To: Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR

From: Sally Strutt, Chair, JSC

Subject: AACR3 - Part I - Review by other rule makers of December 2004 Draft

These are comments on the draft Part I of AACR3 received from Matthew Beacom on behalf of the Dublin Core Metadata Initiative community.

AACR3 – Part I

Comments on the December 2004 Draft

Submitted by: Matthew Beacom, JSC AACR3 Outreach Group, for Dublin Core Metadata Initiative community
E-mail address: matthew.beacom@yale.edu

Date: 15 April 2005

Note: The chapter designators (A1, A2, A3, B1, etc.) in the draft of part I have been used in order to differentiate chapter and rule numbers for the new edition from those used in AACR2 for purposes of the constituency review. The final form of numbering for chapters and rules will be determined once the complete structure for AACR3 has been finalized.
General comments on the formulation or application of the objectives and principles established for part I:

The discussion of the AACR3 Part 1 draft drew upon an ad hoc group of DC-libraries discussion list members. They were

Matthew Beacom, Yale University, USA (AACR/JSC liaison)
John Chapman, University of Minnesota Libraries, USA
Robina Clayphan, The British Library, UK (DC-Libraries liaison)
Brad Eden, University of Nevada, USA
Christine Frodl, Die Deutsche Bibliothek, Germany
Paula Goossens, Koninklijke Bibliotheek Albert I, Belgium
Corey Harper, University of Oregon, USA
Diane Hillmann, Cornell University, USA
Dan Matei, Institutul de Memorie Culturala, Romania
Karen Rollitt, National Library of New Zealand
Robin Wendler, Harvard University, USA
Elaine Westbrooks, Cornell University, USA

It is difficult to characterize the comments of the group as a single view. The discussion process was informal and suffered from being too brief.

Christine Frodl, Die Deutsche Bibliothek, Germany, and staff there compiled a response to the draft that I have not incorporated in the comments here. As it was complete and to some extent distinct from the group's discussion, I thought it best to send that response to the JSC separately. Note, though, that many in the DC discussion thought it was well done and generally agreed with the points made.

At the start of the DC-libraries group discussion, the comments on the draft of AACR3 Part that Paul Weiss submitted to CC:DA as the PCC Liaison document were cited and commented upon That PCC document is at http://www.loc.gov/catdir/pcc/archive/aacr3-pt1pcc.pdf.

A document by the National Library of Medicine (NLM) was also forwarded to the group and became the basis for some comments.

Comments made with reference to the PCC and the NLM documents were, unfortunately, not specific. In general, the members of the DC group agreed with views expressed in the PCC and NLM documents regarding the overly conservative approach being taken in the draft of AACR3 Part 1. They agreed, again generally, that there were critical flaws in the structure, design, and intent of the draft. They suggested a major re-design effort be made, and indicated they would prefer one that took a broader international approach and a more radical set of goals for transforming the cataloging rules into something more universally applicable as a metadata content standard for digital materials.

GENERAL

Some commentators appreciated the generalization of the rules and the organization of the draft. Others thought the organization would be better in the form of a data dictionary, and they counselled moving away from the ISBD framework entirely.

Some thought that a data dictionary approach might work only if the metadata were to reside in only one data structure. So, a data dictionary arrangement was not seen generally to be a useful model. Commentators with considerable experience of non-library data providers thought that ISBD doesn't relate well to the ways these providers think about their information. Thus, an assumption of ISBD as an organizing principle may be an impediment. Could not the ISBD be better integrated (not just referenced) with the rules themselves?

Use of ISBD punctuation was seen generally as an impediment to broad use of the rules. A quote, will indicate the general view best. "If we have any hope of having AACR3 accepted as a content standard outside of libraries, we need to explicitly disassociate display from the mix, and that DEFINITELY includes punctuation (don't get me started)." The preferred idea would seem to be to consider the rules a content standard for metadata and not a display standard for metadata. The view generally is that for digital materials and their metadata many possible displays are more desirable than any one standard display.

FRBR

"Resource" was seen as problematic. Some thought it was poorly defined extension of the expected FRBR framework of Work, Expression, Manifestation, and Item.

It was noted by many as a weakness of the draft that Part 1 was primarily restricted to describing what in FRBR terms would be manifestations. Many expected an approach to Part 1 that would have acknowledge the interest in and value of describing the "higher" FRBR categories of Work and Expression. Note, though, that others considered the restriction of Part 1 to manifestations as appropriate and practical. One noted that the AACR3 draft of Part 1 took an approach that is compatible with the Dublin Core "one-to-one" rule.

TRANSCRIPTION.

Some thought transcription only useful and necessary when working with materials that follow the model of publication of books and other physical objects of mass distribution. For most other things, particularly digital web-based resources, transcription is both difficult and of less obvious

value.

GMD

The GMD was seen by some as a crucial attribute of the resource. Thus, it should not be an "interpolation" in the 'Title and statement of responsibility' area.