The following is a record of motions made and votes taken between July 1, 2004 and December 31, 2004:

A. **CC:DA/TF/Consistency/Area 5/3 and 4JSC/ALA/60** [Task Force on Consistency’s “Prototype of Area 5 for AACR3” forwarded to JSC as an ALA document; July 29, 2004 and August 11]: 7 votes yes, 0 votes no. This prototype represented best effort of the Task Force within the time available, and is very definitely a prototype for consideration by JSC rather than a final thought; an extensive list of unresolved issues was included in the introduction to the prototype.

B. **CC:DA/TF/Rule 21.0D/4/Rev. and 4JSC/ALA/58/Rev** [Designations of function (21.0D): revised proposal; August 9, 2004]: 6 votes yes, 1 vote no. Veterans of CC:DA will recall the previous discussions on 21.0D. During late July of last year, we were at the stage where there was a revised proposal (to send to JSC), written by Jennifer Bowen and Matthew Beacom. There was considerable discussion about this proposal over a period of about a week. The point of the proposal was to prefer consistency with the source of the terms over consistency that might go against the source of the terms; therefore, catalogers are to use standard lists or terms specified in other rules, or make up their own. The discussion on abbreviations was extensive and included such major points as not having any abbreviations at all, and being consistent in keeping all of the abbreviations or none of them. The substance of this discussion was forwarded on to JSC by the ALA Representative to JSC.

C. **CC:DA/TF/EarlyPrintedMonographs/4 and 4JSC/ALA/61** [Report of the Task Force on Early Printed Monographs and Rules for early printed monographs (2.12-2.18); July 24 and August 11, 2004]: 6 votes yes, 0 votes no. The report of the Task Force on the Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs included a number of recommendations about the rules in 2.12-2.18 and how they should be handled in AACR3, which were forwarded to JSC as an ALA proposal. The report also contained recommendations about the future of the Task Force, which will not be acted on until at least after JSC has met in October. The report of the Task Force on the Cataloging Rules for Early Printed Monographs was accepted.
and — with the exception of the section on the future of the Task Force — forwarded the report to JSC.

D. **CC:DA/Chair/2004-2005/1 [Resolution for Matthew Beacom; September 14, 2004]**: 7 votes yes, 0 votes no. This resolution is in recognition of Matthew Beacom’s CC:DA service of 8 years, 1996-2004 as voting member and 2001-2004 as ALA representative to the JSC (including serving as chair of that body for the 2003-2004 year). During that time, he served on eight task forces: on Metadata and the Cataloging Rules; on the Review of the IFLA Guidelines for OPAC Displays; on the Harmonization of ISBD(ER) and AACR2; on Metadata; on Recommendation 2 in 4JSC/ALA/30; on the Review of the Draft Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early-Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM); and on Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2. He came up with the idea of a preconference on FRBR and worked on that task force; he has followed this up by agreeing to chair two CC:DA program committees for ALA Annual – one on AACR3 and one on cataloging cultural objects. CC:DA therefore voted to give him a formal resolution and CC:DA’s thanks for many years of hard work and contributions to CC:DA.

E. **CC:DA/Chair/2004-2005/2 [CC:DA comments on “Guidelines for Standardized Cataloging for Children; November 12, 2004]**: Vote of 8 yes, 0 no. CC:DA accepted the draft comments on cataloging materials for children, including any additional comments made during CC:DA discussion, and the chair forwarded the comments to the Chair of CCS. In summary, CC:DA considers these to be important guidelines, and has three areas of concern: although it is difficult to keep guidelines and the rules in sync, there is a concern that the guidelines are not using the latest revision of AACR2R in the rules referred to within the text; it would be beneficial to discuss the LC/NACO Authority File (NAF) earlier in the document, and in more detail; and the section on series access points is very difficult to understand, and needs revision to clarify the concepts in general, and the coding in particular.

F. **CC:DA/TF/Technical Description of DigitalMedia/1 [Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media; December 7, 2004]**: During the October JSC meeting, there was discussion about the need to ensure that the rules pertaining to the technical description of digital media in AACR3 are as relevant as possible to the types of digital materials that are being cataloged and that are likely to be cataloged in the future. The offer was made to, and accepted by, JSC that because ALA has been so actively involved in examining the rules for Areas 5 and 7, it seems appropriate for ALA to take a serious look at these rules and offer some proposals for revisions to the Draft of Part 1.