other information used in access point control, if JSC decides that general guidelines are necessary.

The Editor said that he would see if there was a need for this instruction in the new structure.

**Action=Editor**

188.7 19.2.0.1. Scope [Scope of usage]

188.7.1 Cover letter: The definition for scope of usage is based on the definition in FRAD. JSC needs to assess whether the definition is appropriate for RDA.

The Editor explained that scope of usage was information such as: "The person uses this name when writing detective novels". The JSC decided to change the scope to use "identity" instead of "persona", i.e.: "Scope of usage is the form of work associated with a particular identity."

188.8 19.2.0.3. Recording scope of usage

- 188.8.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to provide direction on instructions for recording scope of usage.

The JSC agreed that this would be a very general instruction.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.9 19.3.0.1. Scope [Date of usage]

- 188.9.1 Cover letter: The definition for date of usage is based on the definition in FRAD. JSC needs to assess whether the definition is appropriate for RDA.

The Chair read out the definition: “Date of usage is a date or range of dates associated with the use of a particular name established by a person, family, or corporate body.” JSC decided that “established” was not required, and that it should be aligned with 19.2.0.1 and use “particular name for an identity”.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.10 19.3.0.3. Recording date of usage

- 188.10.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to provide direction on instructions for recording date of usage.

The JSC confirmed that this did not need to be a structured element.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.11 19.4.0.1. Scope [Status of preferred access point]

- 188.11.1 Cover letter: The definition for status of preferred access point is based on the definition in FRAD. JSC needs to assess whether the definition is appropriate for RDA.

Margaret Stewart commented that this was currently at the record level in MARC 21. The Editor noted that the status only applied to the preferred access point, and there was only one of those in the record.

- 188.12 19.4.0.3. Recording the status of the preferred access point

- 188.12.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to provide direction on instructions for recording the status of preferred access point.

The JSC decided that the list of values from MARC 21 would be used in the draft for constituency review, and comment requested. It was recognised that this list carries historical baggage.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

- 188.13 19.5.0.1. Scope [Undifferentiated access point]

- 188.13.1 Cover letter: The definition for undifferentiated access point is based on the definition in FRAD. JSC needs to assess whether the definition is appropriate for RDA.

The JSC decided to call this element the “undifferentiated entity indicator”. It was noted that it could apply to persons, families, and works. In the definition, “insufficiently precise to differentiate” was changed to “insufficient to differentiate”.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.14 19.5.0.3. Recording undifferentiated access point

- 188.14.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to provide direction on instructions for recording undifferentiated access point.

The JSC agreed that there would only be one value that could be recorded, i.e., “undifferentiated”.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.15 19.6.0.1. Scope [Sources consulted]

- 188.15.1 Cover letter: The definition for [sources consulted] is based on the definition in FRAD. JSC needs to assess whether the definition is appropriate for RDA.

Barbara Tillett suggested that sources would also be consulted for variants in addition to the preferred access point. The JSC agreed and asked the Editor to adjust the wording of the scope.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.15.2 Barbara Tillett said that sources consulted would also cover sources where information was not found. Margaret Stewart noted that these instructions were at 19.6.0.6 (Other sources consulted). Barbara Tillett suggested that the instructions did not need to be separate from 19.6.0.4 (Sources used to create controlled access points). John Attig said that as there were separate elements in MARC, he would like to see a distinction between where information was found and where it wasn't. The Editor suggested that there could be two element subtypes, one for when information is found and one for when it is not found. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.15.3 John Attig noted that in MARC there was also a distinction between the source consulted and the information found. The Editor noted that the instruction did tell you to record both. The Chair suggested that “the information found” should be included in the scope. The Editor noted that this would only be relevant for one of the subtypes.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.16 19.6.0.3. Recording sources consulted

- 188.16.1 Cover letter: It has been suggested that an explanation of why sources consulted are cited. (See Barbara Tillett's comment at 14.8.3.)

Judy Kuhagen said that, now that there would be separate subtypes, the comment had been dealt with.

- 188.17 19.7. Explanatory references

- 188.17.1 The Editor said that instructions on recording the information to be used in an explanatory reference would be included in the general chapters on relationships. He noted that display would be dealt with in an appendix (5JSC/M/182.35), and the examples would need to be adjusted.

- 188.18 19.7.0.5 References applicable to several preferred access points

- 188.18.1 The Editor said that there were problems with these types of references as they did not belong in the schema (e.g., “Aktiebolaget ... Names of corporate bodies beginning with this word are listed under the next word in the name.”). He said that these references did

not involve a relationship between entities, and he would assess whether the instructions needed to be removed.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

- 188.19 19.7.0.6 Preferred access points based on earlier and later names used by corporate bodies
- 188.19.1 The JSC asked the Examples Group to assess the “England” example at 19.7.0.6.1b.1 as it does not match the authority file that many cataloguers use, which could lead to confusion.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

- 188.20 19.8.0.1. Scope [Cataloguer’s annotation]

- 188.20.1 Cover letter: JSC needs to provide direction on a definition for cataloguer’s annotation.

The Editor suggested that he could turn the instructions at 19.8.0.3.2 into a scope statement. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

- 188.20.2 The Chair noted that 19.8.0.3.1 included “justifying” and asked if this needed to be changed to match the objectives and principles. The Editor explained that the functional objectives had been written from the user’s point of view, but these instructions were for the cataloguer.

## **189 Addition to "Other agreements involving jurisdictions"**

- 189.1 Received and considered the following documents:

5JSC/CCC/1

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response

5JSC/CCC/1/BL response

5JSC/CCC/1/ACOC response

5JSC/CCC/1/CILIP response

5JSC/CCC/1/ALA response

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/CILIP response

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/BL response

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/LC response

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/ACOC response

5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up/CCC response

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 15

- 189.2 The Chair noted that LC had prepared a follow-up document at JSC’s request summarising what had been agreed regarding the preferred access point for treaties. She said that in 5JSC/CCC/1/LC response/LC follow-up/ALA follow-up, ALA had continued to disagree with using the title to name the work for treaties. She noted that CILIP and BL had largely agreed with ALA, while ACOC and CCC had largely agreed with LC.

- 189.3 The JSC discussed the ALA recommendation that the instructions for naming works comprising treaties be consistent with the basic instructions for naming works in RDA. The JSC decided that the instructions for collaborative works in chapter 13 would be applied to all treaties. As a result, the first part of the access point for the work will be the

body named first on resources embodying the treaty, or in reference sources, or if these are inconsistent, the one named first on the first manifestation received. It was agreed that the number of bodies involved would no longer be the determining consideration. [Post meeting note: The JSC later decided that an instruction would be added specifying the use of the preferred title for the work as the preferred access point if neither the resource nor reference sources provide information that can be used to determine the first signatory.]

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes – 21.35A)**

- 189.4 The JSC agreed that there would be a separate instruction for cases where there is a single party on one side and two or more parties on the other side.

**Action=Editor**

## **190 Bible Uniform Titles**

- 190.1 Received and considered the following documents:

5JSC/LC/8

5JSC/LC/8/BL response

5JSC/LC/8/CILIP response

5JSC/LC/8/CCC response

5JSC/LC/8/ALA response

5JSC/LC/8/ACOC response

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/CILIP response

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/BL response

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/LC response

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/ALA response

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/CCC response

5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up/ACOC response

5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part B/Chapter 16

- 190.2 The Chair said that in 5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up, the constituencies had been asked to confirm the decisions made at the April meeting. These decisions were:

The Old and New Testaments will be referred to by their spelled out forms, not the existing AACR2 abbreviations “O.T.” and “N.T.”

Access points for individual books of the Bible will use the name of the book immediately following “Bible” rather than interposing the name of the appropriate Testament.

Access points in the form “Bible. Old Testament”, “Bible. New Testament”, and “Bible. Apocrypha” will be used to identify those parts of the Bible as aggregate works.

- 190.3 The Chair noted that all constituencies had agreed, except for CILIP, who preferred to delay the changes until all issues had been resolved. Hugh Taylor explained that CILIP thought that this is when the real benefits would occur. John Attig said that ALA thought that removing the intervening name of the testament was a major step forward.

- 190.4 Hugh Taylor said that CILIP would withdraw their objections and go with the majority view. The Editor confirmed that the decisions in 5JSC/LC/8/Chair follow-up were agreed.

The JSC agreed that any implementation issues would be covered with the implementation of RDA as a whole.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes; List of implementation issues)**

## 191 Wrap up of Part B issues

### 191.1 Additional instructions

191.1.1 The JSC discussed where the additional instructions for musical works and expressions, legal works, religious works, official communications, and manuscripts and incunabula would be placed in the new structure for RDA. The Editor explained that the options were either to include them in the new chapter 6 (Identifying works and expressions), or to move them to an Appendix.

191.1.2 The JSC decided that exceptions for manuscripts and incunabula would be integrated into the main sequence of the instructions.

**Action=Editor**

191.1.3 The JSC decided to include the other special instructions at the end of chapter 6. It was agreed that there was value in keeping these instructions together. There was concern that if the instructions were included in an appendix it would look as if they had been relegated to second-class status.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

191.1.4 The Chair said that some constituencies had noted that they had difficulties finding people with expertise to comment on the special instructions. She asked whether a separate group to review these instructions would be useful. The JSC decided that this would not be necessary, as major changes to these instructions are not planned prior to the first release of RDA.

### 191.2 Constituency comments on choice of “primary access point”

191.2.1 The Editor noted that there were still a number of constituency comments from the June 2006 draft of chapters 6 and 7 to do with choice of primary access point which had not been discussed. The JSC agreed that the constituencies would be asked to resubmit any comments that were still thought to be relevant in their responses to the revised “Part B” chapters. It was also agreed to make it clear in the cover letter that these earlier comments had been neither accepted nor rejected.

**Action=Secretary (Cover letter for Part B)**

### 191.3 Required elements

191.3.1 The JSC discussed the proposal in 5JSC/ACOC rep/1 for the mandatory elements for the minimum level of authority control:

For the minimum level of authority control, include at least these elements:

- Authorized heading
- Nationality of entity (personal, family or corporate names)
- See references from variant forms of the authorized heading
- See also references from related authorized headings
- Source citation note
- Identifier

### 191.3.2 Authorized heading

The Editor explained that the Authorized heading would now be the preferred access point, which is the preferred name of the person, family or corporate body, and/or preferred title for the work. John Attig said that this would be a major change to the current status of uniform titles. The Editor explained that the functional requirement to find all manifestations embodying a particular work could not be done unless you named the work. Barbara Tillett suggested that this could be implemented in many different ways. She noted that according to the analysis done by OCLC, in 80% of cases the title of the manifestation and the title of the work are the same. John Attig commented that there would be MARC implications if it needed to be signalled that the title of the title proper is the same as the title of the work. It was suggested that another option was for ILS vendors to make the re-input of data unnecessary. The Editor noted that the IME ICC *Statement* listed the uniform title as essential. The JSC agreed that the preferred title for the work would be a required element. This is because it is important to meet user tasks, and for compatibility with IME ICC. The preferred name of the person, family, or corporate body will also be labelled as required.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of MARC 21 issues; List of vendor issues)**

### 191.3.3 Nationality of entity

The JSC decided against making this a required element as it is not regularly used in the AACR communities, and IME ICC does not support it.

### 191.3.4 See references

The JSC discussed to the extent to which see references are needed to meet the user task to access the preferred name. The JSC decided that see references would not be required elements in RDA.

### 191.3.5 See also references

The Editor referred to the draft Statement of objectives and principles, and one of the objectives under responsiveness to user needs: “find works, expressions of works, manifestations, and items represented in the catalogue that are related to those retrieved in response to the user’s search.” The JSC decided that see also references to related works and expressions would be required elements.

**Action=Editor**

### 191.3.6 Source citation note

The JSC decided this element would not be required.

### 191.3.7 Identifier

The JSC decided that the identifier would be required if applicable (i.e., available).

**Action=Editor**

**192 Revised draft statement of objectives and principles for RDA (including IME ICC 5.2.4 Forms of Uniform titles)**

192.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Objectives and Principles/Rev/3

5JSC/CILIP rep/1  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/ALA response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/BL response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/LC response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/CILIP response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/ACOC response  
5JSC/CILIP rep/1/CCC response

192.2 Relationship to IME ICC

192.2.1 The Chair noted that in the ALA comments on RDA Scope and Structure, it had been suggested that the objectives and principles refer to the IME ICC *Statement*. The JSC agreed that this was desirable. The Editor suggested that something could go under “Functionality of Records Produced Using RDA”. He asked what text he should include. John Attig said that ALA had thought something like what was in the October 2006 Outcomes; “The JSC affirmed the role of the IME ICC draft Statement of International Cataloguing Principles as the basis for the cataloguing principles used throughout RDA ...”

**Action=Editor**

192.3 Clarity

192.3.1 The Chair explained that Barbara Tillett had circulated by email a proposed revision to the “Clarity” objective: “The guidelines and instructions should be clear and unambiguous. They should be written in plain English.” The Chair said that she thought that deleting “with respect to underlying concepts, terminology, and scope of application” from the end of the first sentence actually changed the meaning of the objective. She said that there was a conflict between the two parts of the objective and that the Editor was making the instructions clear in terms of underlying concepts, terminology, and scope of application, but comments were received back from the constituencies that wording is too complex.

192.3.2 After discussion, the JSC decided to slightly revise the wording of the objective: “The guidelines and instructions should be clear and written in plain English. They should be unambiguous with respect to underlying concepts, terminology, and scope of application.”

**Action=Editor**

192.4 Consistency

192.4.1 The Chair noted that Barbara Tillett had prepared a document for discussion that highlighted changes between the IME ICC *Statement* and the RDA objectives and principles. Barbara Tillett noted that the IME ICC functional principle was “Consistency – In order to locate sets of records, use the preferred form of name that identifies the entity in a consistent manner, either as predominantly found on manifestations or a well-accepted name suited to the users of the catalogue”. The JSC decided that this was covered by the RDA principles of uniformity and representation.

192.4.2 After reviewing the document prepared by Barbara Tillett the JSC decided that changes to the RDA objectives and principles were not needed.

192.5 Differentiation

192.5.1 The JSC agreed to add to the end of the differentiation principle: “including various identities used by the same entity.”

**Action=Editor**

192.6 Language preference

192.6.1 The Chair explained that the CILIP representative had prepared a paper on IME ICC 5.2.4 Forms of Uniform titles (5JSC/CILIP rep/1) at the request of the JSC. She noted that all constituencies had seen value in alignment with the IME ICC *Statement* as a general principle. She added that overall there had been a rejection of the IME ICC preference to use the “commonly known title” as it was seen to be too subjective and to go against collocation.

192.6.2 The JSC decided to submit the concerns in the CILIP paper, and additional concerns included in responses from the constituencies, to the other participants in the IME ICC process. The JSC agreed that there would be no change to the instructions in the draft of the Part B chapters for constituency review in relation to the language of the preferred title (which are based on AACR2). It was noted that the JSC had the challenge of extrapolating principles from current practice.

**Action=JSC (Participate in IME ICC process)**

### **193 RDA Part B Internationalization**

193.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2

193.2 The Chair confirmed with Barbara Tillett that all of the recommendations in 5JSC/Restricted/LC rep/2 had been discussed.

### **194 Examples in Part B**

194.1 The Chair said that as agreed the previous day, she would draft a response to Examples Group 2 for the JSC to review (5JSC/M/187.2).

**Action=Chair**

194.2 The JSC agreed to charge the Examples Group to prepare some composite examples for the Part B chapters going out for constituency review. The JSC decided that the examples would be both in MARC 21 format, and as a listing of RDA elements.

**Action=Examples Group 2**

### **195 Revised draft of RDA - Part A – Introduction**

195.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Introduction/Rev

195.2 The Editor said that the cover letter for the Introduction for Part A listed no outstanding issues for discussion. He said that in terms of the part I response table, the remaining lines in the wiki has either been withdrawn, or agreed to, in which case he had incorporated

changes in the draft. He noted that with the new structure for RDA this Introduction would no longer exist. He added that some parts would be included in the General Introduction, and other parts would be included in introductory chapters to each section.

- 195.3 The Chair said that at 1.1.3 there was mention of North American standards for archival description, but not of related U.K. or Australian standards (as listed in 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1). The Editor said that instead of a list there would be a reference to the list of standards prepared by ALA (5JSC/ALA/3 series). John Attig confirmed that the list of standards in 5JSC/Restricted/ACOC rep-CCC rep/1 would be included in the ALA listing.

**Action=Editor; ALA**

## **196 Revised draft of RDA - Part A – Chapter 1**

- 196.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Chapter 1/Rev

- 196.2 The Editor led a discussion of issues listed in the cover letter of the draft on which he wanted JSC comment.

- 196.3 1.1.1 Resource

- 196.3.1 The Editor said that 1.1.1 had been completely reworked based on comments by ALA at Line 19 in the part I response table. He asked if all of the nuances in the ALA comment had been captured. John Attig said that he thought they had been. The Editor said that he had gone through all draft chapters and confirmed that the use of “resource” corresponded to 1.1.1. The Editor noted that with the new RDA structure, key terms would be explained in the first chapter of all sections.

- 196.4 1.1.2 Mode of issuance

- 196.4.1 The Editor explained that, based on direction given to him at the April 2004 meeting, he had used the general term “resources issued in successive parts” for those instructions that applied to both serials and multipart monographs. He said that based on LC comments in the document on priority issues for discussion, there appeared to be agreement that this term would no longer be used. The Editor said that for existing combined instructions it would have to be decided whether they applied to both types of resource. Judy Kuhagen said that she would look at all relevant instructions to determine the coverage. The Editor said that the definitions for “resource issued in two or more parts simultaneously” and “resource issued in successive parts” would be removed from 1.1.2 as these terms would no longer be used.

**Action=Judy Kuhagen; Editor; Glossary Editor**

- 196.4.2 The Chair noted that there were a number of comments relating to mode of issuance in the part I response table.

- 196.4.3 Line 28: Reword and combine with 1.1.3 (LC)

The Editor said that this had been done based on discussions at the April 2007 meeting, and there was no longer a section on intended termination.

- 196.4.4 Line 29: Use "issued or assembled" (ALA)

It was noted that this comment now only applied to the definition of “resource issued as a single unit”, i.e., “refers to a resource that is issued either ...”. The Editor said that this section dealt with mode of issuance and did not cover assembly of a collection that occurred after issuance. John Attig agreed.

- 196.4.5 Line 30: 1st bullet: Concerns re "logical unit"; expand to include sets of material issued in a single discrete container (ALA)

John Attig read from 5JSC/RDA/Part 1/ALA response: “In terms of online resources, we find the concept of “logical unit” in this section problematic, and don’t think that it will be understandable to the average RDA user without a definition. What constitutes a logical unit to one person will not appear the logical unit to another. For example, it is possible to catalogue an entire website on one record OR all the publications listed on that website, each with its own record, OR a single chapter of a single publication found on that website, OR a single image found in a single chapter of a single publication found on that single website.” The Editor noted that there were difficulties if the definition of “resource issued as a single unit” is limited to physical units. JSC asked the Glossary Editor to provide a definition for “logical unit”. JSC decided that no action was required for the second part of line 30: “expand to include sets of material issued in a single discrete container”. The Editor noted that sets and kits would be covered under mode of issuance as multipart monographs.

**Action=Glossary Editor**

- 196.4.6 Line 31: 2nd bullet: include "issued as a set" or "together"; add "monographic series" as an e.g. (ALA)

The Editor said that this comment was moot as there was no longer a definition for “resource issued in two or more parts simultaneously”.

- 196.4.7 Line 32: add guidelines for replacement volume sets (ALA)

The Editor said that at the April 2007 meeting this suggestion had been withdrawn by ALA (5JSC/M/137.9.2).

- 196.5 1.1.3 Intended termination

- 196.5.1 Line 33: Reconceptualise as "Intent to continue" and reword (ALA)

The Editor noted that as 1.1.3 had been merged with 1.1.2 this was moot.

- 196.5.2 Line 34: Add text from AACR2 12.0A1 (ALA)

John Attig read out the text suggested by ALA: “Apply guidelines for serials also to resources resulting from limited-duration activities if the resources have characteristics of serials, such as successive issues, numbering, and frequency, e.g., a daily bulletin issued during a non-recurring meeting; the quarterly activities report of a project; the annual report of an expedition; a magazine with a predetermined number of issues.” Margaret Stewart noted that CCC had made a similar comment at Line 36 in the response table. The Editor said that he was not sure that the definition was the right place to include this information, but that he would find a place for it, possibly in the introductory chapter to Section 1. JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

## 196.5.3 Line 35: 2nd bullet use of "series" confusing (ALA)

The Editor noted that the phrase “series of annual reports” was still present in the definition of a serial at 1.1.2.6. JSC decided to remove the phrase.

**Action=Editor; Glossary Editor**

## 196.6 1.1.6 Access points

196.6.1 The Editor said that the definition of “preferred access point” matched the use of the term in the June 2007 version of chapters 6 and 7. He asked about the use of “access point” in 1.9 Elements used as access points. Instead he suggested that the general instruction for title could say that titles may function as access points as well as descriptive elements. JSC agreed to leave this to the Editor.

**Action=Editor**

## 196.7 1.3 Changes requiring a new description

196.7.1 The Chair noted that in the document on priority issues for discussion LC had listed a number of situations missing from 1.3.

196.7.2 Situation missing: change in responsible body if included in name of work

The Editor said that he thought that this was covered by 1.3.1 “b) a change in responsibility requires a change to the preferred access point representing the serial as a work”. Judy Kuhagen said that she thought that the statement at 2.8.0.5b.2 was still misleading: “If the publisher’s name changes, or if a different publisher is named on a subsequent issue or part, and this change does not require a new description (see 1.3) ...” The Editor suggested that publisher not be included at 1.3.1 and that 2.8.0.5b.2 be fixed (see 5JSC/M/196.7.3). JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

196.7.3 Situation missing: change in edition statement

The JSC agreed to remove “and this change does not require a new description” from 2.5.0.6b.1: “If an edition statement is added, deleted, or changed on a subsequent issue or part and this change does not require a new description, make an annotation if the change is considered to be important either for identification or for access.” The JSC agreed to remove the same phrase from 2.8.0.5b.2.

**Action=Editor**

196.7.4 Situation missing: change in mode of issuance

The JSC decided that for all types of resources a change in mode of issuance for the whole resource would require a new description.

**Action=Editor**

196.7.5 Situation missing: change in carrier

The JSC discussed whether changes to any of the elements in chapter 3 would justify a new description. Margaret Stewart noted that in 5JSC/RDA/Part I/Chair follow-up/3, the ISSN Network had noted that the ISSN Manual and ISBD(CR) require that there be a new record when the physical medium of the resource changes. The JSC decided that a new description would be created for all types of resources if the media type changes. It was

noted that this would be a manifestation-to-manifestation relationship. The Editor said that according to scenario 1 in the implementation scenarios (5JSC/Editor/2), successive manifestations could be linked to one work.

**Action=Editor**

#### 196.7.6 Edition and Integrating resources

It was noted that at line 55 in the response table, LC had suggested that the following be included at 1.3 “When describing an integrating resource, create a new description for some changes in edition information”. Judy Kuhagen said that this primarily occurred when a new set of base volumes is issued for an updating loose-leaf. Kathy Winzer added that sometimes in this situation there was an edition statement and sometimes not. John Attig noted that this same issue was covered at line 278 in the response table. JSC decided that “rebasings” of an integrating resource would require a new description.

**Action=Editor**

#### 196.7.7 Change in URL

Judy Kuhagen noted that there was an LCRI for AACR2 21.3 which said to make a new description when the URL changes. The JSC decided that a change in URL would not require a new description.

196.7.8 The Chair noted that LC had suggested in the priority issues for discussion that information be added to RDA about what differences can be ignored when using copy from another library, metadata from a publisher, etc. The JSC decided that procedural details such as this would not be covered in RDA.

#### 196.7.9 “Differences between, changes within”

The JSC discussed whether to include a reference to “Differences between, changes within” at 1.3. It was decided that as the document refers to AACR2, it would not be appropriate to refer to it. However, the JSC agreed to re-evaluate this decision if the document is updated.

**Action=JSC**

196.7.10 The Chair confirmed that lines 53-56 in the part I response table were covered by the preceding discussion.

#### 196.8 1.4 Required elements

196.8.1 The Editor noted that Statement of responsibility relating to title had been deleted from the list of required elements at 1.4.1.1, as agreed at the June 14 teleconference. He added the alternative that was at 1.4.1.2 in the May 2007 draft had also been deleted.

196.8.2 Barbara Tillett asked about the inclusion of subject access as a required element. She added that she had circulated suggested wording on the first day of the meeting: “Subject heading/subject term and/or Classification number, if appropriate”. The Editor said that with the new structure for RDA what would be required would be the relationship to a concept, object, event, or place. He added that this would only appear in the composite list of required elements in the General Introduction. Barbara Tillett asked about the disclaimer that she had suggested: “Follow the standards chosen by the cataloguing agency for subject access. While RDA does not include instructions for formulating or applying subject headings, subject terms, or classification numbers, but it does include

instructions for constructing access points for names of persons, families, corporate bodies, and geographic places that may be used as the subject of works, expressions, etc.” The JSC agreed that it would be useful to include this information with the composite list.

**Action=Editor**

196.9 1.6.0 General guidelines on transcription

196.9.1 Line 58: Add option for early printed resources to allow full transcription (ALA)

After discussion, John Attig withdrew the request as it is covered by the alternative at 1.6.0.2.

196.10 1.6.2 Punctuation

196.10.1 Line 59: Add instruction that transcription covers punctuation as it appears (CCC)

The Editor said that 1.6.2 had been added after the April meeting. He asked if the instruction was sufficient. Margaret Stewart noted that Examples Group 1 had raised a number of questions regarding this instruction in their “Review of examples in part A, chapters 1-2, 4-5”.

The Editor noted that the first examples listed under 1.6.2 in the Examples Group document contained ellipses as found on the source. He said that because RDA did not contain the AACR2 instructions about substituting these with a long dash, there would be ambiguity as to whether a mark of omission was present on the source or not. The JSC confirmed that ellipses would be transcribed as they appear on the source. It was noted that an annotation could be given to indicate that the title had been truncated.

**Action=Secretary (List of AACR2 changes – 1.1B1)**

JSC discussed another query from the Examples Group about transcription of a colon separating the title from other title information, or bullets separating parts of the title, or places of publication. The JSC asked the Editor to add instructions to omit punctuation that precedes or follows an element, and to omit punctuation and symbols that function only as separators.

**Action=Editor**

The Chair noted that the Examples Group had also asked for confirmation that addition of internal punctuation for clarity (that is, not ISBD punctuation) applies equally to a transcribed element, e.g., a title element appearing on separate lines where the addition of commas is reasonable. The JSC agreed, and confirmed that no changes were needed to the instructions.

196.10.2 The Chair confirmed that the comments at lines 60 and 61 in the part I response table had also been covered.

196.11 1.6.3 Accents and other diacritical marks

196.11.1 Line 74: Reword to transcribe what you see, with option to add accents and diacritics (AACR2 1.0G1) (LC)

JSC agreed to the suggested text proposed by LC in the wiki: “Transcribe accents and other diacritical marks as they appear on the source of information. Optionally, add

accents and other diacritical marks that are not present in the data on the source of information in accordance with the standard usage for the language.”

**Action=Editor**

196.12 1.6.5 Spacing of initials and acronyms

196.12.1 The Chair noted that the Examples Group had the following question regarding 1.6.5.2 (“If such letters or initials have full stops between them, omit any internal spaces”): “Would like confirmation that spacing of initials and acronyms apply to transcription of publishers’, etc., names”. The JSC confirmed this, and asked the Editor to add text to 1.6.5.1 to make it clear that all spaces are to be removed whether there are full stops or not.

**Action=Editor**

196.13 1.6.7 Abbreviations

196.13.1 The JSC discussed the following question from the Examples Group: “Would like confirmation that abbreviations as instructed in appendix B (not yet finalized) are to be used or the prescribed abbreviation can replace (without the use of square brackets) the abbreviation in the elements itemized at 1.6.7 (Edition statement, Production statement, Publication statement, Distribution statement). However, as noted at 5JSC/M/89.3, JSC agreed that these elements would be transcribed as found.” The JSC agreed that 1.6.7 would be followed as written, but that this instruction would be influenced by the Appendices Group recommendations on abbreviations.

196.13.2 The JSC discussed this comment from the Examples Group: “Instructions at 1.6.7 also appear to be at odds with the instructions at 1.7.0.3 that states numbers expressed as numerals or as words in a transcribed element would be in the form in which they appear on the source of information. However, the instructions at 1.7.3 indicate the form [in which] ordinal numbers for an English-language sources should be, i.e., not superscript.” It was noted that the instructions at 1.7.1, 1.7.2 and 1.7.3 only apply to the recorded elements listed in 1.7.0.1. If the instructions at 1.7.0.3 are followed for transcribed elements, they will take you to the instructions at 1.6, including those at 1.6.7.

196.14 1.7.2 Inclusive numbers

196.14.1 The Examples Group posed the following question regarding 1.7.2.1: Would like clarification (as the draft stands currently at 1.7.0.1) that inclusive numbers in dates that are part of numbering are to be recorded in full.” The JSC confirmed and asked the Examples Group to add explanation to the “1967-1972” example to say “Designation appearing on item 1967-72”. It was noted that this instruction is not asking the cataloguer to record together data that would normally be in two different elements (e.g., first and last chronological designation).

**Action=Examples Group 1**

196.15 1.7 Numbers expressed as numerals or as words

196.15.1 The Editor explained that the current text at 1.7 was the result of the discussion of 5JSC/LC/5/Rev at the April 2007 meeting. He said that he wanted to confirm that the result was as intended, in particular the treatment of numbers expressed as words. He said that there were now no instructions for numbers expressed as words, which meant that if a date of publication was on the source as “Two thousand and one” it would be recorded

that way. The Editor noted that when LC had first put forward the proposal, the date of publication was a transcribed element, but it was now a recorded element. The JSC decided to reinstate the instructions which say to replace numbers expressed as words with numerals for recorded elements.

**Action=Editor**

196.16 1.8 Annotations

196.16.1 The Editor explained the changes he had made to 1.8. The instructions on notes citing other works and other expressions or manifestations of the same work (formerly at 1.7.4) have been deleted, given that such references are no longer treated as notes but as structured descriptions of a related resource in accordance with instructions under chapter 7. The instructions on combining notes (formerly at 1.7.6) have also been deleted as the treatment of various types of annotations as specific element sub-types effectively precludes the combining of notes.

196.16.2 Line 82: Add option to not require insertion of quotation marks in captured metadata (ALA)

John Attig said that ALA had indicated in the wiki that this could be withdrawn based on the assumption that it was covered by 1.6. The Editor noted that the instructions under 1.8 are not connected to the alternative at 1.6.0.3, which only covers transcribed elements. He added that if the alternative suggested by ALA were agreed, an alternative would have to be added under 1.8.2, or under 1.8.0, if it is to be broadened to apply to the instructions under 1.8.1 as well. John Attig said that he would still withdraw the ALA comment.

196.16.3 Line 85: Add new option to connect an information source to a specific element (LC)

Barbara Tillett noted that LC had indicated they wanted to withdraw line 85, however ALA withdrew line 84 based on line 85. Barbara Tillett and John Attig confirmed that both the line numbers should be withdrawn.

196.17 1.9 Elements used as access points

196.17.1 The Editor noted that this had already been discussed (5JSC/M/196.6.1).

**197 Appendices A-C (Capitalization, Abbreviations, Initial Articles)**

197.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Chair/9/Chair follow-up/3

197.2 The Chair invited Judy Kuhagen to the table to speak to the Appendices Working Group September 2007 status report (5JSC/Chair/9/Chair follow-up/3).

197.3 Judy Kuhagen noted that in June 2007 the Group had prepared draft extracts for each Appendix so that the developers of the online product could see the structure.

197.4 Appendix B (Abbreviations)

197.4.1 Judy Kuhagen said that for Appendix B (Abbreviations) the Group was waiting on JSC discussion of responses about abbreviations in chapter 3. She added that language experts at LC were checking the abbreviations in other languages to see which were used in transcribed or recorded elements.

197.4.2 Judy Kuhagen said that the Group was waiting on JSC decisions regarding abbreviations in Part B, e.g., “b.”, “d.” and “fl.” as used in dates added to names. The Chair said that the JSC wanted the Group to make recommendations on all abbreviations for the JSC to consider. She added that there should be a cohesive policy on abbreviations rather than case-by-case decisions. Judy Kuhagen asked when the Group should do this work. The Editor noted that the Examples Group 2 needed decisions on abbreviations in Part B as soon as possible.

**Action=Appendices Working Group**

197.4.3 Judy Kuhagen said that she had been under the impression that there was a strong preference for no change to AACR2 for Part B. The Chair said that there were two conflicting goals, use of fewer abbreviations, and no change to existing headings. The Editor commented that he thought there was a difference between standard abbreviations for states, provinces, months etc., and “made-up” abbreviations such as “col.”. It was noted that with separate elements for date of birth and date of death, abbreviations such as “b.” and “d.” could be generated for display. Judy Kuhagen said that she was wondering if these abbreviations should be added to Appendix E. The Editor said that as they were to do with display only he thought they should be kept separate from the Appendix.

197.4.4 The JSC asked the Group to prepare recommendations on abbreviations in Part B as soon as possible for quick review by the JSC. The Editor said that a priority was a decision on months and geographic places as these were used as additions to names. The JSC discussed these abbreviations and decided that the existing abbreviations would be used. The primary reason for the decision is the impact on existing files. The Chair said that after the meeting she would prepare a document on the rationale for why some changes are made and others are not.

**Action=Chair**

197.4.5 It was noted that the decision had already been made to retain “B.C.” as an abbreviation in headings (5JSC/M/183.27.1). Judy Kuhagen said that the Group would look at all other abbreviations used in headings, e.g., “fl.” and send recommendations to the JSC.

**Action=Appendices Working Group**

197.5 Appendix C (Initial articles)

197.5.1 Judy Kuhagen noted that a draft of Appendix C accompanied the status report. She added that Hugh Taylor had pointed out that explanatory text was needed for two Irish initial articles.

197.5.2 Judy Kuhagen asked for JSC reaction on whether the lists should be condensed, or whether the language should be listed with each article. She added that she was not sure which would be better for the online version. The Chair suggested that the Project Manager check what was possible with Cognilore.

**Action=Project Manager**

197.5.3 Hugh Taylor noted that it had been agreed earlier to refer to the ISO 639-2 list of language names (5JSC/M/183.39.1). He asked whether it would be possible to confirm the names of languages used in the Appendix against the ISO list. Alan Danskin said that one difficulty was that ISO 639-2 had a very narrow scope and only contained contemporary languages. It was agreed that as a minimum there should be no conflict between the language names used in the Appendix and those in ISO 639-2. The Editor said that the same should apply to the other appendices when there was any arrangement by language.

**Action=Appendices Working Group**

197.5.4 Judy Kuhagen noted that in the past, when changes had been agreed to the AACR2 list of initial articles, LC CPSO had passed this information to the Network Development and MARC Standards Office so that it could be changed in the MARC 21 documentation. She asked when the recently agreed additions to the list of initial articles should be passed on. The Chair suggested that when the Group felt that the Appendix was complete, CPSO should pass on the changes. Judy Kuhagen noted that updates to the MARC 21 format were usually annual.

**Action=LC CPSO**

197.5.5 Alan Danskin asked about the entry for “Panjabi (Perso-Arabic) script” in the Appendix. He asked why script had been mentioned when all of the initial articles in the list were in Roman script. The Editor said that presumably the list of initial articles should apply whatever the script. He suggested that in cases where the language is written in another script it should be possible with Unicode to include the original script. He added that the arrangement for some languages could be firstly alphabetical in the original script and then alphabetical in the transliterated form. Judy Kuhagen agreed that the Group would do this work. The JSC asked the Project Manager to confirm with Cognilore that the other scripts could be included.

**Action=Appendices Working Group; Project Manager**

197.6 Appendix A (Capitalization)

197.6.1 Judy Kuhagen referred to 1.6.1. Capitalization in the September 2007 Editor’s draft of chapter 1 (5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Chapter 1/Rev). She asked why some instructions were present here instead of in the Appendix. The Editor said that originally he had pulled from the appendices those instructions that appeared to be general and could be stated succinctly. He added that since he had done this, some of the instructions had become more complex, such as the exceptions at 1.6.1.1. Judy Kuhagen said that the problem was that the exceptions (for Arabic and Hebrew articles, Compound terms, and, Internet addresses) seemed too prominent.

197.6.2 Judy Kuhagen said that the Group was also not certain of the purpose of 1.6.1.2 Capitalization of other transcribed elements. She asked if this was to do with capitalization of areas in an ISBD display and whether this meant it should move to an Appendix. The Editor suggested that the Group look at 1.6.1 to see if all or some of it should be moved to an appendix.

**Action=Appendices Working Group**

197.7 John Attig noted that 1.6 only applied to the current Part A, he asked if there would be an equivalent in chapter 8. The Editor said that there would not be because, it only applied to transcribed elements in chapter 2. John Attig said that this meant that instructions on capitalization of access points would only be found in the Appendix with no reference to them. The Editor said that he would check chapter 8 to ensure there are references to the appendices on capitalization, abbreviation, and initial articles. He later noted that Capitalization was covered at 8.7.1 and Abbreviations at 8.7.6. It was agreed that the Appendices Working Group would look at 8.7 to see if any of the instructions should be moved to an appendix.

**Action=Editor; Appendices Working Group**

**198 Revised draft of RDA - Part A – Chapter 2**

- 198.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Editor/RDA/Part A/Chapter 2/Rev
- 198.2 The Chair noted that the Editor had gone through the cover letter for the revised chapter 2 and identified his priority issues for discussion.
- 198.3 2.3.0.4 Recording titles
- 198.3.1 The Editor explained that the exception for serials that was at 2.3.1.7b in the May 2007 draft has been transferred to 2.3.0.4c. The exception has been revised to apply to any title of a serial (i.e., title proper, parallel title(s), other title information, variant title, etc.). The Editor asked if the exceptions at 2.3.1.7.2 and 2.3.1.7.3 should also be extended to apply to any title of a serial or integrating resource. The JSC agreed that these exceptions should also be moved to 2.3.0.4.  
**Action=Editor**
- 198.4 2.3.1.7 Recording the title proper
- 198.4.1 The Editor noted that at the June 20, 2007 teleconference it had been agreed that the mark of omission would be used, and that he had been asked to ensure that wording on using the mark of omission was consistent in all specific instructions. The Editor said that he wanted to discuss the exception for serials and integrating resources at 2.3.1.7.3 not to record a mark of omission when omitting mention of an earlier title, etc., and the exception for serials at 2.3.0.4c.1 not to record a mark of omission when omitting dates, names, numbers, etc., that vary if they occur at the beginning of a title proper.
- 198.4.2 The JSC discussed use of the mark of omission at the beginning of a title proper (2.3.0.4c.1) and agreed that this would be allowed. It was noted that MARC 21 non-filing indicators could be used to prevent problems with filing. The Editor said that he would delete “unless it occurs at the beginning of the title, in which case do not record the mark of omission” from the end of the instruction.  
**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 12.1B7)**
- 198.5 2.3.2 Parallel title
- 198.5.1 The Editor explained that the optional addition at 2.3.2.3.2 “If the parallel title is not taken from the same source as the title proper, indicate the source” was an anomaly as optional additions supplement what is called for in the immediately preceding instruction. The JSC decided to delete 2.3.2.3.2 and include at the end of 2.3.2.3 “If the source of the parallel title is not the same as the source of the title proper and it is considered to be important make an annotation.” It was noted that if this sort of information was given in the form of free text it was an annotation, otherwise it was “data about data”. Barbara Tillett said that she thought this should be made explicit. The Editor said that once the JSC had made decisions about “data about data” all annotations would need to be reviewed. He added that text added to 2.3.2.3 would either refer to 2.18.1 (Annotation on title) or possibly to an appendix on data about data.  
**Action=Editor; JSC (Discuss “data about data”)**
- 198.6 2.3.5.5 Supplying other title information

## 198.6.1 Line 187: Make optional [Change to AACR2 1.1E6] (ALA)

The Editor noted that some of the instructions in 2.3.5.5 and 2.3.5.6 (Other additions to other title information) belonged in the content chapters on works and expressions. JSC decided that 2.3.5.5 was not required.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes – 1.1E6)**

## 198.7 2.3.5.6 Other additions to other title information

198.7.1 The Editor commented that if there was not already other title information, there could not be any additions to it. He suggested that the caption be changed to “Supplying other title information.” It was noted that the reference to “other additions” would need to be removed from 2.3.5.6.1. The Editor suggested that another bullet be added to 2.3.5.1 to say that other title information can be supplied. The JSC discussed whether this information could be handled by the instructions at 4.3 and 4.4, and decided to raise this question in the cover letter for the full draft.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (Cover letter for full draft)**

## 198.8 2.3.8 Earlier/later variant title

198.8.1 The Editor asked if earlier variant title and later variant title should be treated as separate element sub-types, which would mean splitting the instructions under 2.3.8 into two separate sections. The JSC agreed.

**Action=Editor**

## 198.9 2.3.11 Devised title

198.9.1 Barbara Tillett asked if a better caption would be “Devised title proper”. The Editor noted that it was possible to provide a devised title even if there was a title proper.

## 198.9.2 2.3.11.5 Devised titles for cartographic resources

## 198.9.3 Line 130: 2.3.7.4 Para b) Reword (CCC)

Margaret Stewart said that she agreed with the wording proposed by LC in the wiki:

## b) Cartographic resources

Always include in the devised title the name or an identification of the area covered and, if applicable, the subject portrayed.

## c) Moving image resources

For a short advertising film, devise a title consisting of the name or an identification of the product, service, etc., advertised, or the subject portrayed, and the word *advertisement*.

It was noted that c) now belonged with 2.3.11.6 (Devised titles for moving image resources). JSC agreed to the LC wording, with the addition of “or video” for moving image resources as found in the Editor’s draft.

**Action=Editor**

## 198.10 2.4.0 Basic instructions on recording statements of responsibility

198.10.1 The Editor asked the JSC to review the new optional omission at 2.4.0.4.2: “Abridge a statement of responsibility only if it can be abridged without loss of essential information. Do not use a mark of omission to indicate such omissions. Always record the first name appearing in the statement. When omitting names from a statement of responsibility naming two or more persons, etc., follow the instructions given under 2.4.0.5.” The JSC agreed with the option, even though it is an exception to the general decision that marks of omission will be used.

198.10.2 The Editor said that 2.4.0.5.2 had also been amended as a result of the June 20 2007 teleconference. Barbara Tillett noted that the examples should contain an actual summary of the omission rather than the placeholder “[summary of omission]”.

**Action=Examples Group 1**

198.10.3 The Editor asked if the exception for editors of serials at 2.4.0.4.3 is really necessary, given that statement of responsibility is now an optional element. The JSC decided that the exception would be deleted, as previously it had allowed serials cataloguers not to include a required element.

**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes - 12.7B7.1)**

198.11 2.4.0.6 More than one statement of responsibility

198.11.1 Line 245: Provide for instances where the major role cannot be determined (ACOC)

The Editor noted that a new instruction had been added at 2.4.0.6.4: “If not all statements of responsibility appearing in the source(s) of information are being recorded, give preference to those identifying creators of the intellectual or artistic content as opposed to those identifying contributors to the intellectual or artistic content”. The JSC decided that “as opposed to those identifying contributors to the intellectual or artistic content” was not required.

**Action=Editor**

The Editor suggested that 2.4.0.6.4 move to 2.4.1.3.2 as it only applied to 2.4.1 (Statement of responsibility relating to title). The JSC agreed.

The JSC discussed the ACOC suggestion that a phrase such as “In case of doubt about which statement(s) of responsibility relate to a major role, record the first statement” or “In case of doubt, record the first statement” be added. The JSC agreed to include this at 2.4.1.3.3.

**Action=Editor**

198.12 2.4.0.7 Titles of nobility, address, honour, etc.

198.12.1 It was noted that this instruction was no longer present in the draft, so the Editor’s comment in the cover letter was moot.

198.13 2.4.0.10 Words included in statements of responsibility that are neither names nor linking words

198.13.1 Line 257: Rewrite as instruction or delete (LC)

It was noted that in the example “written by Jobe Hill in 1812”, it was not clear whether “Jobe Hill” was a place or a name. JSC asked the Examples Group to replace the example with one that is clearly a name.

**Action=Examples Group 1**

The JSC decided to move the instruction to become part of the scope at 2.4.0.1. It was noted that the revised example would be used at 2.4.0.4.

**Action=Editor; Glossary Editor**

## 198.14 2.5.1.3 Recording statements designating edition

198.14.1 The Editor said that a new instruction has been added at 2.5.1.3.3 to address cases where more than one statement designating edition is being recorded, and examples had been added from 5JSC/LC/4. He said that he wanted the JSC to review the instruction and examples to determine whether it would be more appropriate to treat such statements as statements designating a named revision of an edition. The JSC decided that no change was required to 2.5.1.3.

## 198.15 2.7.1 Place of production, 2.8.1 Place of publication, and 2.9.1 Place of distribution

198.15.1 Line 323: Prefer to clarify [place of publication, distribution, etc.] within the element (ALA)

Line 324: Add instruction to clarify place of publication in square brackets (CCC)

It was noted that based on earlier JSC decisions, there would no longer be interpolations within an element. The Editor noted that the following instruction had been added: “If the place name as transcribed is known to be fictitious, make an annotation giving the actual place name (see 2.18.5.3)”.

Barbara Tillett asked where the instructions were about expanding the short form of place names, e.g., “Mpls [Minneapolis]”. It was noted that this instruction is no longer in the draft, and that if necessary an annotation would be made. Margaret Stewart pointed out that there were some examples that followed the instruction at 2.8.1.3.1. JSC asked the Examples Group to edit the examples to remove the interpolations. The Chair asked the Editor to review references to making an annotation.

**Action=Examples Group 1; Editor**

## 198.16 2.7.3 Producer’s name, 2.8.3 Publisher’s name, and 2.9.3 Distributor’s name

198.16.1 Line 302: Instructions on names in a hierarchy is missing (ACOC)

The Editor referred the JSC to 2.7.0.4.4: “Transcribe places of production and producers’ names in the form in which they appear on the source of information, following the general guidelines on transcription given under 1.6.” Margaret Stewart said that CCC would support an option to remove some of the names in a hierarchy. JSC agreed that there should be an optional omission along the lines of: “Omit levels of the corporate hierarchy not needed to identify the entity”. It was also agreed that the marks of omission would be used.

**Action=Editor Secretary (List of AACR2 changes – 1.4D2)**

198.16.2 Line 308: Add instruction to clarify name of publisher in square brackets (CCC)

The Editor noted that this had been covered.

## 198.17 2.7.5 Date of production, 2.8.5 Date of publication, and 2.9.5 Date of distribution

## 198.17.1 Line 358: Need guidance for when there are multiple dates (CILIP)

The Editor noted that this would be discussed with the major issues identified by LC (see 5JSC/M/198.32).

## 198.18 2.7 Production statement

198.18.1 The Editor said that the scope of “production” needed to be clarified, and its applicability to various types of resources (unpublished resources, collections, archival resources, published resources, etc.).

198.18.2 Barbara Tillett suggested that “manufacture” be used instead of “production”. The Editor said that “production” was able to cover unique resources and the act of creation for unpublished resources. Barbara Tillett noted that “production” had a number of connotations, particularly in relation to motion pictures. The JSC discussed the issue and there was no agreement that the change should be made. The Chair said that there would be no change until there was an acceptable alternative.

198.18.3 The Editor suggested that the JSC review the use of the term “creation” in the scope notes for Production statement, Place of production, Producer’s name, and Date of production, as creation in RDA is so closely tied to intellectual content. The JSC agreed to remove “creation” from 2.7.0.1.2.

**Action=Editor**

198.18.4 Barbara Tillett suggested that in 2.7.0.1.1 “producer(s)” be changed to “manufacturer(s)”. The JSC decided that as the change had not been made to the element name, it would not be made at 2.7.0.1.1.

## 198.19 2.7.1 Place of production

198.19.1 Line 341: Add new data element for place of production for moving image material (ALA)

The Editor said that place of production for moving image material was definitely not covered by 2.7.1. John Attig asked if this meant that there needed to be a new data element. He noted that there is a MARC 21 data element for the country of production. The Editor said that in other chapters there were placeholders for “capture” and “creation”. John Attig agreed that this would be adequate.

## 198.20 2.8.5.6 Date of publication not identified in the resource

198.20.1 Line 359: Make clear that “[date unknown]” is a last resort, restore examples from AACR2 (ALA)

Line 362: include when span of dates is certain (CCC)

Line 365: 2nd para: Disagree with use of trailing “s”, suggest investigate ISO 8601 (CILIP)

Barbara Tillett noted that LC had suggested in the wiki that the question mark be used in all situations to replace unknown information. The JSC asked the LC representative to prepare an informal proposal to show what an instruction to use question marks would look like and to provide some examples so that a decision can be made outside the meeting. It was noted that chapter 2 was due to be finalized at the end of January. The

Editor suggested that the chapter 9 instructions for dates could be examined at the same time.

**Action=LC representative**

198.21 2.10 Copyright date

198.21.1 The Editor noted that there was now a new element for Copyright date. He asked if this was acceptable, or whether a higher-level element should be defined for Copyright statement, with Copyright date as a sub-element. The JSC decided to have only an element for Copyright date as the other information is to do with rights management which is outside the scope of the first release of RDA.

198.22 2.11.0.3 Facsimiles and reproductions [Series statement]

198.22.1 Line 378: Clarify for when series information only relates to the original (ALA)

It was noted that ACOC and CCC disagreed in the table with the ALA suggestion. The Editor said that he could answer the ALA question “is intent that original series would always go in a note?”; as what would be recorded would be a relationship. He added that the relationship could be recorded as a structured or unstructured description, or as an access point. John Attig said that, as there had been such a change in context that the ALA comment no longer applied.

198.23 2.11.1.3 Recording title proper of series

198.23.1 The Editor said that following the change to 2.3.0.4c.1 agreed earlier in the meeting (5JSC/M/198.4.2) there was no longer a discrepancy between 2.11.1.3.3 and 2.3.0.4c.1.

198.24 2.12 Mode of issuance

198.24.1 The Editor said that he would draft these instructions based on the discussion on 1.1.2 earlier in the meeting (5JSC/M/196.3.1). Four values will be included: single unit; multipart monograph; serial; and, integrating resource.

**Action=Editor**

198.25 2.14 Resource identifier

198.25.1 Line 423: For the ISBN "in the format prescribed by the relevant standard" is ambiguous (CILIP)

The Editor noted that the instruction had undergone revision since the original comment was made. He said that a complicating factor is that the relevant ISO standards provide for recording identifiers in two ways, a human readable format, and a machine-readable format. He added that there could be “data about data” to show the format that is used. Margaret Stewart noted that the MARC 21 format would tell you what to do in terms of encoding. John Attig said it was ironic that the AACR2 and RDA instructions have examples showing the human readable format, but the machine-readable format (i.e., without hyphens) is what is recorded. Hugh Taylor said that he wanted to do some more investigation into what was included in the standards. The Chair confirmed that the original CILIP comment was withdrawn.

**Action=CILIP representative; JSC (Discuss “data about data”)**

198.26 2.18.1.3 Source of title proper

198.26.1 Line 237: Delete a)-c) and explain principle (or add new d)) (LC)

It was noted that LC had supplied suggested wording in the wiki. Judy Kuhagen commented that this wording had been supplied prior to the JSC teleconference on sources of information, which had resulted in a number of changes. The Chair confirmed that the LC comment was withdrawn. John Attig asked about the LC suggestion to include an option to always give a note. The Editor said that the element was optional. The Chair confirmed that 2.18.1.3 was acceptable as written.

198.27 The Editor said that not all issues from the cover letter had been discussed and he would identify any loose ends that needed to be resolved by email.

198.28 The Chair noted that there were still issues to be discussed from the document on priority issues for discussion:

198.29 2.1 Basis for identification of the resource and 2.2 Sources of information

198.29.1 LC comment: “The use of terminology “resource issued in successive parts” instead of “serials” and “multipart monographs” causes confusion as to the completeness of the 2.1 instructions on basis for identification.”

The Editor noted that the terminology had already been addressed (5JSC/M/196.4.1) and that he would give Judy Kuhagen a list of the instructions that included the phrase “resources issued in successive parts”, which would include 2.1. Judy Kuhagen said that LC would examine the revised instructions (particularly 2.1.1.0) to see if they still thought there were any gaps.

**Action=Editor; Judy Kuhagen**

198.30 2.3.9 Key title

198.30.1 Judy Kuhagen said that LC had recommended not using the term “continuing resource” in the key title instruction (2.3.9.1.1) as it appears to be the only use of the term in Part A. Hugh Taylor suggested that as the assignment of a key title was determined by the ISSN Network, it was not necessary to specify the type of resource to which they are assigned. The JSC agreed to the following: “A key title is the unique name assigned to a resource by centres of the ISSN Network.”

**Action=Editor; Glossary Editor**

198.31 2.7-2.9: Instructions about changes in sub-elements of production, publication, etc., statements at the statement level

198.31.1 Judy Kuhagen explained that the LC concern is that instructions on changes over time are included with the basic instructions (e.g., 2.7.0.5 Recording changes in production statements), but there is no reference to this at the individual sub-elements (e.g., 2.7.1 Place of production). She added that at other places in RDA information about changes is given after the instructions on recording the element. The Editor said that this occurred in the case of element sub-types. He noted that there is a general reference to all of 2.7.0 at 2.7.1.3.1. He said that to add information on changes to each sub-element would be redundant. The JSC discussed the issue and agreed that it would be preferable for information on changes to be in the same place for each element. The Editor said that he would move 2.7.0.5, 2.8.0.5, and 2.9.0.5 further down in the instructions.

**Action=Editor**

- 198.32 2.8.5.5 Resources issued in successive parts and integrating resources and 2.9.1.4 More than one place of distribution and 2.9.3.5 More than one distributor
- 198.32.1 Judy Kuhagen explained that LC was wondering whether there should be separate sub-elements for beginning and ending dates of publication, distribution, etc., as there were separate elements for beginning and ending numbering. The Editor said that if this was agreed there would need to be three separate sub-elements: single date; first date; and, last date. He asked whether the same flexibility was needed for dates of publication as for numbering. He noted that the separate sub-elements in numbering would allow formatting with print constants, e.g., “Began with:”. Judy Kuhagen said that this was related to the LC query about repeatability of data elements and how changes are recorded. She noted that currently in RDA changes are recorded in an annotation, while some would like to use the repeatable 260 field in MARC 21.
- 198.32.2 The JSC discussed whether changes to publication, distribution, etc. elements over time should be recorded as the element or recorded in an annotation. It was noted that the Publication area is not repeatable in ISBD. John Attig said that for those who wanted to output an ISBD display, the MARC coding would make it clear which statement belonged in area 4. The JSC decided that RDA will instruct to record another statement when there are changes over time, with the option to provide an annotation. Margaret Stewart asked if it would be left to the encoding to designate the repeated statements, e.g., “first” and “current”. JSC agreed.
- Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes; List of ISBD issues)**

## 199 Removal of “Introductory words” instruction

- 199.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
 5JSC/CILIP/5  
 5JSC/CILIP/5/BL response  
 5JSC/CILIP/5/LC response  
 5JSC/CILIP/5/ACOC response  
 5JSC/CILIP/5/CCC response  
 5JSC/CILIP/5/ALA response
- 199.2 The Chair said that in 5JSC/CILIP/5, CILIP had proposed removal of the “introductory words” instruction (2.3.0.5, 2.3.0.6 in September 2007 draft) from RDA. She noted that BL and ALA disagreed, and ALA had presented detailed arguments against the proposal. She asked if any of the other constituencies agreed with ALA and BL after having read their responses. Barbara Tillett said that LC found the ALA arguments compelling, but wanted the introductory words instructions to apply exceptionally to e-resources and moving images. Hugh Taylor commented that CILIP had not been aware of the full history of the AACR2 instruction. He said that the ALA arguments were persuasive about the difficulties of removing the instruction. He suggested that the solution could be in the definition of title. The Chair said that in the examples provided by ALA, she did not consider the introductory words to be part of the title.
- 199.3 The Editor referred to the scope statement at 2.3.1.1.1: “The title proper is the chief name of a resource (i.e., the title normally used when citing the resource).” He said that the cataloguer had to make a judgement as to whether the introductory words are part of the title or not. The JSC discussed the issue. Hugh Taylor suggested that as 2.3.0.6 is covered by the definition of title proper, it is not required. The JSC decided to keep 2.3.0.6 as it provides useful guidance. The Chair asked the Secretary to add this to the list of issues for

consideration post the first release of RDA, in acknowledgement that it does not follow the principle of “take what you see”.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

- 199.4 John Attig said that similar questions regarding what is part of the title proper had been raised in the ALA response in relation to 2.3.0.5 (Names of persons, families, and corporate bodies). The Chair noted that CILIP had suggested removing this instruction and adding a further bulleted definition to 2.3.0.1. The JSC decided to make no change to 2.3.0.5, but to consider it after the first release of RDA.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

- 199.5 The Chair noted that CILIP had raised one other related issue, the exception for serials and integrating resources at 2.3.1.4 (now 2.3.1.5) which also conflicts with “take what you see”. Because of the implications for ISSN harmonization, the JSC agreed to consider this after the first release of RDA.

**Action= Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

## **200 Linking words in alternative titles**

- 200.1 The Chair said that there was no time to discuss linking words in alternative titles at the meeting. She suggested that the CILIP representative summarise the issue in an email.

**Action=CILIP representative**

- 200.2 The Editor suggested that if “data about data” was used to record the language, then the linking word could be automatically generated.

**Action=JSC (Discuss “data about data”)**

## **201 Numbering for serials: alternative instruction**

- 201.1 Received and considered the following documents:

5JSC/LC/10

5JSC/LC/10/ALA response

5JSC/LC/10/CCC response

5JSC/LC/10/BL response

5JSC/LC/10/CILIP response

5JSC/LC/10/ACOC response

5JSC/LC/10/LC follow-up

- 201.2 The Chair said that in 5JSC/LC/10/LC follow-up, LC noted that the JSC had not discussed LC’s proposal to add an alternative to give beginning/ending information in a note instead of as an element. The Chair said that her understanding was that the separation of numbering into separate sub-elements had solved the issue. The Editor explained that the sub-elements are recorded in such a way that print constants could be generated such as “Began with” or “Ceased with”. He noted that the JSC was following the principle of not building display into RDA.

- 201.3 Judy Kuhagen said that there was a conflict with instructions for publication information, where information could be given in an annotation. The Editor said that this is because two of the publication elements are transcribed and so were structured in a certain way. In that case, the annotation provided another way of presenting the information. He noted that numbering is a recorded element.

- 201.4 Barbara Tillett said that LC would not pursue the use of an annotation for numbering information.

## 202 Analysis of the proposed CONSER standard record vis à vis RDA

- 202.1 Received and considered the following documents:  
5JSC/Editor/1  
5JSC/Editor/1/Chair follow-up
- 202.2 The Chair noted that 5JSC/Editor/1/Chair follow-up listed some issues for resolution relating to the CONSER standard record.
- 202.3 2.3.10 Abbreviated Title
- 202.3.1 It was noted that the Editor had already created a “place-holder” element for Abbreviated title. The Editor confirmed that the intended scope was any abbreviated title (as defined in MARC 21) and that it was to be recorded as it appears.  
**Action=Editor; Glossary Editor**
- 202.4 2.6 Numbering
- 202.4.1 It was noted that the CONSER recommendation had just been discussed with 5JSC/LC/10/LC follow-up (5JSC/M/201).
- 202.5 2.8.5 Date of Publication
- 202.5.1 The Chair explained that CONSER does not require a date in 260 \$c, but in RDA the date of publication is a required element. The Chair asked if anyone wanted to make a case for not having the date of publication as a required element. John Attig suggested that the most that there could be would be an exception. The JSC discussed the issue and recognised that the CONSER standard record will differ to RDA. It was noted that AACR2 also requires the date of publication.
- 202.6 2.10 Series Statement
- 202.6.1 The Chair explained that this was a similar situation to 2.6, as CONSER did not require a series statement. The Editor noted that all that was required in RDA was the title proper of the series and numbering of the series. The JSC agreed that this is another case where CONSER will differ to RDA.
- 202.7 John Attig asked if a response would be made to CONSER. The Secretary noted that the exercise had been for the benefit of the JSC. The Chair said that a response had already been made to CONSER to say that the instructions were in flux and no rulings could be made.
- 202.8 The Chair noted that there were also some issues to be discussed in terms of uniform titles, which would be covered later (see 5JSC/M/204.15).
- 202.9 The Chair confirmed that no one had any comments on the section marked “No issue to resolve”. She noted that these were instructions on which the CONSER standard record and RDA agreed.

## 203 Examples in part A

- 203.1 The Chair led a discussion of outstanding issues from “Review of examples in part A, chapters 1-2, 4-5”.
- 203.2 **1.6.1.1.1 (p. 1-11)**: Would like confirmation that instructions on the capitalization of titles should also apply to “other title information” (cf. 2.3.0.1.4)
- 203.2.1 The JSC agreed that instructions on the capitalization of titles would not apply to other title information, and asked the Editor to make this clear in the instructions.  
**Action=Editor**
- 203.3 **2.3.5.3.2 (p. 2-29)**: Suggest that the examples be deleted from these instructions and allow the see reference to 2.12 address them.
- 203.3.1 The Editor said that this instruction was now at 2.3.5.3.3 and that he had already removed the examples. He noted that although the current reference was to 2.18 he would make it to 2.13 to provide more context.  
**Action=Editor**
- 203.4 **2.5.0.4.1** and **2.5.1.3.1**: Would like confirmation that the following is a correct interpretation of RDA: The statement designating edition is to be transcribed (cf. 2.5.0.4.1).
- 203.4.1 Judy Kuhagen said that the edition statement is listed at 1.6.7 as one of the elements that are transcribed using abbreviations as instructed in the Appendix. John Attig noted that the Appendices Group still needed to make recommendations on the use of abbreviations.  
**Action=Appendices Working Group**
- 203.5 **2.6.0**: Would like confirmation the following is a correct interpretation of RDA: The instructions for numbering at 2.6.0.4 state that “numbers expressed as numerals or as words” are to be recorded as per 1.7, but “other words, characters or groups of words or characters, or groups of words or characters” are to be transcribed as they appear. Such words would include “volume”, “number”, “part”, as well as chronological designations, such as Spring, Summer, etc. (in a capitalized form).
- 203.5.1 It was noted that the response was dependent on the Appendices Group recommendations on abbreviations.
- 203.6 **2.6.0.4.2 (p. 2-69)**: (2.6.0.4.1 vs. 1.6.7). Words are to be transcribed but not sure if these examples are just following AACR2, appendix B for abbreviations since both “vol.” and “v.” have been used in the numbering as per AACR2 instructions, e.g., Vol. 3, no. 6-v. 5, no. 3.
- 203.6.1 As with 2.6.0, it was noted that the response was dependent on the Appendices Group recommendations on abbreviations.
- 203.7 **2.6.2.3.1 (p. 2-72)**: **Question**: Given that the first issue or part and the last issue or part appear as separate “sub-elements”, wouldn’t the principle of “take what you see” be preferable?

- 203.7.1 The Editor explained that the instruction at 2.6.2.3.1 references the instruction at 2.6.0 for recording the designation. In turn, the instruction at 2.6.0.4 references the instruction at 1.7 for recording numbers expressed as numerals or as words, and 1.6 for general transcription guidelines. 1.7.2 instructs you to record inclusive dates in full, and 1.6.2 says to transcribe punctuation as it appears.
- 203.7.2 The JSC agreed that the current examples do not illustrate the instructions, and asked the Example Group to rectify this.  
**Examples Group 1**
- 203.8 **2.8.0.4 (p. 2-92):** Would like clarification that transcribing places of publication in the form in which they appear refer only to the name of the place and not to, e.g., postal code, connecting words between two places (New York and Toronto). Do the instructions need to be more explicit?
- 203.8.1 It was noted that as each place of publication is recorded separately according to 2.8, and connecting words are not transcribed. The JSC decided that the instructions regarding postal codes did not need to be more explicit as the instruction at 2.8.0.4.1 references the instruction at 1.6, which at 1.6.7 say that abbreviations should be replaced by the prescribed abbreviations from the Appendix.
- 203.9 **2.8.1.3.1:** Would like confirmation that if country as well the state/province are both present, both are to be included
- 203.9.1 The JSC agreed, and asked the Editor to revise the instruction slightly to make it clear that there can be more than one larger jurisdiction, e.g., “name of larger jurisdictions”.  
**Action=Editor**
- 203.10 **2.8.1.4.1 (p. 2-94), 3rd example:** Would like confirmation that this is an intentional change from AACR2; Would like confirmation that layout includes typography given the explanatory text in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> examples.
- 203.10.1 The JSC confirmed that this is an intentional change from AACR. JSC asked the Editor to revise the instruction itself to the effect that they should be recorded in the order indicated by the “sequence, layout or typography” on the source.  
**Action=Editor; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**
- 203.10.2 It was noted that the Examples Group had also asked the question “Would it be more in keeping with RDA principles to transcribe what you see in terms of order without considering layout/typography?” The Editor replied that by taking account of the layout/typography you were transcribing what you see.
- 203.11 **2.8.1.6.1b (p. 2-95):** Would like clarification as to where the question mark might go for an example such as the following: [Sofia? Bulgaria] or [Sofia, Bulgaria?]
- 203.11.1 The JSC agreed that the question mark should appear at the end of the part which is uncertain, and if it is the whole it goes at the end of the element.
- 203.12 **2.8.3.3 (p. 2-97):** Would like confirmation that the name of the publisher would include both the publishing company as well as the name of the subdivision or the trade name or brand name of the publisher.

203.12.1 JSC asked the Editor to revise the instruction to indicate that sufficient information should be recorded to identify the publisher. The default will be to include all the parts of the corporate hierarchy. There will be an option to omit levels of the corporate hierarchy not needed to identify the entity (5JSC/M/198.16.1).

**Action=Editor**

203.13 **2.8.5.3.1 (p. 2-100), 2<sup>nd</sup> example:** Would like confirmation that this example illustrates the *Alternatives* instruction at 1.7.1.1, i.e., “Substitute the equivalent numeral(s) in the script preferred by the agency preparing the description.” If so, the example should be noted as such. If not, the example is incorrect; the date should be recorded as roman numerals.

203.13.1 The JSC agreed that examples should always illustrate the instruction, not any alternatives. The JSC made the following decisions regarding this instruction. The caption at 1.7 will change to “Form of numerals”. The current alternative instruction at 1.7.1 will become the instruction, i.e., “Record numerals in the form preferred by the agency preparing the data”. There will be alternatives to record numerals in the form in which they appear, or to record both forms. Accordingly, the second example at 2.8.5.3.1 can remain as it is.

**Action=Editor**

203.14 **2.8.5.7.1 (p. 2-103):** An example using “p” has been given although there is no instruction referring to phonogram dates as in the December 2005 draft (2.9.3.1). How is this justified in terms of choice or use of “p” since the instructions on the use of the copyright symbol and the term is very specific.

203.14.1 JSC asked the Editor to revise the scope of the instruction on copyright dates to refer specifically to phonogram dates. It was agreed that the element name would not change.

**Action=Editor**

203.15 **2.9.3.5.1 (p. 2-109):** Would like confirmation this example is correct as follows: Sold and distributed in North, Central and South America by: Aspen Publishers, Inc.; Sold and distributed in all other countries by: Extenza-Turpin Distribution Services

203.15.1 The JSC agreed that each of these statements would be transcribed as they appear.

203.16 Sections 2.7, 2.8, 2.9

203.16.1 Would like confirmation that sections 2.7.1.6, 2.6.1.6, and 2.9.1.6 should all have exactly the same examples.

The Editor explained that the examples are only the same because he copied them when creating the new elements that are all based on the same AACR2 rule. JSC asked the Examples Group to provide suitable examples.

**Action=Examples Group 1**

203.16.2 Would like confirmation that other forms could be given as examples since the instructions do not imply that these forms are prescriptive, e.g., [197-], [18--?]

The Chair noted that it had already been agreed that Barbara Tillett would prepare an informal suggestion on use of the question mark in uncertain dates (5JSC/M/198.20.1).

203.16.3 **“Not identified”:** Would like confirmation that only the word “Place” is capitalized in the supplied text.

The JSC agreed that the response would depend on the JSC's discussion of the Appendices Working Group recommendations on capitalization.

- 203.16.4 **“Not identified”**: Would like confirmation that there should be an example repeating the supplied text at each of the instruction (2.7.3.7.1, 2.8.3.7.2, 2.9.3.7.1, etc.) in the preceding bullet.

The JSC agreed that no examples are required for these instructions.

- 203.16.5 Verification of examples if “take what you see” approach is followed:

It was noted that each publisher, etc., and each place of publication, etc., is recorded separately. Punctuation is added as needed for clarity. Capitalization and abbreviations to be used will depend on JSC's decisions in relation to the Appendices Group's recommendations. The Chair said that she would revise the examples in the Examples Group document and send them to the JSC for review.

**Action=Chair**

- 203.17 **2.17.0**: Examples of some annotations do not fall neatly into the specific captions. Would like clarification as to where to include such examples.
- 203.17.1 **2.17.2 (annotation on statement of responsibility)**: Creator's initials represented by musical notes on source of information

The JSC agreed with the placement of this example.

- 203.17.2 **2.17.9 (annotation on frequency)**: Includes amendments through order of December 5, 1983, effective April 1, 1984

It was noted that this appeared to be a note on coverage, and to belong in Chapter 4.

**Action=Examples Group 1**

- 203.18 **2.17.2.9.1c (p. 2-141)**: Would like clarification that making “a separate annotation indicating the date an online resource was viewed” (2.17.1.3.2) applies only to annotations on source of the title proper, i.e., date viewed may be combined as follows: Formerly issued by: Centre for Topographic Information (viewed Feb. 3, 2003)
- 203.18.1 The JSC agreed that in this case, the date viewed identifies the resource, which contains the statement of responsibility, rather than being the date the resource described was viewed. It was noted that this is covered by 1.8.4, and 1.8 is referred to at 2.18.0.3.1.
- 203.19 **2.17.4 (p. 2-142)**: Would like confirmation that 2.17.4 covers annotations on both serial numbering and series numbering, or that 2.17.8 covers all aspects of series statements including series. May have an impact on suggested Editorial revision noted at 2.10.6.3.5 in Appendix 1.
- 203.19.1 It was noted that series numbering is covered by 2.17.8 (now 2.18.8). This is made clear by 2.11.8.3.5 “If the numbering that appears on the source of information is known to be incorrect, transcribe it as it appears. Make an annotation giving the correct numbering (see 2.18.8).”
- 203.20 **2.17.6.3.1 (p. 2-146)**: Would like clarification of what is recorded in the publication statement element for each of the last 3 examples if such information is given as an

annotation. Similar examples (but without “Publication statement reads:”) appeared under the option at **2.7.0.5 More than one publisher, distributor, etc.** in the December 2005 draft.

203.20.1 Publication statement reads: Printed for the author and sold by J. Roberts

The JSC agreed that the annotation is not required as this information can be included in the publication statement (2.8.3.1.2).

**Action=Examples Group 1**

203.20.2 Publication statement reads: Impresi per me Wilhelmum de Machlinia in opulentissima civitate Londonarium iuxta pontem qui vulgariter dicitur Flete Brigge

The JSC agreed that this is a legitimate annotation, but that the information “Impresi per me Wilhelmum de Machlinia” could be recorded in the publication statement itself.

203.20.3 Publication statement reads: Printed by John Baskerville for R. and J. Dodsley

The JSC agreed that the annotation is not required as this information can be recorded in the publication statement.

**Action=Examples Group 1**

203.21 **4.11.3.4.1 (p. 4-21):** Would like confirmation that details of the tactile system are considered annotations (notes), i.e., justification for examples all to begin with a capital. If that is not a correct assumption, revise “Chess code” to: chess code.

203.21.1 The JSC agreed that the details of the tactile system are not considered annotations. The Appendices Working Group will cover the capitalization issue.

**Action=Appendices Working Group**

203.22 **4.16.0.3.1 (p. 4-29):** As these instructions have now been generalized, the ratio as “(1: )” should be given as **e.g.**, since a three-dimensional resource could be larger than the entity it represents, e.g., model of an ear that is four times the actual size of an ear (ratio would appear as 4:1).

203.22.1 Can a scale be given in a form other than a representative fraction, e.g., full size, life-size?

The JSC agreed and asked the Editor to revise the instruction to make this clear. The JSC asked the Group to include an example such as full size.

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 1**

203.22.2 The Editor said that he wanted cartographic experts to confirm the breakdown of elements and element subtypes for scale of cartographic resources. JSC members said that they would check with experts in their constituencies.

**Action=JSC (Breakdown of scale of cartographic resources)**

## 204 **RDA: Resource Description and Access Part A – Constituency Review of June 2007 Draft of Chapters 6-7**

204.1 Received and considered the following documents:

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/LC response

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/BL response

5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/1  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/ACOC response  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/CCC response  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/CILIP response  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/2  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/3  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/4  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/Chair follow-up/5  
 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/ALA response

- 204.2 The Chair suggested that the discussion focus on those issues that would affect the Part B chapters that were about to be issued for constituency review, and structural issues. She noted that there was a document summarizing the general comments on 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev.
- 204.3 Required vs. required if applicable
- 204.3.1 John Attig said that although ALA was aware that the decision had been made at the April 2007 meeting to remove the distinction between “required” and “required if applicable”, some ALA reviewers had disagreed. The JSC confirmed the earlier decision.
- 204.4 Stylistic issues
- 204.4.1 John Attig said that he thought that the way that the Editor was now numbering lettered lists would be an improvement.
- 204.4.2 The Editor said that ALA had also commented that captions such as “*Exception:*” were appearing as the final line of the previous instruction. He explained that this is actually a sub-heading that precedes the relevant section. He added that the problem is that there is often more than one exception. In these cases he has tried to number them with letters, and as a result they can be referred to by the paragraph number. The Editor said that he would have to confirm with Nannette Naught that there was no problem with display of these unnumbered subheadings. John Attig said that he agreed that it was not feasible to number these captions.  
**Action=Editor**
- 204.4.3 The Editor noted that since the revised draft of chapters 6-7 had been issued he had begun indenting alternatives to make clear the relationship to any nearby exceptions. He added that he was not sure what would happen with these indentations in the online product. John Attig said that he would make it clear to ALA that in terms of stylistic issues, what they see is the way that the drafts look, not the way the final product will look.
- 204.5 Chapter 6: FRBR group 2 entities: Use of “families, persons, and corporate bodies”
- 204.5.1 The Chair said that ACOC would like the JSC to give consideration to finding a term to replace ‘families, persons, and corporate bodies’ wherever that phrase appears. She added that the ACOC suggestion was to use “parties” when referring to all three at once. Alan Danskin commented that the work on ISO Party Identifiers now used the term “Names”. Margaret Stewart said that she agreed that the phrase is long, but there is no alternative. The Editor said that with the RDA restructure the phrase would not be used in conjunction with “works, expressions, manifestations, and items” as it is now. The Chair confirmed

that the reason why the other ACOC suggestion “persons and groups” was rejected by the JSC is because it was not used in any other standard.

204.5.2 The Chair said that ALA had made a similar comment regarding the length of the phrase, but had gone further. John Attig said that ALA did not think that families are adequately addressed. He added that there are separate sections for creators (6.3.1) and for originating bodies (6.3.2), but not for families. Before discussing the ALA comment, the JSC decided to discuss originating bodies in general.

#### 204.6 Originating bodies

204.6.1 The Chair noted that in the response table for the revised chapter 6 and 7 there were comments at lines 26 and 27 under 6.3.2. She said that while no one had loved the term “originating body” it was thought to be better than the alternatives.

204.6.2 Barbara Tillett said that LC had proposed that originating bodies be treated as creators. It was noted that ALA, ACOC, and CCC had some agreement with this. John Attig said that the provisions of 6.3.2.0.1 (taken from AACR2 21.1B2) needed to be somewhere. The Editor said that normally you would not consider the listed activities to be creation. He added that there were some corporate bodies, such as musical groups, which were already covered by 6.3.1 Creator.

204.6.3 The JSC discussed the ACOC suggestion that whether a corporate body is a creator be determined on exactly the same basis as for persons. The JSC decided against this because of the huge impact on citing of the work. The JSC agreed to consider this possibility after the first release of RDA as it would result in a more consistent approach.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

204.6.4 The JSC discussed merging 6.3.1 Creator and 6.3.2 Originating body. If this were done, it would be made clear that creators include originating bodies, which are defined according to AACR2 21.1B2. The Editor said that there were implications for chapter 13, as it would mean that there would be two creators rather than a creator and an originating body. It was noted that in AACR2 the provisions of 21.1B2 trump all other authorship. The Editor said that he thought that a category was missing from 13.1.1 for works for which both a corporate body and a person or family was responsible. He said that he did not think that these were necessarily collaborations. John Attig suggested that if the goal is to carry forward AACR2, then if a corporate body falls into a category listed in 21.1B2, it does not matter whether there is any other responsibility. He added that this could become the first category of work under 13.1.1.

204.6.5 Hugh Taylor noted that currently 6.3.1 mapped to 13.1.1.1.1 and 6.3.2 mapped to 13.1.1.1.2. The Chair asked what the difference in effect was between 13.1.1.1.1 (a single person, family, or corporate body is responsible for creating the work) and 13.1.1.1.2 (a single corporate body is responsible for originating a work falling into one or more of the categories listed under 6.3.2.0). She noted that both instructions told you to formulate the access point in the same way. The Editor said that there was still the issue of when there is both a creator and an originating body. He added that it looked as though there needed to be another category at 13.1 for works involving an originating body. He said that it would be easier to refer to creators and originating bodies if they were kept separate in chapter 6. The Editor suggested that 13.1.1.1.2 could be rolled into the new category.

**Action=Editor**

- 204.6.6 After extensive discussion the JSC decided not to merge 6.3.1 and 6.3.2. It was agreed that ultimately these should be collapsed, but there are too many AACR2 rules that the JSC wants to carry forward.
- 204.7 Chapter 6 – Organization
- 204.7.1 The Chair noted that CILIP had made the comment that the draft of chapter 6 is over-complicated, and had proposed a draft outline for consideration. The JSC decided not to consider the new structure in detail as it does not follow FRBR, or have the breakdown of elements necessary for compatibility with DCMI.
- 204.8 6.4 Access points for persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with the expression and Moving image resources
- 204.8.1 Barbara Tillett explained that moving image cataloguers traditionally saw things at different levels (i.e., work vs. expression) to other cataloguers. John Attig said that ALA had made the same point. The Chair said that the main difficulties that ACOC had with expressions were to do with moving images. The Editor said that whether “director” was seen as a creator or a contributor would be determined by the designation of role. He noted that LC was preparing the draft appendix on designation of role. He added that this was separate to chapter 13, where it had been agreed to have an exception for moving image resources (5JSC/M/187.7.1).  
**Action=LC**
- 204.9 Chapter 7
- 204.9.1 The Chair suggested that, as many of the general comments on chapter 7 were from ALA, John Attig could identify those which were a priority for discussion. John Attig said that he did not think it would be useful to discuss the ALA comments on wording. He suggested that the ALA comments on the definitions of relationships be referred to the Editor.  
**Action=Editor**
- 204.10 RDA and FRBR
- 204.10.1 John Attig asked for the Editor’s reaction to the ALA suggestion not to use “work embodied in a manifestation”. He added that in FRBR there was technically no relationship between a manifestation and a work. The Editor explained that all of the primary relationships in FRBR are transitive.
- 204.10.2 John Attig said that he thought the ALA comments on use of “Work (or expression)” and “Work-to-work relationships” would be resolved by the new structure for RDA.
- 204.10.3 John Attig said that he needed to assess the remaining ALA comments on FRBR and chapter 7 to see if discussion is needed.  
**Action=ALA representative**
- 204.11 Options and alternatives
- 204.11.1 John Attig said that it was acknowledged that decisions would need to be made about which options and alternatives to apply. The Editor suggested that the different conventions for recording relationships could be listed only once at the beginning of chapter 7. The Chair said that she thought the separated out examples were helpful.

204.12 Singular and plural entities

204.12.1 The Editor explained that every relationship was at a binary level unless you were doing an unstructured description. John Attig said that he thought that there were some cases where plural nouns were used. The Editor said that this was necessary to allow for unstructured descriptions. John Attig said that he would try to find examples of where this might not be appropriate.

**Action=ALA representative**

204.13 Conventions used in 7.1.2 and 7.3.1

204.13.1 The Editor noted that ACOC had mentioned a slight discrepancy in the way he had worded 7.1.2 and 7.3.1. The Chair said that ACOC would prefer that the conventions be consistent and be given once only. The Editor said that this would be easier to do with the new RDA structure.

**Action=Editor**

204.14 7.1.2.3 Conventions dependent on format/system and structured vs. unstructured descriptions

204.14.1 John Attig said that the point regarding the range of conventions used being dependent on formats/system is also made at 7.3.0.3, but not elsewhere. He added that if this point does not go without saying, it should be stated generally in the General Introduction. The Chair said that ACOC had the opposite view and had drafted a revision which included more information and guidance on when to apply each of the conventions. She added that it had been difficult to do this without referring to specific types of database (e.g., flat file and relational), and the resulting instruction was long and unwieldy. She said that in the current situation naming the related resource is required, but in the future identifiers may be preferable. The Editor said that in scenario 1 it would be redundant to name as well as link. He added that the scenarios would be addressed in the General Introduction. The Chair said that ACOC thought that the cataloguer needs to know the scenario they are working with. She noted that ACOC had provided suggested wording for 7.1.2 in 5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapters 6-7/Rev/ACOC response.

204.14.2 After further discussion the JSC agreed on the following actions. Use of identifiers will be built into chapter 6 (6.1.2), as in the current draft they are not included as a way of reflecting the relationship between the person, etc., and the work. The Editor will include information on mapping to the implementation scenarios in the summary of the RDA restructuring. As part of this, it will be made clear that data created using RDA will be able to be used in all three implementation scenarios. The JSC agreed to the wording proposed for 7.1.2 by ACOC as it provides guidance on choosing the most appropriate technique. Within this wording, the JSC decided to reverse the order of a) and b) in 7.1.2.2 in order to make it consistent with 7.1.2.1. The JSC agreed to discuss at the April 2008 meeting whether more of this type of guidance is needed and in turn, whether it should be placed in an appendix.

**Action=Editor; JSC (Discuss guidance on techniques appropriate to each implementation scenario)**

204.15 The JSC agreed to handle remaining discussion on chapters 6-7 in the following way. Comments will be discussed using the wiki and teleconferences, including the status of the 015 National bibliography number (from April 2007 meeting 5JSC/M/134.23.2), and

relevant issues to do with the CONSER standard record. The discussions will conclude at the April 2008 meeting. The Chair said that she would respond to Examples Group 2.

**Action=JSC; Chair**

204.16 The JSC discussed the number of comments yet to be discussed on chapters 3 and chapters 6-7, and what volume of comments could be expected on the part B chapters. It was noted that with just over a year until the text had to be finalized the JSC needed to concentrate on the main issues. The JSC representatives agreed in their responses to Part B to identify “show-stoppers”. It was also agreed to identify these comments in the wiki before starting on the discussion process. The Chair said that she would prepare a statement for the cover letter on the objectives that need to be met for the first release (based on the Strategic plan).

**Action=JSC; Chair**

## 205 Data presentation (including Punctuation within elements)

205.1 The Chair led a discussion on the three categories of punctuation within elements identified in the cover letter for the March 2007 version of chapter 3 (5JSC/RDA/Part A/Chapter 3/Rev).

205.2 Category 1: Punctuation used to segment data within a sequence of like data.

205.2.1 The JSC confirmed the existing decision that a general instruction will be added to chapter 1 to specify that internal punctuation should be used as necessary for clarity.

**Action=Editor**

205.3 Category 2: Punctuation used to separate data that are related, but different in kind.

205.3.1 The Chair said that in the cover letter for the revised chapter 3, the constituencies were asked to identify which cases warrant separation into sub-elements. She added that there was no clear direction from the responses. She noted that ACOC questioned whether such a fine level of granularity is necessary; ALA did not have consensus; CCC supported treating as separate sub-elements; CILIP supported complete granularity in principle; BL did not have a strong feeling that subdivision is essential; and, LC did not have a strong opinion. The JSC decided that as there was no agreement, there would be no change to the break-down of the elements. Internal punctuation will not be prescribed in the instructions, but there will be the general instruction that punctuation may be used within an element for clarity. The JSC asked the Editor to remove punctuation guidelines from the relevant instructions. The JSC agreed that the punctuation would be retained in the examples.

**Action=Editor**

205.4 Category 3: Punctuation [square brackets] used to convey information about a detail within an element or sub-element.

205.4.1 3.4.4.2.1

The JSC agreed that square brackets would not be used to give the number of unnumbered pages, it would be stated explicitly, i.e.: “44 unnumbered pages”. It was noted that the meaning of square brackets might not be understood by library users.

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 1; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

205.4.2 3.4.4.2.4

The JSC agreed to follow the same pattern for the exception for early printed resources at 3.4.4.2.4: “When recording a sequence of unnumbered pages, etc., record either a) the exact number followed by the word *unnumbered* (if the number is readily ascertainable) ...”

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 1; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

205.4.3 3.4.4.4.2

The JSC agreed to the following wording: “When correcting misleading numbering, record the numbering as it appears on the last page or leaf followed by *that is* and the correct number”.

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 1; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

205.4.4 3.4.4.7.1

The JSC agreed that the number of unnumbered pages would be explicitly stated as agreed for the other instructions under discussion.

**Action=Editor; Examples Group 1; Secretary (List of AACR2 changes)**

205.5 The Chair suggested that the issue of square brackets be discussed more widely, and referred to the summary paper prepared by the Secretary. In this document, it was noted that the use of square brackets is currently specified in RDA for three different categories of information.

205.6 Category 1: Entire element or sub-element is taken from a source outside the resource itself

205.6.1 The JSC agreed with the wording at 2.2.3.4 as found in the current Editor’s draft of chapter 2: “If information taken from a source outside the resource itself is used in any of the elements listed below, indicate that fact either by means of an annotation or by some other means (e.g., through coding or the use of square brackets).” Margaret Stewart noted that there was currently no way to code this information. The JSC agreed to add discontinuing the use of square brackets to the list of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA.

**Action=Secretary (List of issues for consideration after the first release of RDA)**

205.7 Category 2: Extra detail is added to an element or sub-element, or a correction is made

205.7.1 The Editor noted that it had been agreed not to have interpolations in transcribed elements (5JSC/M/198.15.1).

205.7.2 The Editor suggested that the JSC discuss use of square brackets with dates, as this was one place where interpolations were still allowed. It was noted that 2.8.5.6.2 dealt with the entire element and so was covered by category 1, but that there were examples containing square brackets within the element at 2.8.5.3.2 and 2.8.5.5.6.

205.7.3 The JSC discussed the alternatives to square brackets for interpolations to dates. The Chair noted that an annotation would not be practical, and that it would not be possible to use coding within an element. The JSC agreed that square brackets would be used for interpolations to recorded elements.

205.7.4 The Secretary noted that this was not consistent with the decisions which had just been made for chapter 3 instructions. The JSC discussed this and agreed that for the date

element the use of square brackets would be clear in the context (e.g., in the case of supplying a date in the Gregorian or Julian calendar).

205.7.5 The Chair confirmed that the JSC still agreed with earlier decisions to remove the use of square brackets.

205.8 Category 3: No data available for the element

205.8.1 The Editor said that as what was being supplied (e.g., “Publisher not identified”) was the entire element, 2.2.3.4 applied and one could make an annotation, use coding, or use square brackets.

**Action=Editor**

205.9 The Chair noted that the JSC still needed to discuss data about data, including how to handle statements such as “title varies” which tell you something about the element. It was agreed that statements such as “Publisher not identified” are not data about data.

**Action=JSC (Discuss “data about data”)**

**Executive Session 2****206 Communication with other resource description communities (continued)**

206.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**207 Formal recognition of individuals and groups contributing to the development of RDA**

207.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**208 Scope of JSC Web sites and document distribution**

208.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**209 Next meeting**

209.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**210 Plans for future teleconferences**

210.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**211 JSC program of work**

211.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**212 Statement of policy and procedures for JSC**

212.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Policy/4/Rev

212.2 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**213 JSC meetings policy document**

213.1 Received and considered the following document:  
5JSC/Policy/6

213.2 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**214 Outcomes from October 2007 meeting**

214.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**215 Any other business**

215.1 [Note: included in 5JSC/M/Restricted/170-215.]

**End of Executive Session 2**