

## **Report of the Meeting of the DC Libraries Working Group at DC2005, University of Carlos III, Madrid. Tuesday 13 September 2005 17:30 – 19:00**

The DC Libraries Working Group met for two ninety-minute sessions with 28 people attending altogether. Separate reports have been produced for each session and this is the report for the second session. The agenda for this session was:

1. Presentation of RDA Prospectus - Matthew Beacom
2. Discussion – All
3. Discussion of invitation from CC:DA – All
4. Workplan - Robina and All

1) Matthew Beacom had been invited to address this meeting to outline the development plans for Resource Description and Access (RDA). This is a new content standard for resource description being developed on the foundations of the library cataloguing practice established in the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules (AACR). Earlier this year the governing authorities of AACR elected to reassess the principles behind the rules and develop a standard that is applicable to a wider set of resources than traditional library materials and designed for use in a digital environment. In the light of this they are seeking input from a range of communities.

In this context Matthew began his presentation with a simple question: “Does the DCMI community want to influence the development of RDA, the successor to the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition?” And if so, what mechanism should we establish for this communication to take place?

In the opening keynote paper of the conference the previous day Tom Baker had referred to “three legs of interoperability”, shared semantics, a shared model, and thirdly, content-level agreements that would allow users to share practice about how values are expressed within descriptions. Matthew recalled the last of these three necessary legs in characterising RDA as a library domain content-level agreement which is nonetheless seeking greater compatibility with metadata standards used in other domains.

Matthew outlined RDA’s new approach to resource description and its objectives together with an overview of the content of the standard and the proposed timeline. His presentation will be made available shortly in the File Area of the DC Libraries Mailing List at <http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/files/DC-LIBRARIES/>. Full details of the development of RDA can be found in the official Prospectus at <http://www.collectionscanada.ca/jsc/rdaprospectus.html>

2) The meeting was asked if the DC community would like to participate in the development of RDA by reviewing the successive drafts of the standard. The meeting agreed that we did want to participate this way and accepted that for commercial reasons access to the drafts would have to be limited to a sub-group. (This is the model that had been adopted earlier in the year when a sub-group reviewed a draft of a revised AACR3 document.) Given that RDA were seeking to broaden the input to the development it was also agreed that an invitation to join the sub-group would be extended to DC General and other targeted working groups. DC Libraries would be

the focus of the activity with Robina and Matthew acting as liaison points between RDA and DC. They would also work together to draw up the invitation. The other WG Chairs will be approached via the Advisory Board to identify any interest in their particular domains.

3) Invitation from CC:DA. In a parallel development DCMI had received an invitation to provide a representative to sit on the US Committee on Cataloguing: Description and Access. This is the body that advises the American Library Association (ALA) about descriptive cataloguing rules and hence provided input to the development of AACR and now to RDA. There was some discussion about how this fitted with providing input directly to the RDA Joint Steering Committee through the sub-group discussed above, but it was concluded that there was no real reason why a DC perspective could not be provided via both routes. It was also felt that the other national library associations who contribute to RDA could also ask for such input if they wanted.

A DC representative will need to attend the twice yearly meetings of ALA in the US. Although the request for a volunteer to fill this role will be open to all members of the DC Libraries WG it is likely that the nominee will be someone from the US who has support to attend ALA. It is further recognised that as DCMI is an organisation that exists predominantly by virtue of voluntary participation, the nominee will be seen as offering a DC perspective and cannot be seen as representative of DCMI per se.

4) Work plan. Time once again did not permit the articulation of a formal workplan for DC Libraries WG for the coming year but the actions agreed in this and the previous session will be drawn up into a draft plan and posted separately.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robina Clayphan  
Chair, DC Libraries