

Report
CC:DA 3R Project Task Force
ALA Annual 2019, Washington, DC
Robert L. Maxwell

The 3R Project Task force consists of

Robert Maxwell (chair)
Charlene Chou
Felicity Dykas and two of her graduate students
Mary Huismann
Tim Kiser
Faye Leibowitz
Heather McIntosh
Robert Rendall
Sheila Tawney
Glen Wiley
Dominique Bourassa (ex officio)
Stephen Hearn (ex officio)

The TF was quite busy between the Midwinter meeting and late April of this year. We gave ourselves weekly assignments, and recorded our comments and responses in a Google spreadsheet, which was forwarded to the RSC. In addition to commenting on the spreadsheet we had some discussion via the TF listserv.

We began by exploring the beta version of RDA by taking one bibliographic and one authority record and attempting to find the RDA guidelines that justified each part of the descriptions. This exercise sent many of us far and wide through RDA as we explored the links.

Once we had done that for a week or so we began more systematic examination of the beta RDA, beginning with reading and commenting on the Introduction to RDA, Recording methods, and Resource description sections. In following weeks we accepted assignments of other sections. In all cases we were encouraged to follow links and then follow links from the links. Since everyone followed different links, I think we were able to cover a lot of ground, though I'm pretty sure we didn't look at the entire beta RDA

Comments ran the gamut from discovery of typos to high-level discussions.

It is evident that all our comments were read and considered, since they all received responses from RSC. It is also evident that many of our comments resulted in beneficial changes to the text and structure of the beta RDA. For example, a major change that appears to have stemmed from a comment from the TF: a guidance chapter on user tasks was added.

Comments on the opaqueness of the language or confusing wordings, however, were often passed over by claiming this was “standard usage”, etc. There seems to be an unwillingness to accept that the language and overall presentation could – and should – be much clearer.

These were all major topics discussed or commented on by the TF that might lead to further work for CC:DA. Most of these resulted in RSC comments like “will be considered in future RDA development”

CC:DA might want to work on guidance for formation of access points, either for RDA for an application profile. E.g. there is now a place for access points for manifestations, but no guidance on how to create one.

Access point for person: "Include the term Saint unless the person is a pope, emperor, empress, king, or queen": Is it necessary to include that exception in the text of RDA? It would be simpler to just say "include the term Saint" and let agencies determine when to apply the option.

Consider what the word “resource” signifies—appears to be used different ways throughout RDA.

Consider aligning the objectives and principles language more closely with the principles listed in the IFLA Statement. “The IFLA [Statement of International Cataloguing Principles](https://beta.rdatoolkit.org/Guidance?externalId=en-US_ala-78a3c063-b55b-32b8-b4fb-6d8217a823d5#section_rdaId_section_tgp_s5y_mdb) informs the cataloguing principles used throughout RDA and guides the decisions that cataloguers make.” https://beta.rdatoolkit.org/Guidance?externalId=en-US_ala-78a3c063-b55b-32b8-b4fb-6d8217a823d5#section_rdaId_section_tgp_s5y_mdb

Offer to help RSC in the project to merge the so-called “pseudo-element” instructions with the main instructions. RSC is calling elements for specialized communities, such as those for musical, legal, and religious works, “pseudo-elements” and its intention is to merge them with the general instructions if possible, but careful examination is needed before that can happen.

There are no instructions for how to choose or record the preferred title for expression (new element). Consider suggesting guidance.

Consider the issue: does summarization of content belong at the expression level or the work level?

Cardinality restrictions: the WEM Lock applied to diachronic monographic works; the WE Lock applied to aggregating monographic works. Does it work for monographs (or for that matter for serials?)

Treatment of illustrations: “illustrator” relationship has been moved to manifestation, but “illustrative content” remains at expression level.

We have now passed the date of the “stabilization” of the text, but there is still room for further comment and discussion of the beta RDA before it becomes official. Many, perhaps most, task force members are willing to remain and continue to funnel comments to the RSC for further development and improvement, if CC:DA would like the TF to continue.