

MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 2019 MEETING  
RDA Steering Committee  
Asynchronous Meeting  
16-19 September 2019

**Attending:** Catherine Amey, ORDAC representative  
Linda Barnhart, RSC Secretary  
Thomas Brenndorfer, NARDAC representative  
Ahava Cohen, EURIG representative (regular representative unable to attend)  
Gordon Dunsire, RSC Technical Team Liaison Officer  
Kathy Glennan, RSC Chair  
James Hennelly, Director, ALA Digital Reference  
Kate James, RDA Examples Editor  
Ebe Kartus, Wider Community Engagement Officer  
Honor Moody, RDA Example Editor-Elect  
Daniel Paradis, RDA Translations Team Liaison Officer

**Table of Contents**

Executive Session

[149 RDA Milestones](#)

Public Session

Fast Track Changes to RDA

[150 Place: authorized access point for place](#)

RDA Discussion Topics

[151 Glossary issues](#)

[152 Specifying string encoding schemes in the new Toolkit](#)

[153 Collective Agent review](#)

RSC Administrative Topics

[154 Notes on the September 5, 2019 RDA Toolkit Release](#)

[155 RSC/Chair/1/rev/2/draft – 2019-08-29](#)

[156 Agenda topics to suggest, or priorities for the Santiago meeting](#)

[157 Communicating the outcomes from this virtual meeting](#)

[158 Review of Meeting 2019 September](#)

## Executive Session

### 149 RDA Milestones

## Public Session

### Fast Track Changes to RDA

#### 150 [Place: authorized access point for place](#)

150.1 James noted that the current cataloguing practice for constructing [Place: authorized access point for place](#) was not included in the options in the beta Toolkit. This issue is raised both to identify and resolve the specific changes needed for this element, and to agree upon a standing process, since the situation of unintentionally omitted current practice will likely arise again. The RSC was asked to answer three questions.

150.2 This topic generated a detailed and spirited discussion. Several members noted that this discussion was linked to agenda item 152 on specifying string encoding schemes (and an earlier discussion on punctuation patterns) as well as an upcoming discussion on jurisdictions planned for the Santiago meeting. Background information was provided about how some “preferred name” instructions in the original Toolkit (unstructured descriptions) were moved into “access point” instructions in the beta Toolkit (structured descriptions). One member questioned whether qualifiers should be treated consistently across jurisdictional places and associated governments. Brenndorfer suggested that a key problem is naming/labeling the different strings involved in access point construction, and that the layout of options needs improvement to distinguish what strings follow what conventions. Amey proposed adding an option to use [Place: name of place](#) in general as a qualifier.

150.3 Question #1: Does the RSC agree that there should be instructions that preserve the current practice? Kartus reminded the group that this principle had already been agreed to by the RSC; the group re-confirmed their agreement. Dunsire clarified that an exception is when current practice does not conform to the LRM. He noted that if current practice is missing, it should be treated and corrected as an editorial error.

150.4 Question #2: What is the best technique (Fast Track or proposal, or something else?) to fix or amend instructions to preserve the current practice? Kartus observed that this may have to be decided on a case-by-case basis, and most RSC members agreed. One member felt that such situations were clearly not Fast Tracks, while another felt that the Fast Track process was more than sufficient.

150.5 Question #3: What does the RSC recommend for changes to [Place: authorized access point for place](#)? No specific wording was proposed to amend [Place: authorized access point for place](#) to incorporate current practice. RSC discussion centered around the Anglo-American practices and the need to have further strategic discussion about community extensions to a “base” RDA, particularly to open opportunities for as-yet-unrepresented communities.

**ACTION ITEM:** Specific wording for changes to [Place: authorized access point for place](#) need to be articulated.

**ACTION ITEM:** The RSC will discuss principles and processes further at the Santiago meeting.

## RDA Discussion Topics

### 151 Glossary issues

151.1 A briefing paper “RDA Glossary” prepared by Dunsire outlined the issues, made two recommendations, and asked three questions.

151.2 There is an inadvertent duplicate entry in the Glossary for “Reference source,” meaning there are different definitions for the term in Nomen and in RDA Terms. Recommendation #1 was: Remove ‘reference source’ from RDA Terms and amend the Toolkit accordingly. In general, the RSC supported this recommendation. James agreed with removing the duplicate RDA Terms entry but does not agree with replacing the term, used in 15 Toolkit pages, with “source of information;” she suggests “source consulted” instead. Dunsire disagreed, as “source consulted” is new (metadata) Work element, so any usage would be [Work: source consulted](#). Amey suggested adjusting the definition of “source consulted,” and Brenndorfer suggested deferring the discussion to another topic thread.

151.3 “Source consulted” was included as a cross reference from “reference source” as well as having an entry in its own right. Recommendation #2 was: Remove ‘source consulted’ as an alternate label of ‘reference source’. The RSC agreed with this recommendation.

151.4 Regarding labels that are parenthesized in the original Toolkit and whether the parenthesized form should be retained as an alternate label in the beta Toolkit, Question #1 asked: Does the RSC wish to apply the policy to these cases? The RSC generally agreed that it is not necessary to add alternate labels to the Glossary where the only change is parentheses. There was some discussion of the utility of this mapping for data maintenance purposes in MARC21, or for policy statement needs. Brenndorfer suggested that, as alternate labels, these would overcrowd the Glossary and suggested that another mechanism be found for this mapping.

151.5 Question #2 asked: Does the RSC have any proposals for new ‘see also’ references? Amey suggested a number of specific “see also” references. James would like to know the principles for when “see also” references are made before going further.

151.6 Question #3 asked: Does the RSC have any suggestions for improving the Glossary? There were several recommendations for changes to the Glossary display. James suggested preparing a guide for when “see” and “see also” references are made and published.

**ACTION ITEM:** Dunsire will make changes to the RDA Registry and will consider other possible mechanisms for mapping parenthesized labels.

**ACTION ITEM:** Hennelly will consider improvements to Glossary display.

**ACTION ITEM:** Dunsire and Barnhart will consider developing information for the RDA Editorial Guide for the principles of “see” and “see also” references in the Glossary.

## 152 Specifying string encoding schemes in the new Toolkit

152.1 A briefing paper “Specifying string encoding schemes in the new Toolkit” was shared by Dunsire which outlined some of the issues with how string encoding schemes and punctuation patterns should be presented in the beta Toolkit. This agenda item continues and extends an earlier Basecamp discussion of punctuation patterns, and discussion will continue at the Santiago meeting. The RSC view coming into this discussion is that punctuation patterns should be included under the Resources tab and kept separate from the optional instructions that specify a punctuation pattern. This could be a case where the beta Toolkit could accommodate community-maintained tools for local use.

152.2 Three recommendations from the paper were discussed: (1) Treat punctuation patterns as community-maintained tools, in the same way as Books of the Bible and similar RDA resources; (2) Treat component string specifications as community-maintained tools, in the same way as Books of the Bible and similar RDA resources; (3) Ask RDA Regions, coordinated by the Wider Community Engagement Officer, take responsibility for the community-maintained tools area of the Toolkit.

152.3 While there was some general support for the idea of treating punctuation patterns and string specifications as community-maintained tools, there was also concern that a “pure” or short-term implementation was not feasible and concern about the many challenges of moving in this direction. Some felt that RDA should provide a default set to continue past practices before transferring responsibility to the community. There were concerns about the workload for communities and the impact on users. One person wondered how these practices would fit in with application profiles and policy statements. Some reminded the group to look to the future and beyond the need for handcrafted strings. Dunsire outlined some of the characteristics of community-maintained content.

152.4 Many questions and concerns were raised. Could ISBD be pointed to for a default punctuation pattern? How would such a change impact examples in RDA? What is the effect on pseudo-elements? How would community-maintained content be identified and maintained? Would communities wish to indicate use, and if so, how? What process would be used for changes? Both principles and practicalities in going down this path need to be examined at the Santiago meeting.

**ACTION ITEM:** RSC will discuss this further at the Santiago meeting.

## 153 Collective Agent review

153.1 At the 2018 Montréal meeting, ORDAC volunteered to prepare a briefing paper that teased out issues with the new entity Collective Agent. This paper was discussed on the 14 March 2019 RSC phone call. The regional communities subsequently formally responded, and ORDAC then prepared a “further thoughts” document. The RSC was asked for their thoughts on two issues raised by the latest ORDAC document in preparation for an in-person discussion in Santiago.

153.2 RSC comments on “Entity definitions” for Collective Agent, Family, and Corporate Body: ORDAC proposes changing the definition of "collective agent" to use the term "agents" instead of "persons". The current definition in the beta Toolkit is verbatim from LRM. ORDAC suggests changing the definition for family, and proposes further refinements of the corporate body definition. Points were raised both in favor of and against the proposed changes, and there was general agreement that this topic requires further discussion in Santiago.

153.3 RSC comments on “Creating a new entity: Collective Event”: ORDAC agreed with EURIG and NARDAC that a new subclass of Collective Agent (Collective Event) should not be created. Instead, ORDAC recommends adding guidance to the Toolkit to make it clear that ‘corporate body’ includes gatherings of people and organisations associated with events. RSC discussion seemed to prefer that gatherings of people and organisations associated with events (and other “outlier” categories) be considered collective agents rather than corporate bodies. The group wishes to discuss this more in Santiago.

**ACTION ITEM:** RSC will discuss this further at the Santiago meeting.

## RSC Administrative Topics

### 154 Notes on the September 5, 2019 RDA Toolkit Release

154.1 The 5 September 2019 beta Toolkit release was the first release since the stabilized English text was published on 30 April. The accompanying [Release Notes](#) was the first attempt to identify, capture and share important RDA content that changed. This set of Release Notes was handcrafted, and changes will be made in the future to enable a more consistent and less labor-intensive workflow. RSC members were asked for their thoughts and to recommend changes.

154.2 The RSC was concerned about the difficulty for users in managing this long list, and several changes were recommended.

- Amey suggested the creation of a csv file to accompany the list so users can sort and filter to match their interests.
- A controlled vocabulary for the types of changes was endorsed by several RSC members.
- James suggested removing four categories of changes: fixes to broken links, added internal navigation links, deleted links, and reformatting changes.
- Brenndorfer suggested organizing the list by significant changes.

Broken links and typos were noted in the current file. Cohen expressed a concern about the filenaming convention for the PDFs, which may cause confusion.

154.3 Barnhart wondered if added examples should be included in the list; James noted that all example changes were included in past reports off-and-on. She argued that example changes don't change the substance of the instructions.

154.4 The group recognized that translators and policy statement writers would need a more expanded list of changes.

154.5 Several members noted that user feedback in this area would provide useful guidance for further development.

**ACTION ITEM:** Hennelly will investigate adding a downloadable csv file to the next release and will take the types of changes to be removed under advisement.

**ACTION ITEM:** Barnhart and Dunsire will develop a controlled vocabulary for the types of changes.

**ACTION ITEM:** The core team will provide assistance to Hennelly in developing a more streamlined workflow.

## 155 RSC/Chair/1/rev/2/draft – 2019-08-29

155.1 This document is a revision of the public 2016 document [Information for New RSC Representatives](#), with additions and updates proposed by the RSC Chair.

155.2 One area of discussion was the utility of links in the section for RSC workspaces and collaborative tools, which may be frustrating for people reading the document who do not have access. The consensus was that links to RSC login pages should not be provided here. Brenndorfer recommended a link to the general Basecamp site for those who want to learn more about this collaborative tool. James suggested that such a list should be posted on Basecamp for RSC use.

155.3 Amey suggested that a visual aid showing how the parts of RDA (such as the RDA Registry, Toolkit site, Content Management System, etc.) fit together would be useful.

155.4 Paradis noticed a discrepancy with how the positions of the standing committees chairs were named between this document and the RSC website.

155.5 A new version of the file with editorial changes was provided by Paradis, and various other needed edits were noted. The group agreed that the RSC does not need to see the document again after the Chair does the final edit.

**ACTION ITEM:** Glennan will update this Chair document.

**ACTION ITEM:** Barnhart will update the RSC website to ensure the positions of the standing committee chairs are named consistently and will publish the final version of the document.

**ACTION ITEM:** Barnhart will work on a Basecamp page to provide links to RSC workspaces and collaborative tools.

**ACTION ITEM:** The core team will consider developing a diagram showing how the parts of the RDA technical infrastructure fit together.

## 156 Agenda topics to suggest, or priorities for the Santiago meeting

156.1 Topics to add:

- Fast Track proposal on Corporate Body: preferred name of corporate body (Paradis)
- Fast Track proposal on Corporate Body: authorized access point for corporate body (Paradis)
- Options that reflect a community's practice: scale and maintenance. Should these be included in RDA, where do they go, and who is responsible for them? (Glennan)
- Discuss a "base" RDA with community extensions (Glennan)
- Next steps for the Orientation Project: streamlined lineup and e-courses (Hennelly); discuss training in general (Kartus)
- Procedures for adding subtypes to the agent relationship elements (Brenndorfer)
- Appellation elements refresher/update on the movement of instructions from Preferred Name to Access Point (Brenndorfer)

156.2 Cohen could join remotely if not on a holiday.

**ACTION ITEM:** Barnhart will adjust the draft agenda to include these topics. No fuss for the Examples Editor recognition noted.

## 157 Communicating the outcomes from this virtual meeting

157.1 The RSC needs a record of discussions and decisions, properly organized, including background documents, major decisions, decisions about Fast Tracks, and items deferred. This should be the responsibility of the RSC Secretary, in coordination with the RSC Chair. Minutes should have sufficient context so that users can understand the issue. The RSC would like to review a draft of the meeting minutes before it is made public.

157.2 RDA users need a record of RSC decisions. Public versions of agendas and minutes should be broadly shared; the public minutes could be the basis of a blog post or website announcement. Executive Session minutes will be restricted, as they are for in-person RSC meetings. With more experience and a wider variety of topics, the RSC will be able to determine other practices, such as when background documents should be publicly shared, and to come up with a holistic communication plan.

157.3 Communicating information about Fast Track changes was discussed. Will the Release Notes documents be sufficient, or should more detailed information be provided? If Fast Track proposals are defined to be small or minor in nature, do they need to be reported at all? The

distinction in reporting Fast Track versus formal proposals has been how much information is made public about the RSC discussion. In the past, the RSC presented approved Fast Track actions in “Sec Final” documents but did not include the rationale for the action. All Fast Track changes should be announced to translators and policy statement writers. This topic will be discussed further in Santiago.

**ACTION ITEM:** Glennan and Barnhart will prepare draft minutes for this meeting.

**ACTION ITEM:** The RSC will review and comment on the draft before publishing.

## 158 Review of Meeting 2019 September

158.1 This discussion item provided an opportunity for RSC members to evaluate this first asynchronous meeting and suggest improvements. This topic will also be discussed at the in-person meeting in Santiago, where the calendar for future quarterly asynchronous meetings will be determined.

158.2 Generally, the RSC had a positive reaction to this style of meeting, but a few negative aspects were also noted.

158.3 Suggestions made:

- Before the meeting:
  - Everyone should know who is and is not planning to attend the meeting.
  - Everyone should have a clear understanding of meeting start and end dates/times and length of the meeting (no surprises).
  - A basic package of required reading would both be useful and would provide a better record of the meeting.
  - Post the agenda and supporting documents sooner.
  - Planning for time management was tricky because participation was sparse in the early days and very busy on the last day.
- During the meeting:
  - Use hyperlinks instead of citation numbers when referencing the Toolkit.
  - Provide old (marked up) and new text (following [RSC/Operations/5](#)) when proposing changes to RDA. This topic provoked some discussion about possible alternatives.
  - Staying on topic is difficult when very broad discussions are desired; over time we may figure out the kind of topics best suited for asynchronous discussion.
  - A more standardized format for documents, such as numbering for recommendations and questions, would make expectations for commenting clear.
  - When required, clearly indicate when explicit approval or disapproval is needed (versus simply commenting).
  - Explicitly state agreement or disagreement; sometimes it is hard to tell.
  - Ideas from the group about how best to stay on top of discussions:

- Subscribe RSC members to each commenting page when it is created, so email notifications will be sent. (Subscribe also to related Google Docs for those commenting notifications.)
  - Use the “Hey!” icon.
  - Use tags for individuals (@) for specific responses as needed.
- After the meeting:
    - A separate final decision area for each topic might help in preparing the meeting summary.
    - An Action Log might be useful.
  - In the future:
    - A separate Basecamp site might help avoid confusion.
    - Consider standing agenda items for regional representative reports and other business.
    - Consider recorded presentations to listen and respond to.
    - A mix of small-group synchronous and asynchronous meetings may be desirable.
    - Translation facility might be needed as the regions expand.

Approved by the RSC  
07 October 2019

## Appendix to the Public Minutes

### Agenda Item 151: Glossary issues

#### RDA Glossary

Discussion paper for RDA Steering Committee, September 2019  
Gordon Dunsire, RSC Technical Team Liaison Officer

#### Background

The Glossary of the beta Toolkit is one of the main navigation aids for users.

It functions as a bridge between familiar terminology in the current Toolkit and new terminology and concepts in the new Toolkit.

It gives lexical context to elements by displaying 'inverse', 'see'/'use for', and 'see also' references.

The content of the Glossary is a separate keyword index for the Toolkit search feature. This is useful for finding terms that are not 'preferred' for the Toolkit instructions, but recorded as alternate labels.

This briefing paper covers specific issues with a high priority for resolution, and a general review of further development of the Glossary.

#### Duplicate entries

Most of the duplicate entries in the original Glossary have been resolved.  
Two new duplicates were inadvertently added during the 3R Project.

#### reference source

1: A source in which there is evidence for the use of a nomen.

Use for: source consulted

2: A source from which authoritative information is obtained.

A reference source includes an authority file, a reference work, etc.

Entry 1 refers to a new element for the Nomen entity. Changing the label of the element has a significant impact, so the recommendation is to remove entry 2.

Entry 2 is in RDA Terms, and is used in around 15 Toolkit pages. In most cases it can simply be replaced with "source of information".

**Recommendation 1: Remove 'reference source' from RDA Terms and amend the Toolkit accordingly.**

#### source consulted

1: A manifestation in which there is evidence for a metadata work.

Inverse: source consulted of

2: See: reference source

Entry 1 refers to an element for a (metadata) work. Entry 2 is a cross-reference from an alternate label.

**Recommendation 2: Remove 'source consulted' as an alternate label of 'reference source'.**

Note: The elements 'source consulted' and 'reference source' are complementary: the first provides data provenance for all RDA entities except Nomen; the second provides data provenance for Nomen.

This pattern is repeated for other specific data provenance elements. The reason why Nomen is treated separately is that it is already technically a metadata work (a single statement that says an entity is associated with a nomen string). The Nomen elements will be developed from their current 'blank template' state accordingly.

#### Current parenthesized labels

It is RSC policy to provide 'see' references for current element labels that are changed by the 3R Project. This is implemented by adding the current label as an 'alternate label' for the new label.

The policy has not been applied when the only change is the removal of parentheses.

The assumption is that the two versions would file next to each other, so the reference would not be necessary. For example:

#### **abridged as (expression)**

See: abridged as expression

#### **abridged as expression**

[Definition ...]

The number of cases is approximately 470. The current display format uses two lines for a 'see' reference and one line for a 'use for' reference, so the length of the Glossary will increase by over 1300 lines.

#### **Question 1: Does the RSC wish to apply the policy to these cases?**

#### See also references

The Glossary can accommodate any number of 'see also' references between related entries.

For example:

#### **element**

A specific aspect, characteristic, attribute, or relationship used to describe an RDA entity.

See also: element sub-type

See also: super-element

See also: string encoding scheme

See also: sub-element

See also: element super-type

Each reference is reciprocated in the target entry, so each reference requires two lines in the Glossary.

#### **Question 2: Does the RSC have any proposals for new 'see also' references?**

#### **Question 3: Does the RSC have any suggestions for improving the Glossary?**

## Agenda Item 152: Specifying string encoding schemes in the new Toolkit

### Specifying string encoding schemes in the new Toolkit

Discussion paper for RDA Steering Committee, September 2019

Gordon Dunsire, RSC Technical Team Liaison Officer

## Background

A string encoding scheme (SES) is “A set of string values and an associated set of rules that describe a mapping between that set of strings and a value of an element”.

An SES specifies a set of strings and rules for assembling them into a single string that is the value of a structured description of specific kinds of RDA element.

Two distinct kinds of string can be specified:

- The value of another RDA element recorded as an unstructured description, structured description, or identifier.
- A fixed text string or boilerplate value.

The ‘assembly rules’ may include:

- The order in which the component strings are to be assembled.
- Punctuation or other delimiters of one or more of the component strings.

Example: authorized access point for work

Option: [https://beta.rdatoolkit.org/en-US\\_ala-086aad00-3bd2-3cc1-8dd0-52a5353b227b/p\\_y3r\\_2wn\\_bhb](https://beta.rdatoolkit.org/en-US_ala-086aad00-3bd2-3cc1-8dd0-52a5353b227b/p_y3r_2wn_bhb)

Component string specification gives order of assembly:

1. a value of Agent: authorized access point for agent for an agent who creates the works
2. the conventional collective title Works

1: is a string that is the value of another element.

2: is a fixed string “Works”.

No punctuation pattern is given, but a common pattern is to insert a stop-space between the two component strings. This pattern might be presented as “Value 1. Value2”.

Punctuation patterns are often recorded and maintained separately from the component string specification. For example, ISBD presents a set of patterns at the beginning of the stipulations for each area of description.

There are no global SESs that are used by all libraries and cultural heritage organizations for all resources meeting specified conditions. The specification of an SES is dependent on the local application, and is generally considered to be in the scope of a policy statement or application profile.

## New Toolkit

The original RDA Toolkit contains several component string specifications and punctuation patterns.

Component string specifications have been moved to instructions for authorized access point elements.

There are more specifications for Person and Corporate Body than other entities, and none at all for new entities.

Punctuation patterns are discussed in a separate document, Specifying punctuation patterns in the new Toolkit

([https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CP5L2CzoaQB1xRv0Wq2EB369sXf9gG\\_uwmdox3n7\\_6U/edit?usp=sharing](https://docs.google.com/document/d/1CP5L2CzoaQB1xRv0Wq2EB369sXf9gG_uwmdox3n7_6U/edit?usp=sharing)), that supports the Basecamp ‘to-do’ Develop punctuation patterns (<https://3.basecamp.com/4121405/buckets/9685925/todos/1966535201>).

The RSC view, so far expressed, is that punctuation patterns should be included under the Resources tab, and kept separate from the optional instructions that specify a punctuation pattern.

Specific punctuation patterns may conform to international standards such as ISBD, national and language standards as recorded by IFLA, or application profiles and policies.

The number of patterns is dependent on the communities and applications that use RDA metadata. This makes it difficult to estimate the scale of “common” or “practical, in use” patterns that will be required.

Similar issues apply to component string specifications. It is difficult to estimate the number of specifications required to meet the needs of the wider international and cultural heritage communities.

It is more consistent to treat the component string specification and punctuation pattern aspects of string encoding schemes in the same way.

There is a current assumption that “local” or less common or established methods of constructing access points will be specified in policies or application profiles. It is better to take a more general, integrated view of Toolkit structure and functionality. We have stated for several years that we would like to accommodate extensions to the Toolkit, such as local value vocabularies. Books of the Bible is an example of a set of local value vocabularies, and is maintained in a separate area of the Toolkit content management system. Other files in that area, such as the old Gender and Collective title vocabularies, are under-developed.

This area of the new Toolkit is designed to accommodate community-maintained tools for local use. In the bigger picture, these are community-scale tools that bridge the main Toolkit with policy statements and application profiles.

**Recommendation: Treat punctuation patterns as community-maintained tools, in the same way as Books of the Bible and similar RDA resources.**

**Recommendation: Treat component string specifications as community-maintained tools, in the same way as Books of the Bible and similar RDA resources.**

**Recommendation: Ask RDA Regions, coordinated by the Wider Community Engagement Officer, take responsibility for the community-maintained tools area of the Toolkit.**

## Implementation

Development of the ‘community-maintained tools’ area of the Resources tab and implementation of these recommendations requires a coordinated project.

The content management system and Toolkit architecture do not require significant development. The folder and menu structures are scalable.

The main editorial tasks are:

- Establish a template for punctuation patterns.
- Establish a cross-reference/navigation template to link instructions with patterns.
- Establish a cross-reference/navigation template to link instructions with component string specifications.
- Move existing punctuation patterns to new Punctuation patterns folder.
- Shred latent punctuation patterns from the beta instructions to the new folder.
- Move existing component string specifications to new folder.

The current template of using an ordered list is sufficient for component string specifications.

## Issues

Implementation will remove the need for pseudo-elements. The remaining pseudo-elements consist of component string specifications for special materials, and additional elements that can be used to distinguish access points.

Implementation will also remove much of the detail in authorized access point and variant access point elements.

The new component string specification section (we need a better name – perhaps an umbrella ‘string encoding schemes’ will do) can be organized in parallel with the main Toolkit: by entity and then by aap and vap (there are no specifications in the access point elements). Within the aap and vap files, we will need internal ‘titles’ to anchor the links from the element pages. These can be based on the existing internal titles, and the reviewed and refined for consistency.

This project will take 3 months to complete. That is, it can be completed within a quarterly review cycle.

## Summary

- Add a menu item for “String encoding schemes” to the third section of the Resources tab, with a sub-menu for “Punctuation patterns”.
- Organize the string encoding schemes by entity, each with a file for authorized access point and variant access point schemes.
- Organize the punctuation patterns by an artificial classification (e.g. pattern 123).

- Cross-reference string encoding schemes and punctuation patterns from element instructions.

### **Agenda Item 153: Collective Agent review**

## **Review of Collective Agent – further thoughts from ORDAC**

ORDAC thanks NARDAC and EURIG for their thoughtful feedback and suggestions. We would like to comment further on:

1. Entity definitions
2. Creating a new entity, Collective Event

### **1. Entity definitions**

#### **1a. Defining the entity Collective Agent**

NARDAC and EURIG consider that it does not matter if the definitions of Collective Agent and Corporate Body are similar, as Collective Agent is simply a way of declaring attributes that belong to both types of collective agent.

ORDAC has some reservations. We believe that Collective Agent may also be used as a superclass if a RDA user does not wish to use narrower subclasses in a particular implementation of RDA.

This means that any given user of RDA may apply Collective agent in the following situations:

- a) There is not enough information to define an agent as a Family or Corporate Body
- b) An agent does not fit the definition of a Corporate Body
- c) The user does not wish to use the subclasses Corporate Body or Family in their RDA implementation

We feel that the current definition of Collective Agent is adequate, but that ‘persons’ should be changed to ‘agents’, as a gathering or organization could include other organizations.

#### **Possible new definition for Collective Agent**

A gathering or organization of **agents** bearing a particular name and capable of acting as a unit. A collective agent includes a corporate body and a family.

#### **1b. Defining the entities Family and Corporate Body**

NARDAC and EURIG are opposed to narrowing the meaning of Corporate Body. While ORDAC appreciates their concerns, we suggest that the Corporate Body definition needs to exclude families, and the Family definition needs to exclude corporate bodies.

We suggest looking further at the definition of Family and Corporate Body and identify differences.

One key difference between Family and Corporate Body is that the members of a Family are connected by biological, legal, or emotional relationships. In contrast, a Corporate Body exists in order to pursue a purpose or activity. Even though a family may engage in specific activities, these are not the primary reason why the family exists. Perhaps the definition of Family could emphasize the relationships

between the members, while the definition of Corporate Body could emphasize that the intent of the group is to pursue a purpose or activity.

**Possible new definitions:**

**Family**

Two or more persons connected by biological, legal, or emotional relationships, bearing a particular name, who present themselves as a family, and who are capable of acting as a unit.

**Corporate body**

An organization or group of persons or organizations, bearing a particular name, who present themselves as pursuing a common purpose or activity, and who are capable of acting as a unit.

**2. Creating a new entity, Collective Event**

EURIG and NARDAC generally oppose creating a new Collective Event entity as a subclass of Collective Agent. They consider that the presence of elements that are specific to events is not sufficient justification for the burden of creating a new subclass.

ORDAC now agrees that a new subclass should not be created.

We have had further thoughts as to a possible approach for describing event-type entities, such as meetings, conferences, exhibitions, expeditions, fairs, festivals, etc. We consider that the real issue with 'collective events' is not that they have special relationships to Timespan and Place, but that they often show a lack of structure and purpose.

According to the 1995 Task Force on Name Versus Subject Authorities of the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, events in the name authority file are entities that are "(1) formally convened; (2) directed toward a common goal; (3) capable of being reconvened; and (4) have formal names, locations, dates, and durations that can be determined in advance of the event." This is very different from the definition of an agent in the LRM.

We came to the conclusion we need to pull apart event-type entities into two separate entities:

- 1) **A group of people or organisations present at the event** – who may or may not call themselves by the name of the event. This gathering often lacks the organisational characteristics to collectively create a work, publish proceedings, etc, and is not an Agent. Such an event only rarely meets the LRM definition of 'An entity capable of deliberate actions, of being granted rights, and of being held accountable for its actions.'

This is further confirmed by this paragraph from the LRM:

‘A gathering of people is considered a collective agent **only** when it exhibits organizational characteristics that permit them to perform actions that reflect agency with respect to instances of entities of bibliographic interest (such as approving a report, publishing the proceedings of a conference).’

Most gatherings of persons or organisations associated with conferences, fairs, festivals etc. lack the organisational characteristics to undertake such activities. We suggest that the gatherings associated with festivals, fairs, exhibitions etc. are virtually **never** actors that are able to demonstrate agency in this area. Usually, the creator of a work associated with an event is a person or corporate body that organised the event, or took responsibility for publishing the work.

However, quite rarely, a gathering associated with an event will indeed create collectively under the name of the event. Examples include [Constitutional Conventions](#), or a workshop where the attendees collectively create a book or a video game. Such a gathering of people is a particular type of corporate body, one that only exists temporarily, and in a particular place. It is not the associated event. Even though it may have the same nomen string as the event, it represents a different nomen.

- 2) **The event or occasion itself** – which is never an Agent. While it may be identified by a particular name, the event itself cannot act as a unit.

A named occasion, and a named gathering lacking the characteristics of an agent are both outside the scope of RDA. These should be treated as non-RDA entities. Relationships may be recorded using the element ‘Related entity of work’, according to the Toolkit guidance in ‘Fictitious and non-human appellations’. The guidance on this page should be expanded to encompass appellations for events.

*Example:*

*a) The 2017 LIANZA AGM meeting report, authorised by the AGM - The LIANZA AGM, if named, should be considered to be an event-type corporate body.*

*b) The 2017 LIANZA Conference proceedings - The LIANZA Conference should be considered to be a non-RDA entity, and related to the conference proceedings (an aggregating work) through the element Work: related entity of work. The creator of the aggregating work plan is the person or corporate body (in this case LIANZA) who selected and arranged the individual papers, creating an aggregating work plan that is embodied in the aggregate manifestation that represents the conference proceedings.*

**Recommendation:**

We suggest adding guidance to the Toolkit to make it clear that ‘corporate body’ includes gatherings of people and organisations associated with events. The text needs to make it clear that we are not talking about the events themselves, and that the aforementioned gatherings of people or organisations associated with such events are **only agents** in the rare situation that these are capable of creating or contributing to works.

The Toolkit should also make it clear that there may be a different corporate body with a similar name (such as the conference organising committee) who organised the event and may or may not be responsible for creating or authorising creative works that arise from it.

### **Impacts**

This approach does not require creating a new entity, and would necessitate only minor changes to the Toolkit.

We do have concerns about MARC implementation. However, this is a fairly minor issue, and we do not feel that MARC should dictate Toolkit decisions. Presumably whatever MARC workaround is devised for fictitious entities can also work for events.