

To: ALA/ALCTS/CaMMS Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
From: Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee
Subject: Report on JSC/RSC Activities, July-December 2015

The following report summarizes the November 2015 meeting of the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA (JSC) and highlights other RDA-related activities of the JSC and its successor, the RDA Steering Committee (RSC), during the second half of 2015. As always, I am indebted to past and current CC:DA members who supported me in the development of ALA papers, responses, and fast track proposals during this time period.

Governance and Name Changes

Various changes associated with RDA governance happened prior to the JSC's November meeting. This included making the Examples Editor an official (non-voting) member of the JSC and establishing a single representative for the United Kingdom (instead of the previous two representatives, one from CILIP and one from the BL).

At the close of the JSC meeting, the committee was renamed the RDA Steering Committee, and the Committee of Principals became the RDA Board. These name changes are reflected in the RSC's website, which is now at www.rda-rsc.org (the old address redirects here). Future proposals and discussion papers will no longer use the *6JSC/...* document numbering; instead, the new series will start *RSC/...*

A multi-year plan is in place to transition the RSC representation from the current JSC constituency model to a RSC regional community model. By 2019, this will result in having a single North American representative, instead of the current three: ALA, CCC, and LC. ALA will continue to have a representative to the RSC until the new North American representation model is finalized.

Joint Steering Committee Meeting

Note: This summary, along with John Attig's blog reports (<http://sites.psu.edu/jscblog/>) and the official *Outcomes of the JSC Meeting* (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/sites/all/files/RSC-Outcomes-2015.pdf>), serve as early reports on the meeting. For specifics about what changes will be made to RDA as part of the April 2016 RDA Toolkit update, only documents originating from the JSC/RSC itself should be considered authoritative. These include the ".../Sec final" versions of the proposals and the minutes of the 2015 JSC meeting (which should be available within several months). A table listing the JSC decisions/actions for all proposals and discussion papers will be posted on the RSC website early in 2016.

The Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA held its final meeting November 2-6, 2015, at the National Library of Scotland in Edinburgh.

Documents associated with the meeting are available on the RSC website, including the agenda (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/RSCmeetingagendas>) and the various documents under discussion (available both at <http://rda-rsc.org/newrscdocs> and under the responsible constituency's document listing).

The Joint Steering Committee members present were:

Gordon Dunsire, JSC Chair
Judy Kuhagen, JSC Secretary
Kate James, Examples Editor (Library of Congress)
Kathy Glennan, American Library Association
Ebe Kartus, Australian Committee on Cataloguing
Pat Riva, Canadian Committee on Cataloguing, substituting for Bill Leonard
Susanne Oehlschläger, Deutsche Nationalbibliothek, substituting for Christine Frodl
Dave Reser, Library of Congress
Alan Danskin, United Kingdom (British Library)

A large number of observers attended part or all of the JSC meeting. These included over 50 regular observers and the following special observers:

Simon Edwards (CILIP), Chair of the Committee of Principals
Deborah Fritz, (TMQ), Co-chair of the JSC Aggregates Working Group
Massimo Gentili-Tedeschi (Istituto Centrale per il Catalogo Unico), Chair of the ISBD Review Group
James Hennelly (ALA Publishing), Managing Editor of RDA Toolkit
Damian Iseminger (New England Conservatory), Chair of the JSC Music Working Group
Francis Lapka (Yale University), Chair of the ACRL/RBMS Descriptive Cataloguing of Rare Materials Task Force
Clément Oury, ISSN International Centre
Verena Schaffner (Austrian Library Network), Vice-Chair of EURIG
Thurstan Young (British Library), UK representative back-up

Summary of the JSC meeting

General

The RSC will hold its first face-to-face meeting at the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek in Frankfurt am Main, November 7-11, 2016. It is possible that some of the RSC membership transitions will be completed by this meeting, such as having a single European representative.

Three factors drove the large number of observers for this JSC meeting: hosting the meeting in Europe; holding a one-day RDA and rare materials seminar in conjunction with the meeting; and

having a RIMMF-based hack-athon the following Monday, which focused on creating linked data associated with the works of Robert Louis Stevenson.

The JSC agreed to extend its Working Principle (<http://www.rda-rsc.org/node/229>) through the next year. This affects the consideration and implementation of revision proposals that would impact sections of RDA that are likely to be revised based on upcoming changes related to the new FRBR-Library Reference Model (FRBR-LRM).

This year, JSC members welcomed the opportunity to issue and review revised proposals in mid-October, which incorporated suggestions from constituency responses. This process allowed for briefer in-person discussions of the affected papers. This procedure will be formally implemented as part of the RSC deadline structure in 2016, with a three-week window to review the revised proposals prior to the RSC meeting.

Governance discussion

The JSC reviewed the governance transition plan, which has the following key principles:

- Current key stakeholders will be actively engaged in the change process and will be tasked with helping to shape future structures and support mechanisms to ensure they are fit for purpose.
- RDA Board and RDA Steering Committee will carefully balance retaining current skills and expertise and bringing new skills and representation in order to ensure that the stability of RDA as a tool does not suffer.
- The new structure will evolve gradually rather than as one big change.
- RDA Board aims to have the new structure firmly in place by 2019.

The changes in the governance structure will result in a greater reliance on RSC working groups to prepare change proposals, and it may require revisiting the concept of making consensus-based decisions at the RSC level. The RDA Board recognizes the need for a more robust infrastructure to support the regional representation model (such as wikis, discussion forums, live chat rooms, conference call support, etc.).

In addition to the full JSC discussion, the North American representatives met separately with the JSC Chair, JSC Secretary, and the Chair of the Committee of Principals to share our initial thoughts and concerns about making the move to the new RSC governance model. During this meeting, it was clarified that Mexico will be part of the Latin American and Caribbean community, rather than part of the North American community.

Toolkit structure project

Several factors are contributing to the need to rethink the RDA Toolkit structure, including: the need to replace the current element set view with an updated entity set view; accommodating changes arising from FRBR-LRM; determining what truly belongs in the Tools Tab; the problems with maintaining the current instruction numbering; and the increasing number of

policy statements and guidelines from specialist communities. A Toolkit Restructure Working Group will soon be established by the Co-Publishers to investigate these and other issues. These structural changes should not impact the actual instructions; rewording changes related to any of this activity would still go through the “normal” channels.

Relationship designator fast track proposal moratorium

The JSC issued a moratorium on adding new relationship designators other than those already proposed during 2015 until the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group completes its tasks of preparing a general paper on designators and a set of guidelines for proposing new designators. JSC members have been dissatisfied for some time with the piecemeal approach to adding new relationship designators and are looking forward to having guidelines that clarify the appropriate terminology, levels of granularity, sources of terms, etc.

Proposals and discussion papers

6JSC/ALA/37: *Eliminating “Laws, etc.” as a conventional collective title (RDA 6.19.2.5.1, 6.19.3.6, etc.)*

Outcome: Accepted.

Follow-up work: ALA [AALL] to do follow-up on issues raised by the JSC Secretary in relation to 6.29.1.1.1 and 6.29.1.1.2.

6JSC/ALA/38: *Create RDA 2.17.14, Note on Identifier for the Manifestation*

Outcome: Accepted with modifications.

Follow-up work: In 2016, the RSC will further investigate “Details Relating to...” elements in 2.17.

6JSC/ALA/39: *Expand the scope of RDA 2.17.5, Note on Numbering of Serials, and 2.17.11, Note on Series Statement*

Outcome: Accepted; examples will be evaluated by the Examples Editor.

6JSC/ALA/40: *Revision to RDA 3.1.4, Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type and RDA 3.4.1.3, Recording Extent*

Outcome: Rejected; bigger issues raised by CCC.

Follow-up work: ALA (group to be determined) to work with CCC to resolve issues identified; create discussion paper for consideration in 2016.

6JSC/ALA/41: *Additional instructions in Chapter 27 for Structured Descriptions of the "Contained in" and "Container of" Relationship*

Outcome: Deferred, due to the evolving understanding of RDA's four-fold path (currently identifier, authorized access point, structured description, unstructured description) and the upcoming expected reorganization of the RDA Toolkit in light of FRBR-LRM.

Follow-up work: Further pursuit of the contained in/container of relationships was referred to the RSC Aggregates Working Group.

6JSC/ALA/42: *Clarify Sources of Information for Statement of Responsibility Relating to Title Proper (RDA 2.4.2.2, etc.)*

Outcome: Accepted with modifications.

Follow-up work: In its response, the UK made a suggestion to add an option to 2.4.1.6; if needed, UK/EURIG will follow-up with a separate proposal in 2016.

6JSC/ALA/43: *Revision and Expansion of RDA Appendix K: Relationship Designators: Relationships Between Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies*

Outcome: Deferred. The JSC agreed to impose a moratorium on fast track proposals for all relationship designators while the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group pursues its work in 2016.

Follow-up work: [done]

By the end of November 2015, ALA Representative to:

- Analyze the constituency responses.
- Identify terms with (potential) agreement from all constituencies and propose them as fast tracks. [17 new terms and 3 revisions proposed. Anything affecting the current arrangement of Appendix K was out of scope for this project.]
- Report on the terms which are not eligible for fast track proposals now. This portion of the report will be shared with the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group to help inform their work in 2016.

6JSC/ALA/44: *New Chapter 3 elements for Optical Disc Data Storage Format and Optical Disc Recording Method*

Outcome: Rejected. The RSC will consider adding just two vocabulary terms, "stamped" and "burned" with very general definitions in 3.9.1.3 (Recording Production Methods) and the Glossary. Action expected by the April 2016 RDA Toolkit update.

Follow-up work: Potential for a new RSC working group or task force to rework the Encoding Format vocabulary. [Not acted on during JSC meeting.]

6JSC/ALA/45: *Referential relationships: RDA Chapter 24-28 and Appendix J*

Outcome: Rejected. Referential relationships are not really WEMI-to-WEMI relationships.

Instead, this is a subject-like relationship between the manifestation or item being described and a separate description of it.

Follow-up work:

- Cross-entity problem referred to RSC Relationship Designators Working Group.
- Possible creation of new RSC working group on rare materials, who could work on this further.

6JSC/ALA/Discussion/5: *Machine-Actionable Data Elements for Measurements, Extent of the Carrier, Pagination and Foliation, Dimensions, Extent of the Content, and Duration – Discussion Paper (2015)*

Outcome: General agreement that:

- 1) RDA needs to support both machine-actionable and human-readable data.
- 2) Additional work on this project should continue.

Follow-up work: In early 2016, the RSC will establish a new working group to replace the ALA task force.

6JSC/BL/25: *2.15.1.4 Optional Addition*

Outcome: Accepted with modifications based on the CCC response.

6JSC/BL/26: *2.7 Production Statement: changing method of recording*

Outcome: Rejected in favor of developing a self-described vs. non-self-described approach.

Follow-up work:

- Fast track proposal from the UK to redefine “inscription” and to add something to production method (3.9.1.3) that uses this term. Anticipated for the RDA Toolkit April Update.
- Major revisions will need to be folded in to the expected redesign of RDA.

6JSC/BL/27: *Appendix I Relationships for works issued over time*

Outcome: The designator “editorial director” will be added, using the definition proposed by LC, with some additions from the CCC response. The designator “founder” (of a work) will be added.

6JSC/BL/Discussion/1: *Conventional Collective Titles in RDA: a discussion paper*

Outcome: No consensus.

Follow-up work: Evaluate specific use cases and how they are supported by continued use of conventional collective titles (CCTs); determine if there are other means of supporting these use cases. Consider distinguishing between collections of incomplete and complete works. A paper on use cases will be developed by the RSC Aggregates Working Group and EURIG.

The RSC Music Working Group will prepare a position paper to represent their issues/concerns regarding CCTs.

6JSC/BL rep/2: *Simplification of RDA 2.7-2.10. Follow up*

Outcome: Action deferred, due to the JSC Working Principle. However, there was general agreement that RDA should be developed to include a new generic modeling solution for manifestations that clearly separates transcribed information from recorded data. This would include creating a second set of elements for manifestation-related recorded data.

Follow-up work: The RSC Secretary will clarify RDA 1.4 (Language and Script) and RDA 1.7 (Transcription) regarding transcription and transcribed elements. The RSC will keep in mind the longer-term issues.

6JSC/CCC/16: *Transcription of punctuation and symbols (1.7.3, 1.7.5)*

Outcome: Accepted with modifications, which included placing the new Alternative after the 1st paragraph, and not including CCC's proposed text about spacing.

6JSC/CCC/17: *Recording the Fuller Form of Name (9.5.1.1)*

Outcome: Accepted with modifications, which include using "diminutive" instead of "nickname"

Follow-up work: CCC to make fast track proposal which defines "diminutive".

6JSC/CCC/18/rev: *Recording numbering for a series (2.12.9.3)*

Outcome: Accepted with minor modifications.

6JSC/CCC/19: *Parallel language elements (1.7.7)*

Outcome: Action deferred due to the need for additional development in RDA to support this.

Follow-up work: CCC to rework as a new proposal, in light of the JSC's discussion on transcribing vs. recording manifestation elements (see 6JSC/BL rep/2).

6JSC/LC/32: *Revision to instructions for devised titles in RDA 2.3.2.11*

Outcome: Accepted "/rev" version with minor modifications.

6JSC/LC/33: *Revision to instructions for Adaptations and Revisions (6.27.1.5)*

Outcome: Accepted "/rev" version with modifications to allow for multiple creators.

6JSC/LC/34: *Location of a conference, etc.*

Outcome: Accepted "/rev" version.

Follow-up work: The RSC Technical Working Group will investigate modeling issues regarding using both "associated institution" and "online" as locations, which they really aren't.

6JSC/AggregatesWG/1: RDA and FRBRoo treatment of aggregates

Outcome: The Working Group focused on the modeling from FRBRoo (Object oriented FRBR, available at: http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr/frbroo_v2.2.pdf), since FRBR-LRM is not yet available. They mocked up two examples in detail in this paper and analyzed the results. FRBRoo offers a detailed, complicated model which does solve a number of the problems with aggregates. The issues raised by this paper and discussed by the JSC included:

- Online resources do not have manifestations; instead, they are pure content. If this is true, we cannot aggregate at the manifestation level. If this is the final analysis in FRBR-LRM, it will have significant implications for the description of online resources.
- FRBRoo presents two different types of manifestations: *manifestation singleton* (one offs) and *manifestation product type* (reproduced in multiple items). Adding this division to the model is helpful, especially when keeping in mind that there's a one-to-one relationship between the *manifestation product type* and the *publication expression* (the entire content of the manifestation, including blank pages, form of numbering, index, etc.)
- Every published work is an aggregate: manifestations include layout and typography decisions made by the publisher, along with the work of the author. Of course, other parts of the manifestation may have separate creators, such as the introduction or the illustrations. The JSC observed that different communities have different needs; some will want to identify the aggregate works separately. RDA will need to allow communities to ignore augmentations while also supporting the more detailed description and access needs of archival and other specialist communities.
- When the model is applied at the most detailed level, the contributor role disappears: a preface has an author; an illustration included in a book has its own artist; etc.
- FRBRoo may need to be developed to identify what is core vs. what is an extension. FRBR-LRM may fill this role.

Follow-up work: The RSC Aggregates Working Group will continue its investigations.

6JSC/CapitalizationWG/1: Capitalization Instructions and RDA

Outcome: The purpose of the capitalization instructions is to get the information right when recording (not transcribing) data. The JSC generally agreed that the current A.0-A.9 should remain in RDA proper, although the Working Group has identified some gaps. The language-specific instructions will be expanded to accommodate more languages. This may ultimately move to the Tools tab, although the restructuring of the Toolkit will have an impact on the final decision about placement.

Follow-up work: The RSC Capitalization Working Group will:

- Review A.0-A.9 and make recommendations for additions/clarifications.
- Develop a template for structuring the instructions for each language.

6JSC/FictitiousWG/1: *Fictitious and other entities in RDA and the consolidated FR models*

Outcome: Rejected. The paper does not conform to the view of person in FRBRoo or the upcoming FRBR-LRM. The JSC acknowledged how contentious this issue is, and several members raised the problems associated with reversing the original RDA decision to consider fictitious entities as capable of authorship. However, the JSC also noted that this discussion is not about subject entities. Thus, the conversation focused on the role of persons as creators, and the challenges of trying to fit fictitious and non-human entities into this model. As RDA is revised in light of FRBR-LRM, the role of the Nomen entity will need to be used to address fictitious entities. It's possible that a solution will be to associate statements of responsibility in a manifestation with a particular Nomen, along with the use of appropriate relationship designators.

Follow-up work: The RSC Fictitious Working Group will start modeling the Nomen approach to fictitious and non-human entities based on the FRBRoo/FRBR-LRM models.

6JSC/MusicWG/10: *Revision of instruction language for Part of a Larger Part (6.14.2.7.1.5)*

Outcome: Accepted, based on the wording in the ALA response, with minor modifications.

6JSC/MusicWG/11: *Revisions to instructions for additions to access points representing musical works with distinctive titles (6.28.1.10 and 6.28.1.10.1)*

Outcome: Accepted option 2 with minor modifications.

6JSC/MusicWG/12: *Revisions to Additions to Access Points Representing Compilations of Musical Works (6.28.1.11)*

Outcome: Accepted option 2, with modifications; will revise 6.28.1.9.4 and delete 6.28.1.11.

6JSC/MusicWG/13: *Revisions to Numeric Designation of a Musical Work (6.16)*

Outcome: Accepted, based on the wording in the ALA response, with minor modifications.

6JSC/MusicWG/14: *Removing lists of terms from the Medium of Performance (6.15) instructions*

Outcome: Withdrawn by the Working Group, in light of the larger discussion contained in 6JSC/MusicWG/Discussion/2.

6JSC/MusicWG/15: *Finnish Music Group proposed revisions for recording preferred titles of musical works*

Outcome: Accepted with modifications (using UK suggestion for 1st Alternative to 6.14.2.5.2.1 and ALA suggestion for Alternative to 6.14.2.5.2.2).

6JSC/MusicWG/16/rev: *Finnish Music Group proposed revisions for recording preferred titles of parts of musical works identified by both a number and a title (6.14.2.7.1.3)*

Outcome: Accepted, with changes based on ALA response.

6JSC/MusicWG/Discussion/1: *Evaluating authorized access point instructions for musical works at 6.28.1.1—6.28.1.8*

Outcome: The JSC agreed that further work should proceed on the following:

- Look at broader issues associated with pasticcios; consider ways to simplify.
- Remove exceptional practice for multiple excerpts from pasticcios.
- Review and consider revising treatment of a single excerpt from a pasticcio.
- Add a general paragraph about works for choreographic movement, possibly in 6.28.1.4.
- Modify instructions for adaptations of musical works in light of decisions made in 6JSC/LC/33/rev; include a reference to special music instructions in Chapter 6.
- Update instructions to clarify that a work of incidental music is a work in its own right (and not a part of the dramatic work it was composed for).

Follow-up work: The RSC Music Working Group will prepare a proposal for 2016.

6JSC/MusicWG/Discussion/2: *Simplification of the Medium of Performance Instructions (6.15)*

Outcome: The JSC preferred the more radical option, which would result in removing medium of performance vocabulary in RDA in favor of using external lists, such as the IAML list (see UNIMARC field 146) and the *Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus*.

Follow-up work: the RSC Music Working Group will continue working on the details of this option.

6JSC/MusicWG/Discussion/3: *Additional element for Medium of Performance of the Expression*

Outcome: Action deferred. The next steps are dependent on outcomes in FRBR-LRM, which may recast medium of performance only at the Expression level.

6JSC/PlacesWG/1: *Place as an RDA entity*

Outcome: The JSC discussed this paper, which contained no proposals or recommendations. Instead, it brought together instructions regarding place from both Chapter 11 and Chapter 16. This kind of analysis is necessary for implementing the “Place” entity which will be part of FRBR-LRM. Discussion centered on the following issues:

- The need to clearly separate (and name) the entities of place, jurisdiction, and court.
- Place is defined as a boundary which is closed.
- The role of application profiles for recording data such as coordinates, or using a unique character string to define a place.

- A given place entity may change over time (e.g., city boundaries, names, etc.) – it’s defined by humans.
- Place as subject is not in scope for this discussion. In FRBR-LRM, places will be defined in relation to bibliographic data rather than to the real world.
- New relationship designators will be needed; once place is an entity, it can be used in relationships (place of birth → person; place of publication → resource; etc.)
- In FRBR-LRM, place cannot be a corporate body.

Follow-up work: The RSC Places Working Group will identify relationship designators associated with place. They will also follow up on the issues surrounding the use of “jurisdiction” and “government” first raised in 6JSC/TechnicalWG/4 (2014) and will consult with EURIG in preparing proposals for consideration in 2016.

6JSC/TechnicalWG/5: RDA models for authority data

Outcome:

- The JSC agreed with Recommendation 1, to introduce the high level relationship that links a Nomen to its appellation, once FRBR-LRM is approved.
- The JSC also endorsed Recommendation 2, to develop appropriate RDA elements for compatibility with the appellation-Nomen model by assigning element sub-types and ranges.
- Recommendation 3, to atomize personal names into “family name” and “given name” was more problematic; these concepts are not universally applicable across cultures. However, the JSC agreed that further investigation of the issues was warranted.
- The JSC accepted Recommendation 4, to further investigate the preferred name in the context of the appellation-Nomen model and how RDA should accommodate the relationships between various Nomens.
- Recommendation 5 suggested replacing the RDA instructions for constructing Authorized Access Points (AAPs) with general guidelines for assigning Nomens. Guidelines for AAP construction would move to application profiles. In the linked data environment, the need to create unambiguous identifiers for an entity is addressed by the use of URIs, rather than specific character strings. This will need to be investigated after FRBR-LRM is adopted.

Follow-up work:

- The RSC Technical Working Group, often in concert with the RDA Development Team, will further investigate these issues.
- The RSC Chair will continue developing a draft core application profile for the RSC to review next year.
- The task of finalizing this application profile will be the responsibility of the RDA Development Team.

6JSC/TechnicalWG/6: RDA accommodation of relationship data**Outcome:**

- The JSC generally agreed with Recommendations 1 & 2, to clarify the guidelines for using identifiers to describe relationships; however, actual change proposals need to be crafted to do so.
- Recommendations 3 & 4 focused on what constitutes a structured description and how it should be constructed. Some JSC members were concerned about confining the elements used in a structured description to those at the same level (e.g., only manifestation elements can be used in a structured description of a manifestation). Further action on these issues was deferred.
- The JSC agreed that RDA should provide explicit guidelines about the four-fold path (defined in the paper as unstructured description, structured description, identifier, URI link).

Follow-up work:

- LC to collaborate with the RSC Technical Working Group to develop proposals for recommendations 1 & 2.
- Although the JSC agreed that the linked data path needs to be developed as soon as possible; responsibility for this was not assigned during the meeting.

ALAREp2015Transcribe: Use of the terms “recording”, “record”, and “transcribe” in RDA Chapter 2

Outcome: This internal paper analyzed the use of record and transcribe in RDA Chapter 2. The JSC noted that transcription only applies to manifestation elements and that it can only be used for self-describing resources. The conclusion was that RDA should be very clear what elements should be transcribed, and exactly what that means.

Follow-up work: Same as for 6JSC/BL rep/2: The RSC Secretary will clarify RDA 1.4 (Language and Script) and RDA 1.7 (Transcription) regarding transcription and transcribed elements.

Gender as an RDA Element (Discussion paper prepared by JSC Secretary and JSC Chair)

Outcome: The following points were raised during the discussion:

- The use cases for the gender element are for disambiguation and identification.
- Data recorded can be used for information/data mining, and could prove useful for future historical purposes.
- Concerns were expressed that for identification, gender identification is subjective – and for a single individual, this may change over time.

Follow-up work:

- Fast track proposal to replace the current term “no known” with “other” to complete the vocabulary and to modify the text in 9.7.1.3 to support this change.

Note: After the fast track was proposed in November, the RSC did not agree with this approach. Two alternatives are being considered instead: 1) deprecating the element and the vocabulary; 2) retaining the element and deprecating the vocabulary.

- The JSC charged the RDA Development Team and ALA (individuals yet to be determined) to explore the option to add “transgender” and/or any other appropriate terms as an extension of the RDA vocabulary. This would not become an official part of the RDA vocabulary itself; instead, it would be a community extension. Work on this will need to be deferred until the RSC decides if the gender element will be retained in RDA. If anyone is interested in working on this, please contact me.

Unresolved Fast Track Proposals

Outcome: After review of some of the outstanding fast track proposals (primarily relationship designators and vocabulary definitions), the JSC agreed to have specific communities review and revise particular proposals. They may be proposed for the February 2016 release of the RDA Toolkit, or a later release or update, if necessary.

Follow-up work:

- The DCRM Task Force will make recommendations about the following terms: scroll, folded sheet, double leaf [done].
- ALA to take the lead in resolving the following music/AV relationship designator proposals: casting director, DJ mixer, dubbing director, mixing engineer, music producer, producer (expression), programmer (music), remixer. In early 2016, I will be working with volunteers from OLAC and the Music Library Association on this task.
- The RSC Secretary will review other outstanding fast track proposals and uncompleted vocabularies tasks.

Presentation - FRBR-Library Reference Model (FRBR-LRM)

Pat Riva, the chair of IFLA’s [FRBR] Consolidation Editorial Group, gave a presentation on the current content of FRBR-LRM, which is expected to go out for worldwide review in early 2016. During the review period, the documentation will include tables about what was previously defined and what happened to it. The FRBR-LRM integrates and revises the three current FR models (FRBR, FRAD, and FRSAD), and aligns with FRBRoo and with the CIDOC-CRM (International Council of Museums’ International Committee for Documentation – Conceptual Reference Model). It will remain a high-level conceptual model, with an entity-relationship framework. Its focus is on user tasks and not library operations. Major changes include:

- The deprecation of FRBR Group 3 entities (*Concept, Object, Event, Place*).
- The creation of two new entities (*Place, Time-Span*).
- The establishment of the *Agent* entity (a super-class of *Person* and *Collective Agent*).
- Definition of *Person* as a real human being [see related discussion above under 6JSC/FictitiousWG/1].
- A greater emphasis on relationships over attributes.

- The introduction of *Nomen* (A designation by which an entity is known), applicable to all entities.
- Renaming/redefining FRSAD's *Thema* to *Res* – the single top level entity in the model.

The results of the world-wide review will be evaluated and integrated into a final draft, which will be considered at IFLA 2016 in Columbus, OH.

The JSC discussed the need to synchronize RDA with FRBR-LRM as its fundamental underlying model. This will require substantial changes to RDA in the next few years. The JSC also recognized the need for outreach to the RDA user community (current and potential) to explain the underlying model and the resulting modifications.

Reports

ISBD status: The ISBD Review Group anticipates that the next revision of the standard will begin in about four years. In the meantime, efforts are being made to make ISBD compatible with linked data standards and FRBR-LRM. The Review Group remains interested in trying to maintain a strict alignment with RDA, not just as display tool, but also to make interoperability possible. The protocol between the JSC [now RSC] and the ISBD Review Group supports the goals of alignment and interoperability between these two standards.

ISSN update: Work is underway to revise the ISSN standard, which was last published in 2007. Issues under consideration include the granularity of ISSN assignment, what constitutes a different edition of a digital publication, and the alignment with ONIX. ISSN is also interested in remaining aligned with RDA; for example, there are some new fields provided by RDA that are of interest and may be ingested into the ISSN Registry. Regina Reynolds (Director, U.S. ISSN Center, an audience member) noted the U.S. dissatisfaction about how to handle major/minor changes, observing that this will come up in the revision discussions. She observed that this may lead to deharmonization of ISSN with ISBD and RDA.

PRESSoo update: PRESSoo (http://www.ifla.org/files/assets/cataloguing/frbr/pressoo_v0.5.pdf) is an extension of FRBRoo for serials and continuing resources; it recognizes the dynamic nature of these resources and offers greater detail to support their description. As a result of developing this model, additions have been made to FRBRoo for evolutions of serials (mergers, splits, temporary replacement, etc.). This model could be very useful in RDA, especially in the treatment of aggregates. The RSC will consider creating a protocol with the PRESSoo Review Group, once it is established.

Other JSC/RSC Activities, July-December 2015

- Approved 244 corrections/minor revisions of instructions and/or examples, including 16 new and 12 revised relationship designators and their definitions. (Changes implemented in the August and October releases of the RDA Toolkit.)

- Approved and published two new documents on the RSC website:
 - 6JSC/ROFWG/3, *Guidelines for proposing new carrier and content categories and terms in RDA*
 - 6JSC/ROFWG/3/Categories, *RDA carrier and content categories*
- Updated the complete RDA Example set that is accessible via the Tools tab in the RDA Toolkit. These contain both bibliographic and authority records, and they are presented in two “formats”: RDA elements and MARC21 coding.
- Co-sponsored the latest “Jane-athon”, this time focusing on Robert Louis Stevenson and his works. It was held November 9, 2015 in Edinburgh, Scotland, following the JSC meeting and had over 40 attendees.

Follow-up Actions for ALA

The following list identifies work for ALA (or the ALA Representative) arising from the 2015 JSC meeting.

1. **Follow up on 6JSC/ALA/37:** ALA to create proposal to address related changes needed in 6.29.1.1.1 (Laws, etc.) and 6.29.1.1.2 (Categories Excluded from Laws, Etc.)
Action to date: Referred to AALL.
2. **Follow up on 6JSC/ALA/40:** ALA to work with CCC to resolve issues identified and create a discussion paper for consideration in 2016. ; create *Revision to RDA 3.1.4, Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type and RDA 3.4.1.3, Recording Extent*
Action to date: None, but an agenda item for CC:DA at Midwinter 2016.
3. **Follow up on 6JSC/ALA/43:**
 - ALA Representative to identify terms with potential agreement and propose them for inclusion in the RDA Toolkit February 2016 release.
Action to date: Done; 17 new terms and 3 revisions proposed.
 - ALA Representative to follow up with OLAC, asking for a list of AV-related roles that are currently missing from Appendix I.
Action to date: Request made.
4. **Follow up on unresolved music/AV relationship designator proposals:**
ALA Representative taking the lead in resolving the following music/AV relationship designator proposals: casting director, DJ mixer, dubbing director, mixing engineer, music producer, producer (expression), programmer (music), remixer.
Action to date: Requested names of volunteers from OLAC and the Music Library Association.