

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2012 Midwinter Meeting in Dallas, Texas**

January 21 and January 23, 2012

Members present:

Lori P. Robare, Chair
John DeSantis
Patricia M. Dragon
Kevin M. Randall
Robert Rendall
Peter J. Rolla
Kathy Winzer
Bob Wolverton

Jennifer D. Miller, Intern
Gayle Porter, Intern
Melanie Polutta, CC:DA Webmaster (Monday, January 23 only)

Ex-officio representatives present:

John Attig, ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC

ALA Liaisons present:

Elizabeth Marie German, ALA/ACRL
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:CCM
Robert L. Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA/MARBI
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CaMMS /CC:AAM
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, ALCTS/CRS
Nathan B. Putnam, ALCTS/MIG
Randy Roeder, ALCTS/PARS
Adolfo Tarango ALCTS/CRS
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA

Non-ALA Liaisons present:

Thomas Duszak, CLA (Saturday, January 21 only)
 Kathy Glennan, PCC
 John Hostage, AALL
 Diane Hillmann, DCMI (Saturday, January 21 only)
 Chamy P. Kincy, MedLA
 Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA
 Dorothy McGarry, SLA
 Kelley McGrath, OLAC
 Mark Scharff, MusLA
 Jay Weitz, IFLA

Notes:

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have been rearranged in order to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the process of transcription is laborious. Only in the case of some comments are exact quotes made.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.
- IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

AACR2	Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision
AALL	American Association of Law Libraries
ACRL	Association of College and Research Libraries
AJL	Association of Jewish Libraries
ALA	American Library Association
ALCTS	Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
ARLIS/NA	Art Libraries Society of North America
ATLA	American Theological Libraries Association
CC:AAM	ALCTS/ CaMMS /Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:CCM	ALCTS/ CaMMS /Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee

CC:DA	ALCTS/ CaMMS /Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CaMMS	ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
CIP	Cataloging in Publication
CLA	Catholic Library Association
DC	Dublin Core
DCMI	Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
FRAD	IFLA's <i>Functional Requirements for Authority Data</i>
FRBR	IFLA's <i>Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records</i>
FRSAD	IFLA's <i>Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data</i>
IEEE LTSC	IEEE Learning Technology Standards Committee
IFLA	International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ILS	Integrated library system
ISBD	<i>International Standard Bibliographic Description</i>
JSC	Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC	Library of Congress
LITA	Library & Information Technology Association
MAGIRT	Map & Geospatial Information Round Table
MARBI	ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC	Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA	Medical Library Association
MusLA	Music Library Association
NAL	National Agricultural Library
NISO	National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM	National Library of Medicine
OLAC	Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PARS	ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC	Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PLA	Public Library Association
PSD	LC Policy and Standards Division
RUSA	Reference and User Services Association
SAC	ALCTS/ CaMMS /Subject Analysis Committee
XML	Extensible Markup Language

*Saturday, January 21, 2012, 1:30-5:30 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Dallas at Reunion, Ballroom E/F*

1158. Welcome and opening remarks

Lori Robare, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1159. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to initial and correct, if necessary, and an attendance sheet for visitors.

1160. Adoption of agenda

[CC:DA/A/65]

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. **Winzer** moved to adopt the agenda, with **Rolla** seconding. The motion carried unanimously.

1161. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2011 Annual Conference, June 25 and 27, 2011

[CC:DA/M/ 1137-1157]

The **Chair** noted corrections to the minutes as follows: Lawrence **Creider**'s name will be deleted from the list of liaisons present. On page 11, second paragraph, a comment by **Glennan** will be clarified to: "...so that we end up with a single practice." On page 15, in the final paragraph, the spelling of Lubetzky will be corrected. On page 22, second paragraph, reference to the PCC wiki will be changed to the Bibliographic Control Committee website. Also on page 22, third paragraph, **Glennan**'s comments will be clarified: "more than 1 instrument or voice"; "We have not consistently used trumpets (2) in the past"; and two other instances of replacing "two" with "(2)". On page 31, in **Linker**'s report regarding feedback from users, "until" will be corrected to "once": "Once people actually use the Toolkit for a period of time we get a different level of feedback."

Wolverton moved to approve the minutes as corrected; seconded by **Rolla**. The motion carried.

1162. Report from the Chair

[CC:DA/Chair/2011-2012/1]

The **Chair** stated that members had a list of the votes that were conducted electronically since Annual, and that the votes needed to be confirmed. The Chair summarized the lengthy list of proposals as follows:

- CC:DA approved two RDA revision proposals on Affiliation and Artistic/Technical credit. CC:DA authorized the JSC Representative to provide the ALA response to the following: eight proposals and two discussion papers from LC; three proposals from ACOC; five from CCC; three from CILIP; one from the British Library, and one from the German National Library (via JSC Chair).

CC:DA rejected a motion to approve MLA/2011/1, Container as a Source (2 in favor, 6 opposed), and subsequently approved the formation of a Task Force to continue work on this topic. The motion to approve AALL/2010/1 revised was withdrawn.

The **Chair** asked for a motion to confirm approval of these votes that were conducted electronically. Moved by **Rendall**; seconded by **Winzer**. The motion carried.

The **Chair** highlighted items from the written report on updating committee documentation in light of RDA and organizational name changes. A small task force may be appointed to work on a revision of the document *Building Descriptive Cataloging Standards: the Role of the American Library Association's Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access*.

CC:DA was asked to co-sponsor (in name only) a program at the Annual conference, "RDA Worldwide," to be held on Sunday 1:30-3:30. Three of four speakers were confirmed: Christine Frodl from the German National Library; Agio Garcia from Tulane University; and Chris Todd from the National Library of New Zealand. Co-sponsoring in name only would mean that CC:DA would help publicize the program. **Rolla** moved to co-sponsor; seconded by **Randall**. The motion carried. The **Chair** will inform David Miller that CC:DA will co-sponsor the event in name only.

A Task Force is being formed to address changes affecting RDA in the *Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition*. The **Chair** has called for volunteers on the discussion list but will also circulate a sign-up sheet.

1163. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet

[LC Report, January 2012]

Tillet gave an abbreviated version of her LC report; a more thorough version of this report is available on the LC website (see link in the first paragraph to the full report of LC activities). **Tillet** thanked Susan Morris for her assistance with the report. **Tillet** pointed out that she had left out some information from the website version of the report about activities related to LC's presence in various social media such as Flickr, Twitter, iTunes, and Facebook; and also information about LC's work with the Twitter archive. **Tillet** referred parties to view the website version of the report for more information.

Regarding personnel changes, **Tillet** noted that Deanna Markham retired from LC in December; Roberta Shaffer is the new Associate Librarian for Library Services. Due to budget cuts, LC was asked to take part in a voluntary early retirement program; as a result, LC gave up 186 positions which will not be filled. A number of additional employees retired as well, including Judy Kuhagen, Senior Descriptive Policy Specialist, who has been one of the key people in planning RDA training; others will take on this role. Judy will continue part time as JSC Secretary, so her excellent corporate memory and incredible organizational and tracking skills will help for years to come. **Tillet** listed other retirements and also noted the death of several staff members. She stressed that LC has lost a lot of staff and will not be able to provide all of the services it has in the past. In the past year PSD went from having weekly lists for updates to subject headings and classification to a monthly list due to staff limitations, and even the monthly pace is difficult to maintain.

Tillet discussed the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative and noted that Deanna Markham, although retired, will lead the Advisory Committee. She and others in that group are working hard to come up with funding for long-term support for the initiative. There will be one

or more technical advisory groups which will probably be launched this year after funding is secured.

Tillett highlighted news about an initiative by the Cataloging Distribution Services (CDS) to conduct a strategic survey of future distribution of cataloging services and products. It is hoped that the study will be completed this spring and there will be information to share at Annual.

The US National Libraries' RDA implementation preparation is discussed on page 5 of the report. LC recently mounted a new website for its planning for RDA implementation: www.loc.gov/ada/rda/ which is updated frequently. As announced in June 2011, LC, NAL, and NLM intend to implement RDA but not before January 1, 2013, and only if certain conditions are met. **Tillett** noted that almost all of those are well on track, and many are now completed, so there is a sense of confidence about implementation. About 35 LC staff members who were engaged in the US RDA test resumed using RDA in November 2011. They will assist PSD and LC in general in preparing for training and documentation and other tasks in order to train the remaining approximately 420 cataloging staff in RDA, which will take about seven months. This will probably be done in phases over time with a certain number of staff each month and as each group of catalogers is trained, they will continue to catalog using RDA. During 2012, more RDA copy cataloging and RDA authority records will be available from LC. Those same staff will help with proposals to improve RDA and suggestions for improvements to the RDA Toolkit.

Tillett highlighted news about PSD on page 10 and clarified that the *Library of Congress Policy Statements (LCPSs)* are intended to be used with RDA and are freely available. The *Library of Congress Rule Interpretations (LCRIs)* will continue to be available for those who continue to catalog according to AACR2 but LC does not intend to update or change the *LCRIs*. 2011 was a productive year for romanization tables. Four new or revised ALA-LC tables were completed: Judeo-Arabic, Persian in non-Arabic scripts, Thai, and Vai, and many others are underway; these are posted on the LC website. LC is trying to make all of the romanization tables available in Word format so that anyone who wishes to submit proposals for change can use the text files, which should make the process easier.

The Virtual International Authority File achieved some major milestones last year. It has grown to more than 20 million authority records and nearly 100 million associated bibliographic records from 25 different participating institutions. As of September 2011, it includes uniform titles along with personal and corporate names, so this is a huge step forward. The usage of VIAF has increased, with more than 30,000+ hits from 116 countries in October and more than 6 million hits per month from automated systems.

Page 7 of the report includes information about electronic CIP (ECIP), which has two new partners since the last LC report, both of which will catalog their own publications starting in 2012: the Getty Research Library and the University of Florida. The partnership program has a strong interest in recruiting libraries with science or technology expertise, as these are high-volume subject areas for ECIP applications. **Tillett** invited people who want their library to be a program partner to contact Karl Debus-Lopez; his email address is given in the report. The numbers for ECIP production (which were higher than in fiscal 2010) were: 4,617 titles cataloged in fiscal 2011. LC wants to open this up to more publishers and institutions in future.

Tillett highlighted information about the recently developed ONIX to MARC conversion program, which takes ONIX data from publishers and converts it to MARC 21 for ECIP. LC has been training its catalogers to use it; 8,499 ONIX-derived bibliographic records were produced in fiscal 2011. It is a major advancement for LC and ties in nicely with RDA, as it allows one to take publisher information as they get it. **Tillett** also mentioned that the Children's and Young Adults' Cataloging Program (CYAC) is the new name for the program that includes the former Annotated Card Program. It has a new website which was launched in November 2011 and its URL is given in the report.

On page 11 of the report is information about shelf-ready services; LC continues to work with the vendor community to provide institutions with cataloging and physical processing services. The division responsible for many of these programs and coordinating with the vendors has ongoing activities and is expanding to include many institutions which are listed in the report. LC is training a lot of vendors in RDA.

LC statistics are listed on page 12. Original cataloging production for fiscal 2011 is up: 297,342 original catalog records were produced. Total record completion has gone up as well as total volumes cataloged, but the creation of new name authority records dropped. The PCC has contributed many records. Despite all of the RDA testing, LC still managed to catalog more items in 2011 than before. There was a 16% increase in the number of items cataloged by the Geography and Map Division in fiscal 2011 compared to fiscal 2010.

Work continues on the National Library Catalog, formerly called the XML Data Store Project. It is intended to provide seamless access across all of the types of metadata included in LC's collections. It currently is available only within LC, but may be more widely available soon.

The Network Development and MARC Standards Office is also enhancing and improving the Search Protocol Interface to LC's Voyager databases. It accepts SRU and Z39.50 protocol searches. **Tillett** also noted that updates of both the full and concise MARC formats were made available online in September; only the MARC 21 Concise Format is published in print.

LC continues to make its vocabularies available as linked data at: id.loc.gov.

Rendall asked whether the romanization table for Persian in non-Arabic scripts was an official ALA/LC table. **Bruce Johnson**, LC's romanization specialist, replied that it was issued as a searching guide, not a formal romanization table. A revision proposal for Persian was submitted but some reservations to it were expressed by CC:AAM at Annual and conveyed to the Persian language specialist at LC. That proposal was withdrawn and LC plans to continue to work on it. **Rendall** asked if the intention is to make the Persian in non-Arabic scripts table publicly available, as he had heard it was strictly for internal use. **Johnson** said it was intended to be publicly available, and that he thinks it is available on the website, but he will check on it.

1164. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/3]

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/4]

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/5]

Attig thanked Kathy Glennan for her willingness to attend the JSC meeting in November in his possible absence; fortunately, this did not prove to be necessary. The JSC held a very productive meeting in Glasgow in November 2011, the first JSC meeting since the publication of RDA. He highlighted a few items from the JSC meeting: Barbara Tillett will be the chair of JSC for the next 2 years; Judy Kuhagen will serve as the JSC secretary. She is getting JSC revisions ready for the publishers. The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek accepted the Committee of Principals' invitation last fall to be a full member of the JSC. Their representative will be Christine Frodl, who had already planned to attend the meeting so she was able to participate as a full member. **Attig** noted that four JSC members were present at today's meeting, including Frodl from DNB and Marg Stewart from Library and Archives Canada. **Attig** stated that the JSC finished the revision proposals in two half-day sessions. **Attig** covered the status of the four ALA proposals as follows:

6JSC/ALA/1: Reports of One Court was approved with minor wording changes; the final version has been sent to the publisher.

6JSC/ALA/2: Heads of State and Heads of Government. The ALA proposal included a suggestion that those headings be based on the language of the jurisdiction; other constituencies preferred them to be based on the language preferred by the agency creating the data. **Attig** consulted with the task force and submitted a revised proposal; it raised some more issues which the JSC still needs to resolve, but it is hoped that can be finished in the next few weeks, so this can be included in the next update.

6JSC/ALA/3: Affiliation. The JSC rejected the proposal regarding the affiliation element. **Attig** expects the JSC to raise this issue with the FRBR Review Group. In the meantime, notes to describe an affiliation can be recorded in the Biographical Information element, and formal links can be made using authorized access points and the appropriate relationship designator from Appendix K. The JSC confirmed that it will accept proposals for additions to appendix K. All of the relationship designators are open to proposals for additions and changes. Appendix K is provisional; people knew it was very incomplete. **Adam Schiff** has suggested ways to approach this; a task force to work on Appendix K may be formed as a result. A number of potential task forces need to be formed to deal with other issues, so CC:DA will discuss these during the last agenda item of the Monday meeting.

6JSC/ALA/4: Technical and/or Artistic Credits. The JSC decided to extend the use of this element to sound recordings and multimedia resources but not to all resources. **Attig** drafted a revised proposal which will be part of the update package, although a few unresolved issues need to be discussed. More generally, the JSC would like to reconsider the present situation in which some statements of responsibility are transcribed from the source as statements of responsibility, whereas others (i.e., performers and credits) are recorded as notes. It was also an issue for the ISBD Review Group. The ISBD has only a single element for statements of responsibility; it is a harmonization issue and an inconsistent practice, longstanding from AACR2. ALA was invited to prepare a proposal, so CC:DA will need to decide whether to accept the invitation or not.

Attig stated that the official outcomes of the JSC meeting are posted on the JSC website. The JSC held a joint meeting with the members of the ISBD Review Group and representatives from

the ISSN Network and had a fruitful discussion, identifying issues that are possible conflicts between these standards and RDA. The goal of the discussion, particularly for the ISBD Review Group, was to achieve a functional level of interoperability which would allow records created under any standards to be used by the others. There was also an agreement to work towards a mapping between the ISBD and RDA elements. For the Review group, one of the positive outcomes was that the JSC confirmed that the ISBD section of Appendix D could be expanded to include additional information about mandatory/optional requirements, as well as notes such as an indication that certain alternatives shouldn't be used in ISBD-compatible records. This is a way to resolve some of the inconsistencies.

Attig stated that many issues remain. In a few cases, it was agreed that the ISBD Review Group would make proposals to the JSC, and they would be considered. The JSC indicated that they have at least one proposal to submit to the ISBD Review Group. The important thing is that the two groups started discussions with each other. The discussions that included the representatives of the ISSN Network as well as the ISBD Review Group had a slightly different basis; because in fact, this is the second round of discussions about the harmonization of the standards for describing continuing resources. There was an initial harmonization discussion during the process of revising chapter 12. This is sort of a successor to that, looking at whether RDA raises additional issues, whether some of the issues that were not resolved at that point could now be resolved. **Attig** believes the goal of the initial harmonization discussions was to make the same number of records and descriptions when applying the standards; thus, the focus is on when to make a new record, what is a title change, and what other circumstances require a new description. The goal at minimum is to agree on when a new record is necessary. One of the major unresolved issues has to do with integrating resources. The ISSN Network considers each iteration with a different title as a distinct resource and makes a new description, even though it might no longer exist. ISSN catalogers feel they need to apply the same set of standards to both serials and integrating resources because of their limited success in explaining the difference between serials and integrating resources to the publishers. Plus, even though the resources may no longer exist, they are still being cited. That is certainly a very significant issue for RDA, and probably for ISBD. It is very unlikely the JSC constituencies would be willing to change current practices in this regard. **Attig** stressed the importance of these groups meeting together. He noted that the JSC also has issues in common with the FRBR Review Group and hopes to set up similar meetings with it.

Attig stated that one of the major topics discussed during the executive session was to update plans to respond to the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee. The major recommendation from the Coordinating Committee was to reword the RDA instructions in "clear, unambiguous, plain English." ALA Publishing is managing this process; Troy Linker will have more to say about this at the Monday meeting. **Attig** reported on the JSC's participation in this process. ALA Publishing hired a copy editor, Chris Oliver. **Attig** hopes people will agree that she was a very good choice for this task. Five chapters will be reworded during the first stage of this process: Chapters 9 (Persons); 10 (Families); and 11 (Corporate Bodies); then chapter 6 (Works and Expressions); and chapter 17 (Primary Relationships). The latter is a short chapter, but is completely new, with no counterpart in AACR, so drafting text for it was particularly difficult. The intent is for Oliver to continue rewording; chapter 2 will probably be next, and all of the

chapters will eventually need rewording. Oliver finished work on chapter 9 by early December, so the JSC has finished the first revisions on chapter 9, which required a fair amount of discussion because it was the first chapter reviewed; it took time to figure out what was going to work. Oliver finished chapter 10; it is currently being reviewed. **Attig** implied that the rest of the chapters would be easier to reword after having made some decisions. The results were interesting. The goal is to improve text readability; at least in part, to improve readability as based on standard tests, which are primarily based on the number of words per sentence. Much of what Chris did was to turn long sentences with more than one clause into two sentences. The JSC spent a lot of time discussing whether this changed the meaning of an instruction, because the other part of the assignment was not to change the meaning. The JSC reached consensus and has received some indication from the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee that the rewording does lead to improved readability.

Attig explained that in addition to shortening sentences, the most dramatic change in the scoring (which had nothing to do with Oliver's rewording) was that someone at ALA Publishing noticed that citations or rule numbers (which are separated by periods) were treated as separate words. Another rewording change is that when there is a long string of conditions that catalogers need to look at, it would help in some cases to turn those conditions into numbered lists. This doesn't change the number of words but it breaks it up, so that it is easier to process. Future plans include adding some navigational guidelines to help people get around in the rules and clarifying some of the definitions.

Attig stated that the following work on the five chapters targeted for completion needs to occur by June: review by the JSC and by the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee; final review by the JSC and submission to the publishers. Linker can announce when these chapters will appear in the Toolkit; either the June or July release, most likely near the Annual conference time. In addition Oliver has been compiling a list of recurring phrases; these not only occur multiple times within a given chapter, but are also very likely to occur in other chapters, and some of them are everywhere in the rules. As decisions are made to reword these, all of such occurrences are being identified and revised. When the first set of reworded chapters is released, that list will also contain other rewording changes to the chapters. Thus, it will be a good start to rewording the entire text. On the other hand, that's no substitute for reviewing each chapter, which is intended to be done eventually; this can happen during 2012 and be concluded by the end of the year. **Attig** stated he was unsure of the exact time frame, because these are some of the larger chapters.

Attig stated that another recommendation from the Coordinating Committee was to complete the registry of the RDA elements and vocabularies in the RDAvocab namespace in the Open Metadata Registry. The goal was to publish those terms that are currently in a proposed status. This task was begun last summer. **Attig** said that he published a miscellaneous collection of vocabularies that were ready. Last week another milestone was reached: vocabularies for Carrier Type, Content Type, and Media Type were published. This is particularly significant, as these vocabularies are based on the RDA/ONIX Framework, support the categorization of bibliographic resources, and are likely to be of general interest to the web community as a whole. The remaining vocabularies will be published as soon as they are finished by the JSC. The main thing to do is to provide definitions for all terms. In particular, the JSC heard **Gordon Dunsire**

express very strongly that definitions are a vital part of any registered vocabulary. We cannot use an entity based solely on its name; you cannot map entities unless they have comparable definitions. You cannot simply compare the names; it doesn't tell anything. For example, the JSC has had discussions with the ISBD Review Group about parallel titles. Both ISBD and RDA have parallel titles; some RDA parallel titles are ISBD parallel titles, but not all of them, and you would not know that simply by looking at the name. A page on the CC:DA wiki lists which vocabularies need definitions. **Attig** had raised this at Annual and noted that he has asked some individuals to work on this issue and will continue to do so. People can sign up as individuals or as the organization that they represent. The bar for quality of definitions is very low; there is not a lot of research or intellectual effort required. In some cases, the most appropriate thing to do is to look up the term in a dictionary and decide if that is how we use the term. It was agreed that ALA Publishing will do copyright clearance if necessary. The only thing that is needed beyond the definitions is to cite the sources used.

Hillmann suggested we do some social networking to do this task. **Attig** asked if it was something that could be organized quickly and efficiently. **Hillmann** stated she was open to suggestions, and added that perhaps the lists might be a way to say we have trouble with this particular definition, ask for suggestions, and get people to think about it, to play with it; then you get a discussion going. It's not just a one-person product. This approach would break up the task into smaller bites. **Hillmann** added that her model for thinking about the process is the LC Flickr project, in which the approach was: put the information out there, and get people to think about it; it was quite effective. **Tarango** suggested there be a blog with the terms where people could access them and choose terms to work on. **Attig** tentatively agreed but added it would be better to work at the vocabulary level; he added that although some vocabularies were very large, some have a modest number of terms. He suggested that they look at the CC:DA wiki to see what's there, and that might be used as a source of information. **Hillmann** said that some of the groups were specialized terms such as broadcast standards and it would be good to call on experts in that area and identify someone who really knows about and thinks about broadcast standards. **Attig** agreed and stressed the need to get started on the project and get it done as soon as possible and that he wanted to give everyone a chance to review the terms that were proposed.

Attig stated that another recommendation was to give additional complete examples. The JSC is revising the existing set of examples; these will be available soon on the JSC website and perhaps also in the freely accessible portion of the RDA Toolkit. The JSC has received some proposals for new complete examples that it has not finished considering; there will probably be more proposals. The JSC decided to establish a new Examples Working Group to provide recommendations on the examples in the text of proposed revisions to RDA and also to develop procedures to expand the number and coverage of complete examples. **Attig** thinks that more in-text examples are needed, so that is probably what the JSC will concentrate on; there are also two other possible encodings that the JSC might want to illustrate. He stated that the charge for the Examples Group should be finished soon and the JSC is already seeking members. He invited those interested in participating in that group to contact him. **Maxwell** said that the PCC has a task group that is compiling MARC-tagged examples as well. **Attig** suggested that perhaps they could coordinate these efforts. He stressed that encoding is optional for RDA; what the JSC wants are the RDA elements and what goes in them, so the PCC group may be doing only part of

what is needed, but that the Examples Group should be in communication with anyone who might be doing this type of work.

Attig stated that the report to the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee included a number of specific recommendations, a few of which were written into proposals from various JSC constituencies; other recommendations are waiting to receive proposals. The JSC needs to remind everyone that they can't act without specific proposals; telling the JSC to fix something is not sufficient, because the JSC is not in a position to develop or initiate proposals for all of the revisions that may be needed. During the development of RDA it was decided that the only way this would work is if the JSC itself developed the content; an editor was hired to do the job and did an incredible amount of work. After RDA was published the editor was discharged with thanks. The JSC is therefore once again in a position where it must act on proposals from constituencies. **Attig** stressed that he and CC:DA members were available to the wider community to help people develop proposals. The JSC would also like to institute a less formal procedure to deal with certain categories of changes, such as corrections of errors in the text. Additions and changes to examples and changes to the list of relationship designators can in most cases be treated as minor changes. In certain cases, changes are needed in the Glossary, because all of the things that go into the Registry also need to go into the Glossary. To deal with these sorts of changes, the JSC developed a Fast Track process and began applying it this month for a large number of proposals from LC, which **Attig** believes are feedback from the RDA test participants. This process is designed to work mainly through email correspondence. The JSC wiki has a page that indicates where you can agree or disagree, but it's not for issues that require extensive discussion. **Attig** asked how CC:DA wishes to participate in this process. Some Fast Track proposals will be initiated by **Attig** as ALA representative; some but not all of these will come from CC:DA members. **Attig** recommended that the JSC Representative be allowed to submit Fast Track proposals, working with whoever proposes the idea and consulting with other CC:DA members at his discretion. If **Attig** knows that certain communities care about these issues, he will make sure to check with them. For ALA responses to proposals from other constituencies, he also proposed that the JSC Representative be authorized to make responses. He brought up the point, because he is speaking for ALA when he participates, and if people were not comfortable with allowing the JSC Representative to do that, they could discuss other options. He recommends keeping it simple.

Tillett stated that there would be a 3-week turnaround time for responding to Fast Track proposals. **Myers** stated that he thinks the selection process in choosing the ALA JSC Representative would recognize the level of judgment and knowledge of such individuals, so he advocates **Attig's** proposal. The **Chair** stated that **Attig's** proposal made sense and that she would like to focus CC:DA's energy on revision proposals. There was no objection to this arrangement; no consultation will be required for Fast Track proposals.

1165. Revision proposal from AALL: Hostage

[CC:DA/AALL/2010/1: Places in Certain Federations]

The **Chair** introduced the proposal by noting that we were returning to the original proposal AALL made last year and by summarizing three questions posed to the discussion list and

comments received to date. First, to what extent should historical jurisdictions such as the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia be covered in RDA? In this proposal, the USSR and Yugoslavia are retained, as “the former,” with the result that places in these countries would be qualified by the current name of the larger place. Another approach would be to treat them under the default rule for Places in Other Jurisdictions. The result would be that places in these countries would have different preferred names for the period when they were part of the federation and the period when they were independent. This was discussed at Annual, and there is not a clear answer.

Second, should Ireland be excluded from the instruction at 16.2.2.10 and the instruction renamed Places in the United Kingdom? The point has been made that we can actually leave this as it is now (as Places in the British Isles), because we’re not attempting to treat places in the UK as an alternative to the general instruction. Another comment received is that there is no reason to include the Republic of Ireland in these instructions.

Third, how should we treat overseas territories, especially those of the US and Australia? The proposal has a new section for places in overseas territories and insular areas. We have previously discussed whether to call these instead “islands and island groups.” **Attig** outlined his view of the two issues to be decided: where in the sequence of instructions to put the new section on places in islands and island groups; and whether the islands in Australia, Canada, and the US are to be treated under the instructions for those countries or under the instructions for islands. The **Chair** noted a typo that will be corrected: there is a closing parenthesis on pages 3 and 8 that needs to be removed.

Rolla asked whether treating Australia, the US, Canada, and Great Britain as alternatives to the general rule was still on the table. **Attig** explained that at the point of doing final revisions on that version of the proposal, it was pointed out that if these are treated as alternatives, they can’t be used as examples anywhere in the rules. Any government body affected by this would be entered under a name we don’t want people to use. A great number of examples would need to be revised throughout the text, and what was in the text would have been very unusable if the assumption is that you want to use the alternative. It was an interesting experiment, and there were good reasons it was worth trying, but it would have been disastrous. **Attig** exercised an executive decision and pulled the plug on the proposal. **Rolla** stated that he did not want to be obstructionist, but it seemed like discarding a good theoretical principle issue for editorial reasons. **Attig** paraphrased a comment from Hostage stating that you should write the rules the way you think people ought to apply them; if you want people to follow current practice, don’t make it an alternative.

Rolla said that the objection would be that we’re not giving other countries that consider themselves federations the option of also using that second level hierarchy as a qualifier. For example, Mexico’s official name is the United States of Mexico. A person living in Guadalajara would say they are from Guadalajara, Jalisco, not Guadalajara, Mexico. Letting other countries use this alternative is important. **Rendall** noted that with this proposal we’re also removing Malaysia, but conceivably, catalogers in Malaysia who are used to qualifying local places with

regional jurisdictions might want to keep doing that. It would be good if there were a way for RDA to allow options for additions to this category.

Attig commented that how one extends RDA in an international sense is a tricky issue. When he proposed treating the four countries as alternatives, that was a little easier to conceptualize; each country could decide whether to be an alternative or not. Whether it is set up that way or not, the same exercise will have to happen, people will need to decide whether special treatment for their country and other countries is appropriate in their contexts. He did not think we could write this into the rules. **Hostage** reiterated that chapter 16 needs to be completely redone. It would be better to create an identifier for a place that links to a larger place, but this was too much to take on. We are stuck with the holdover concept of access points including the name of the broader jurisdictions, and we have to make some kind of choice about what will be the qualifier. We tried to do a totally principled approach and that was not going to be satisfactory. Certain countries have historically been treated this way, where states are considered to have importance; to what extent that might be true in other countries is hard for us to say.

Myers noted that there was a similar problem in working on the Bible headings; there was a theoretical problem where the group had to decide to retain current practice or try to deal with a broader environment. They didn't have the resources (time, stakeholder, knowledge) to deal with it so decided to focus on things they could solve, leaving intact things brought forward from AACR2, and wait until constituencies are part of the RDA community that will bring the necessary investment and expertise to the table. **Tarango** commented that even in this country, Mexicans represent a huge population that doesn't think about these issues the way we are approaching them. **Maxwell** asked whether we could expand 16.2.2.9 to places in Australia and other federations, and add an alternative to treat federations like other countries; this would allow having Mexico follow 16.2.2.9. **Rolla** suggested the reverse, adding an alternative at 16.2.2.12; if the cataloging agency feels it is important, treat places as in 16.2.2.9. **Rendall** noted that we would still have the problem of examples; if the default is to treat any country that is a federation as a federation, we'd have to decide which countries are federations and look through all of RDA for examples that affect them. **Attig** said that in a sense, this is something that RDA is guilty of in many cases, so one more shouldn't shock people. On the other hand, if you do leave it open-ended and say "other federations" without saying which countries are federations, essentially when you need to apply it you don't know whether it applies to certain countries. If it isn't listed, is Mexico a federation? **Rendall** thought that it was reasonable not to address this issue in this round of revisions. **Attig** questioned whether we even could get through it all and suggested moving on to other questions to see where we have agreement.

The **Chair** invited discussion about the extent to which historical jurisdictions should be covered in RDA. **Hostage** said we should not include historical jurisdictions; they haven't been included in the past. Rules were written to cover jurisdictions that were current at the time; we can strike any mention of Yugoslavia or the Soviet Union since they've been gone more than 20 years. If we need to deal with them, it could be done in Policy Statements or by decisions in the authority file. **Attig** said that if they are not mentioned, the default would be that they're covered by places in other jurisdictions. That may be what we want, but it isn't that they're missing, it's that there's no special treatment so you apply the default.

Rendall asked for examples of how current headings for cities will change if we remove this. **Hostage** said that you would apply the default rule, so you could have Belgrade (Yugoslavia), which is Belgrade (Serbia) now. Currently there is an LCPS that says if the name of the larger jurisdiction changes, use the current name of the larger jurisdiction. **Attig** said this is essentially saying that the place as part of the federation has a different name from the same place when it was not part of the federation.

Rolla asked how RDA deals with places that don't exist anymore; for example, the Duchy of Saxony -- if you need to establish a town there, would it just be Germany? **Hostage** said that was part of his point, for really older jurisdictions we don't worry about it so much, we just qualify by the current name. **Rendall** commented that for the government of Serbia itself, it would be Serbia (Yugoslavia) for the former period, and just Serbia now; currently it's Serbia for both periods. He noted that he was feeling cautious about omitting this and thought it would be safer to leave it in for now. If we're going to take it out, it might be good to think through the implications more thoroughly.

The **Chair** noted the suggestion to retain the wording as proposed here. A straw poll of those present supported the approach of leaving "the former USSR and Yugoslavia" in the instruction. **Attig** noted that this choice would be the closest to current practice; omitting it would require more changes.

The **Chair** invited discussion of the second question, the instruction at 16.2.2.10: whether to exclude Ireland or leave it in. **Attig** commented that it wouldn't affect the results; either way you end up with the same heading. Ireland is simply there to help with a concise caption, this instruction covers the British Isles. Since it doesn't affect the results, he suggested we take it out. **Myers** found a connection to the previous discussion, that Ireland was part of the UK in the past and commented that we should be consistent in some manner in retaining it as for the former USSR and Yugoslavia. **Rendall** noted that this proposal does not refer to the United Kingdom but to places in England, the Republic of Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands. **Hostage** was not convinced that Ireland was originally included in the rule because it was formerly part of the UK, but rather due to Anglo-American tradition. He also emphasized that the tradition we use for geographic qualifiers has not been about what is the controlling jurisdiction but more about where in the world is the place. For places in Korea, we don't distinguish in the qualifier between North and South. For other places, this is partly why islands are not qualified by their own country: the qualifier describes where it is, not what it belongs to. If we were consistent, we wouldn't use Northern Ireland as a qualifier; we'd just say everything on the island of Ireland would be qualified by Ireland. Rules in place for the British Isles are special rules because the British were part of the original authors; that's why the Isle of Man and Channel Islands are mentioned.

Attig agreed that this is a unique situation, and we have treated them specially at the request of our British colleagues and should continue to honor that. **Maxwell** asked if it would be possible to generalize this into the same rule with the United States and Yugoslavia to simplify it. **Attig** thought that would be complicated and didn't think we could say it is a federation. **Myers** noted

that two members of the JSC are from the geographic area under question and it will be a point of discussion there. **Attig** said that the important thing is whether we want to raise the issue; we have to recognize that much weight will be given to those JSC members. **Rendall** commented that this seemed less problematic than the previous question. The **Chair** commented that it sounded like we wanted to raise the issue and let our JSC colleagues have the final say.

The **Chair** invited discussion of the third question, and **Attig** identified the main issue: whether overseas islands of Australia, Canada, and the US should be treated under the rules for Australia, Canada, and the US, or under a special rule with instructions for islands. He said that the instructions for dealing with components of Australia, Canada, and the US are much clearer and more precise than for islands and he would prefer that we treat it under the more concrete set of instructions. The result would be the same; the question is where would the examples be, such as examples of places in Guam or Puerto Rico. **Attig** drafted some text that put it under 16.2.2.9.1 & 16.2.2.9.2 rather than under the new instruction for islands and island groups; **Hostage** prefers the other way.

Rolla asked how does that deal with other examples like Guadeloupe? **Attig** said that it doesn't; those would have to be dealt with in an instruction on islands. **Hostage** said that since the result is the same, why have something in two places? The word territory in AACR2 is not meant to apply only to overseas territories, but also to places like the Yukon Territory, which is part of the land mass of Canada. Otherwise you have two rules, and you have to think about whether it belongs to the US, Canada, etc., and you need to follow rules for those countries. It seems more logical to have them all covered in one rule.

Rolla noted language about places in Australia, Canada, and the US; he did not think of Guam as *in* the US; he also commented that the wording of 16.2.2.11 regarding overseas territories seems clear. **Rendall** agreed that the current 16.2.2.11 makes more sense than in the version we discussed at Annual; that version used the terminology "islands and island groups" but the problems we were having then were more with the instruction than with the terminology. **Rendall** strongly prefers this wording including overseas territories, because there is at least one overseas territory that we want to continue applying the instruction to, that is like others but not an island, French Guiana. **Maxwell** commented that 16.2.2.9.1 defines territories as "in" the place, and also that he had a problem with "insular areas" because Ireland is an insular area, as is England, etc. **Hostage** stated that he thought it was understood that we're talking about things that are not countries.

The **Chair** asked for a quick sense of whether we have consensus on this issue: should overseas islands of the US like Guam be treated in special instructions for islands (as is done in this proposal) or should we keep the instructions with the US at 16.2.2.9? A straw poll indicated that places like Guam should be treated in special instructions and not in 16.2.2.9.

1166. Report from the TF on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies: Randall

[CC:DA/TF/Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies/3]

Randall explained the charge and that the Task Force was trying to determine the principles that are currently in place in the rules. Two principles that are stated in RDA are Differentiation and Representation. The group also identified Parentage and Collocation as other possible principles. Most types fall into one or more principles, but Type 6 (non-governmental name that includes the entire name of the higher or related body) does not. For Type 6, it depends a lot on how the body is presenting itself in resources being cataloged. The Task Force experimented with getting rid of Type 6. **Attig** said that there may be another principle at work, Continuity; whenever you're using the name of the body itself, when that changes you've got a new body. As long as certain elements are present, people know what to do with it; it doesn't matter whether in some cases in publications of the Agricultural Experiment Station of Auburn University these appear on different lines. If the body is entered under its own name, that could be a name change. **Rendall** agreed and noted that without Type 6, we'll be making a judgment call about whether Auburn University is part of the name; it will be established a different way depending on what we decide. **Maxwell** suggested that we will always have to make judgments like that and said he didn't think frequent changes will need to be made; these will be variants.

Winzer said she did not have a problem with eliminating Type 6 in general but was a little concerned about some names like St. John's College Library, where if you took away subordination, how would you distinguish it? She wondered whether Library should be a subordinate term like department. **Rolla** noted that if the guiding principle is Collocation, how will we retain this as a principle in an environment where we don't have 3x5 cards? **Attig** commented that he didn't think the intent of Type 6 is Collocation, but it is an issue. As a principle it is most likely to be in conflict with representation, it is the thing we most often do that violates representation in order to achieve something. It is clearly less important than it used to be, and it is worth wondering what value collocation should be given as a justification for certain decisions. **Maxwell** did not think that collocation is a principle; it is a value. **Rendall** noted that we will still have collocation; it's just the references that will be collocated. **Maxwell** reiterated the reason for this task force: the benefit would be not to have three separate lists. He said that we need to address religious bodies as well; he sees no reason why there is a separate list for those.

The **Chair** said that it was an important point for the Task Force to understand the direction that CC:DA wants to go. A straw poll was conducted on the question of eliminating Type 6. The result was not unanimous but there was overall support for eliminating it.

Randall raised the question of adding more words to Type 1, like conference or meeting, to help with headings like Annual meeting of [corporate body]. **Attig** suggested that that could be done without re-characterizing type 1 and noted that some meetings or conferences are not subordinate. **Rendall** commented that terms should not be added to Type 1 to try to get the same results we got from Type 6; it should be principled.

The **Chair** wrapped up discussion and encouraged the Task Force to ask questions on the discussion list.

1167. Revision proposal from ATLA: Myers
[CC:DA/ATLA/2011/1: Sacred Scriptures]

Myers presented the report for **Knop**, who was unable to attend. **Myers** described the three categories of works addressed in the report: a set of old works developed by Group A and subsequently adopted by Group B; a set of middle-aged works also developed by Group A and adopted by Group B, subsequently given secondary status by Group A and some members of Group B; and a third group of works developed by Group B. Added to these three collections is a fourth category, various works that have been rejected by both Groups A and B. These categories are called the Old Testament, the Apocrypha, the New Testament, and apocryphal books. People tend to use Apocrypha and apocryphal books interchangeably but they are two distinct categories.

The group developed three separate proposals. Proposal 1 deals with the apocryphal books; this was set aside for now. The key thrust of Proposal 2 is that when the drafts of RDA were being developed, a proposal was made by LC to remove Old Testament, New Testament, and Apocrypha as intervening terms between “Bible” and individual books of the Bible, but the Apocrypha issue was overlooked, so the proposal seeks to rectify that. The group also realized that RDA (and AACR2) dealt with the Apocrypha as a special subset of groups of books of the Bible, which naturally fell after the rule for groups of books, but that as a “metagroup” it should immediately follow the rule for the Testaments. In addition, several members felt that the category of groups of books known as “wisdom literature” needed to be added to the list. Proposal 3 changes the sequence of the instructions to present the general rule first, and then provide specific faith tradition rules as exceptions, in keeping with attempts to remove Judeo-Christian bias.

Attig suggested discussing editorial comments on Proposal 2. If you want to re-arrange logically, it might be better to have the order: Testaments, Apocrypha, groups of books, and then individual books. He asked why it is important to include references for instructions to individual books for the Apocrypha but not for the Testaments. The same is true for references to instructions for Selections; either delete them under Apocrypha or add them under Testaments. On the lists of groups of books, **Attig** asked whether there should be an entry for Esdras and Maccabees under Apocrypha, in case someone has a collection of just those. **Attig** also commented that if re-arranging the rules in this way actually improves usability, then what is done in Proposal 2 makes sense, but he was concerned that we make sure it’s worth the effort because this sort of re-arrangement is going to end up being costly.

Maxwell commented that he recently looked through all of the provisions of 6.23.2.9 and it is the only place where we still have Works. Selections. He recommends that we remove Works and just use Selections to identify the collection.

Tarango and **Myers** discussed the question of which books are part of the canon. **Myers** noted the differences in the books and passages accepted by different traditions and the challenges if RDA is adopted in countries where Eastern Orthodoxy is prevalent, but said that we can’t

anticipate what solutions would work for them. **Rendall** agreed that the group made the correct decision on how they handled what is in the canon or not.

Attig pointed out that there is a fast track proposal to change the caption of apocryphal books to apocryphal books in the Bible, which suggests that it's in the wrong place, and invited input from the task force.

1168. Report from the RDA Programming TF: Abbas

Abbas reported that there has been a name change for the Task Force; it is now the RDA Conference Forums and Programs Task Force. The Task Force would like to have more representation from public, special, and school libraries. Plans for Annual include a one-day preconference, "A Change in Authority: Authority Work in the RDA Environment," with speakers Ana Lupe Cristán and Paul Frank from LC. The Task Force learned a lot from last year's two-day preconference, at which all 115 attendees brought laptops and there were a lot of connectivity issues. They are trying to be proactive and specify ahead of time how many participants will need access. Three forums are planned for Annual: an RDA Update Forum, a Vendor Implementation Plans Forum, and a Non-MARC RDA Implementation Forum. The Task Force also hopes to have a forum on lessons learned during the RDA Test and from others who have already implemented RDA.

1169. Revisions to CC:DA Procedures: Chair

[CC:DA/Chair/2011-2012/2]

The **Chair** highlighted changes in the revision, mostly name changes and an addition to reflect the new SAC liaison. In the Documentation section, point D includes a reference to two ALCTS documents that may not exist anymore; if so, we will need to strike that sentence. The **Chair** asked whether it is necessary or useful to specifically identify the SAC liaison in the Membership section. The SAC liaison is covered under point D for liaisons from ALA units, but was listed separately because the appointment authority is different and it seemed best to make that clear. **Myers** noted that the other document on eligibility for representation seemed like the appropriate place to address the SAC liaison. The **Chair** will discuss with CaMMS Executive and bring this back for action on Monday.

Meeting recessed at 5:30 p.m.

*Monday, January 23, 2012 - 8:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m.
Hyatt Regency Dallas at Reunion, Ballroom E/F*

1170. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The **Chair** welcomed members and visitors and circulated an attendance sheet.

The **Chair** is gathering names for a task force on changes affecting RDA in the *Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition*, and noted that we may be forming other task forces later in the meeting. Some items from Saturday's agenda will be covered today in the Chair's report, including the Procedures revision and two proposals from the JSC representative.

1171. Report from the MARBI Representative: Myers

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2012/1 (preliminary)]

Myers reported on highlights from and actions taken during the MARBI meetings on Saturday and Sunday:

Proposal 2012-01 New Data Elements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats for Medium of Performance. MLA presented the proposal that arose out of genre/form work by SAC. Medium of performance terms for music were out of scope for genre/form but the information needs to be recorded somewhere. Consensus coalesced around using the 382 field, and option 1 moved forward with minor changes to first indicator values and subfield coding. **Attig** noted the implications of the choice of the 382 field; medium of performance statements according to RDA rules and according to guidelines for the thesaurus will often differ in content and have different functionality. There will be a subfield \$2 for conventions used in formulating the content; there will be a code for RDA and a code for this new thesaurus. **Tillett** said that according to RDA, you can use any vocabulary, and the vocabulary could be the LCGFT. **Myers** said MARBI felt that both RDA and the medium of performance thesaurus at this stage were not quite concrete, and that we should allow also for alternative outcomes. One key issue was a sense that the thesaurus terms appear to be singular where RDA terms have the potential to be singular and plural. **Tillett** emphasized that genre/form (what a resource *is*) is not to be confused with subject (what a resource *is about*).

Discussion paper 2012-DP01 Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format. This concerns a machine-actionable field that might allow matching of the authority record to related resources. **Myers** explained it as the reverse of the bibliographic record that says this title has this creator; on the authority side, this would give the reverse relationship, this author has created these works. There was a sense that we should move forward in this direction. MARBI also discussed whether fields should be restricted to works or allow the possibility of other levels; whether it would be used for works that were by or about a person; and implications for undifferentiated names. The discussion paper will be returned at Annual as a proposal.

Myers summarized discussion about the future role of MARBI in the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative. Despite appearances that MARBI is organized and functions like CC:DA and SAC, it actually is two distinct bodies: the ALA body of MARBI itself and the MARC Advisory Committee, which is under LC. Lines of authority and structure have been blurred over the years. MARBI discussed how to move forward as the new bibliographic framework is developed; the general consensus was to continue the current structure. A larger issue was that MARBI's role with respect to MARC is well articulated, but its role with respect to procedures for anything outside of MARC has not been developed; a working group or task force may

develop a white paper but there are no guidelines in place for such an effort currently. Regarding language, there was general agreement that when discussing MARC, MARBI should use MARC terminology; when exploring other machine-actionable data and the new environment, MARBI should try to generalize its language. **Attig** commented that LC's message was that they are actively looking for advice from anyone who wishes to contribute to the Bibliographic Framework Initiative.

1172. Report from the TF to Update “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA”
[CC:DA/TF/Update “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA”/3]

Kincy outlined the charge and the approach of the Task Force and highlighted changes in the document. The Task Force streamlined the guidelines and replaced all instances of “rules” with “instructions,” which affected the title as well. Rather than replacing AACR2 examples with RDA examples, the Task Force decided it was sufficient to link to recently submitted ALA proposals. The timeframe for proposals submitted to the JSC is now three months. There is language in the document stating that the entire process can take a year or more. The Task Force wondered whether this was still true and whether or not it should be mentioned in the document; they decided to leave it in and bring it up for discussion. The Task Force did not include much detail about the Fast Track procedure, but thought it might be mentioned to steer petitioners in the right direction. If this is retained, we may wish to delete one example on page 18, example of “Error in Appendix B,” which would be submitted through the Fast Track process. A change in the “Forwarding the Proposal” section was to say that proposals could be forwarded to any CC:DA member, not just to the representative whose area of expertise coincides with that of the proposal.

Attig wanted to make sure that the document reflects the formal process, the actual instructions about how to submit revision proposals, and not the Fast Track process, but there should be a link to the Fast Track procedures; the **Chair** verified that the document did reflect the formal process only. **Tillett** suggested showing the full range of choices by adding that there is an option to report typos through the Toolkit. **Attig** commented that we now know a bit more information than we did previously about the JSC schedule, but we don't want to get too specific. **Tillett** thought the wording was flexible enough as written. **Kincy** raised the question of deleting “Error in Appendix B” from the Examples since it would be a Fast Track item; there was agreement. **Randall** suggested a change to wording in the final Example, replacing the parenthetical phrase with a term such as “Change to Glossary entry for compact discs.” Motion to approve with changes discussed at today's meeting by **Rolla**; seconded by **Winzer**. The motion carried. The **Chair** dismissed the Task Force and will work with **Kincy** to finalize revisions. When finalized, the document will be posted to the web site and ALA Connect, and the interim guidelines will be removed.

1173. Report from the TF on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Rolla

Rolla provided an update on the work of the Task Force. The charge is to evaluate the structure of data elements in RDA chapter 3 that contain quantitative information in the form of a quantity and a unit of measure, and to propose revisions to make these instructions more machine-

actionable. The Task Force has had good discussions online and has met at conferences. A discussion paper will be ready by Annual so that everyone can give input; the Task Force probably will not have a revision proposal by that point.

1174. Report from the PCC liaison: Glennan

Glennan thanked Becky Culbertson for her help in preparing the report. The PCC is very active; task groups are being formed to address many issues: RDA implementation; PCC RDA interim practices and decisions needed before implementation; and RDA and FRBR training and webcasts. RDA activities are highlighted on the PCC web site, including reports from three groups that completed their work in September: the PCC RDA Decisions-Needed Task Group; the PCC Task Group on AACR2 and RDA Acceptable Headings, and the PCC Task Group on Hybrid Bibliographic Records. There is also a PCC policy statement on RDA training, a PCC and RDA FAQ, and a document on PCC Day One for RDA Authority Records.

The PCC Standing Committee on Automation has prepared the Authority Source Citation final report and the ISBD and MARC Task Group final report. The PCC Standing Committee on Standards developed the BIBCO Standard Record Supplemental Requirements for Electronic Monographic Resources (Remote & Direct Access) Other Than Leader/06=Computer Files and prepared a policy proposal for the use of field 588 in all records for electronic resources. The SCT also developed the BIBCO Standard Record for Archival Collections and charged three task groups to address 25 issues listed in the PCC RDA Policy and Practice Decisions spreadsheet. The PCC Standing Committee on Training formed the RDA Records Task Group, which will collect examples of RDA bibliographic and authority records for various types of resources. This group just had its first meeting and it will be important to coordinate the efforts of JSC and PCC. **Attig** agreed that it would be good to coordinate with the JSC Examples Group. The SCT is also forming an RDA training materials task group.

Attig mentioned the timeline for NACO update training, which is to be available by the end of March so at any time after that institutions can consider doing the training. **Glennan** said that the online training will be in modules, with the total expected to take two days. The SCT is also working on training for new NACO participants. **Attig** asked about NACO series. **Glennan** said that with Judy Kuhagen's retirement, the PCC Secretariat has noted that expertise in series practice needs to come from the PCC community; the community needs to step up and identify volunteers, both for training and for policy matters. It is not clear whether the PCC will charge two separate groups or one group to do both. **Tillett** commented that LC does continue to provide answers to series policy questions; **Glennan** appreciated the clarification.

There was also discussion about RDA Day One for Authorities, targeted for the first quarter of 2013. That will be the day after which NACO libraries are not allowed to contribute AACR2 authority records. The implication for BIBCO records is that after Day One, all headings in BIBCO records would be controlled by RDA authority records but the description itself could still be AACR2. **Maxwell** pointed out that Day One does not mean that that's when everyone starts doing RDA, it's when they stop doing AACR2 records, so everyone needs to start earlier than that. **Tarango** noted that this applies to CONSER records as well. **Glennan** said that there

is a PCC handout listing all task groups underway. Most are related to RDA activities. She encouraged people to volunteer for PCC task groups. **Attig** commented that the good news from the group looking at authority records is that 95% are valid under RDA and there's no need to do anything with them. **Glennan** described findings of the task group and plans for flagging records not acceptable under RDA. The current plan is to re-code and re-issue the RDA compatible records.

1175. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2012/1 to come]

Polutta demonstrated three different web site mock-ups. All made a distinction between information for committee members and information for those outside of CC:DA. She explained that the current web site has a very clear underlying structure and she tried to take that basic structure and make it more explicit and navigable, with main areas for working documents, task forces, reports, information about CCDA, an index with document number listing, and links to other resources. The first mock-up had the Working Documents page as the main page, with the current agenda and reports; other main pages included: task force pages, report pages, and about CC:DA pages. The second mock-up made the distinction between internal and external users more explicit with a top navigation bar indicating information for the committee and about the committee. **Polutta** was not sure this was an improvement. The third mock-up used WordPress, open-source blog software that can also be used as a content management system. WordPress has many advantages: it doesn't require knowledge of HTML and has easy ways of categorizing individual posts and pages so that indexes do not have to be maintained manually. It doesn't have to look like a blog or use comments. It also has keyword search functionality, archives and recent posts, so it is easy to find things. **Attig** commented that having maintained indexes manually for years, this was appealing.

Attig did not think it was necessary to make a clean distinction between things for the committee and the external audience; **Polutta** said that the blog software offers the flexibility to blend the two. **Tarango** said that as a new member, he liked the clear path to information about the committee in the second version and had some concerns about the blog software as external audiences won't be familiar with the categories we're using. **Scharff** asked if WordPress allowed for arrangement in a more systematic structure; when relying on tags, the order of results is sometimes unclear. **Polutta** said yes, that a "theme" could easily provide that type of structure. **Attig** asked whether the main content you see has to be in chronological order in WordPress. **Polutta** said no, it does not have to be; the home page can be static as is evident from examples on the WordPress showcase page.

Several people spoke in favor of using WordPress. **Lipcan** said it is used in his library and they find it very flexible, and thousands of people use WordPress so it is not esoteric. It comes with a mobile interface and could easily be edited from an iPad or smartphone. **Winzer's** library uses WordPress for its Technical Services manual; they can organize it well and find it much easier than static web pages. It's also easy for someone else to take over without much training. **McGrath** has used WordPress in the editorial committee for the Code4Lib Journal and finds it easy to use. **Dragon** liked the WordPress version and asked if we might move internal

committee discussion onto a WordPress site, since some areas could be password-protected. **Polutta** said that is an option we could pursue.

Randall was pleased to see the examples, and preferred the first two but was reassured to hear about the flexibility of WordPress. **Attig** stressed that the biggest advantage of WordPress in addition to flexibility was not having to maintain the indexes; he suggested that if we take that approach, we ought to have a static home page, with explanations of categories and tags. **Rolla** liked the organization of the first mock-up where everything about the Dallas conference was obvious and asked if that kind of organization was possible with the blog software. **Polutta** said yes, you can do a “sticky post” to make all information about a meeting stay at the top of the home page for as long as needed. She demonstrated how easy it was to sign in to the dashboard and add a new post and new tags. She also confirmed that we can give a WordPress page an ALA URL.

Myers asked if we can have stable URLs, as it can be challenging to link to blogs in which the content changes frequently. **Polutta** said yes, and you can also link to a specific post. **Lipcan** suggested using the preference for numerical-based permalinks as opposed to date-oriented, as his library has experienced some issues with the latter breaking. He asked whether we could install WordPress on ALA servers; **Polutta** said yes, she would prefer that because it extends functionality. The **Chair** noted that we seemed to have a preference for going with the WordPress option. **Polutta** said that the next step would be to get some answers from the ALA office and then set up a test site with extended functionality before we implement.

1176. Report from the Task Force on Sources of Information: Scharff

Scharff announced that during the break he had passed out a handout entitled: “A Progress Report on the CC:DA Task Force on Sources of Information,” which summarized his thoughts on the issues and included a list of questions that could guide the discussion. He suggested that the discussion be started with the question of how to deal with the notion of a collective title being a preferred way to identify resources.

Scharff explained that the group asked the question “What is it that identifies a resource?” because the instructions that include the basis of identification of a resource also mention the source of information, i.e. a geographic place, but they don’t reveal whether or not it’s data. **Scharff** hoped it was obvious that the data in a source identifies a resource, but that’s not how the instructions are worded in RDA. The Task Force wants to be clear about the instructions, which seem to suggest that the resource title has no prominence for identifying a resource, because all of the items in the preferred source of information instructions include the word “title” in the description. Point zero (.0), has a list of the types of items that identify a resource when a title is given. But there’s no explicit statement saying: “We privilege a title as a way to identify a resource.” Without that, the Task Force has issues with the question: would we privilege a collective title over a list of titles that identify all of the works in a resource? If a source has a list of titles, and another source has a collective title, would we privilege the source with the collective title? In order to establish that and figure out how to state it, the cataloger would need a clear understanding of what the title is.

Attig stated that this was a fruitful way to discuss the issue, and encouraged further discussion. **Tillett** said that RDA is trying to generalize, but many things lack titles, so you don't want to "privilege a title" necessarily. The emphasis now is: What makes sense to you? Use your cataloger's judgment. We don't want always to have to find a title for things that lack titles. **Attig** said but when it has a title, you want to be able to use the title.

Tillett suggested that if a resource has a title, prefer the title; if it has a collective title, prefer that. **Attig** and **Scharff** agreed; **Scharff** added that that was what we tried to do in the initial proposal but we want to ensure we had a strong basis for it. **Randall** viewed this as one of the prime examples where RDA doesn't give the cataloger a sense of the principles behind the elements to help them use their own judgment. **Randall** thinks that the source of information for the title should be one that most people who approach the resource as described would take as being the title; something that they would search under as they try to find the item online.

Scharff asked: if a source of information presented three data elements about the resource, i.e., title, statement of responsibility, and publication data, but another source that we might prefer because it has a collective title doesn't have those data elements, does quantity matter?

Attig stated maybe, but there are many things more important than quantity. He added that the source of information (from which you take all your data) includes emphasis on the title. **Attig** agreed that the principle of representation is important. He added that sets of conventions (which can vary) are used to identify resources. The title page has a very standard set of conventions that differ from those conventions for identifying a map, or a sound recording, or a motion picture. **Attig** thinks that is the basis for why catalogers make distinctions for various formats; there is no single general rule for source of information. He stressed that we are trying to identify the conventions that publishers use to convey information and to look to these conventions for the identifying information. **Scharff** stated: I think you mean that we wouldn't necessarily want to consider recasting the list in 2.2.2.2-4. **Attig** replied that it could be organized differently, but there will be distinctions due to different sets of conventions that identify bibliographic resources, and trying to force them into a single set of conventions probably will not work. To **Maxwell**, the principle of representation as given in RDA includes the authority to choose the title, or to choose what you use as the title. Cataloger-based judgment should ask, "How is this manifestation commonly known?" That is what you would choose if there was a question, because that's the way people will look for it.

Scharff asked: should a collective title be considered to identify a resource better as a whole as opposed to multiple titles? He gave an example of a CD which has the titles of three works on its label, but the container has a collective title. **Myers** was not sure that CC:DA could answer that definitively and commented that the rules ought to be more generalized so that we optimize the ability to apply cataloger judgment.

Scharff suggested discussing what video catalogers have been doing under AACR2 1.1G1, where, in a resource with multiple works, it is possible to describe the resource based on the predominant work. **McGrath** explained that according to AACR2, if you don't have a collective title for a resource such as a DVD with a feature film and extras, you can use the predominant

work and base the description on that. Often there are multiple title frames, such as for the feature, the documentary, and the deleted scenes. There is no equivalent RDA instruction.

Randall sees the title proper as a manifestation element—for example, for the DVD, we catalog the package that has the disc, and probably a case, the artwork inside the sleeve, etc. In most cases, the titles on all these items will be the same. But it's not just the feature film that is being cataloged. **McGrath** agreed, and added that there is a better method; for example, you won't get the statement of responsibility from a disc label. Also, there are issues about all of the contents notes from a disc that go into a 505 note.

Glennan stated that we deal with this predominant work in books all the time, as we have a title page. But we tend to ignore a lengthy introduction, or a preface in different languages by various people; we are actually cataloging a predominant work in that case. This is a similar situation; we simply don't have an obvious way to identify the predominant work as we do when we catalog books. **Attig** agreed that the principle of a predominant resource could be very helpful regarding RDA instructions.

Scharff mentioned that the document he passed out was slightly different from the electronic version he sent to the Chair, which would be posted on the web site. **Scharff** welcomed feedback on the issues and questions discussed in the meeting and hoped to have a proposal ready by Annual. **Attig** asked for confirmation that ALA would be dealing with the issue of embedded metadata for electronic resources; **Scharff** said yes.

Attig added a suggestion to look at how we got to this point. AACR2 had separate chapters for each type of resource. They all have their own sources of information. The JSC tried to make these more generalized, and group them into categories. The same happened during the consolidation of the ISBDs; they all have their own sources of information rules. The consolidation was an attempt to generalize these. This is a harmonization issue for ISBD and RDA. It might help you to look at how the ISBD solved this problem; it might suggest a different way of doing things. If we can move the two closely together, that would help address some of the harmonization issues. **Attig** requested that the committee consider that and see if it reveals anything interesting.

1177. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Linker

Linker reported on RDA Toolkit releases, recent improvements, and the RDA rewording project. Regarding the Toolkit, past releases came as needed; now there will be a predictable schedule. This will generally be monthly on the second Tuesdays, with 8-10 updates per year; updates will be announced one month ahead.

JSC changes will be in two categories: Fast Track changes that will not have a dramatic impact on cataloging practice (could happen in any release); and more substantive changes twice per year, in April and October. There will probably not be a small Toolkit release in March or September. ALA will publish the revision history, which will be accessed via an icon in the text.

The biggest improvements in the January release include improved loading times for large chapters by dividing into smaller page sizes (and there is a goal of adding more servers worldwide). Icons will replace English-text links, to help prepare for translations of RDA. There are two new buttons: “Resume” picks up where you left off at time-out, and “Table of Contents” will show chapter numbers immediately. A development blog has been started; updates have been slow, but more will be made soon after Midwinter.

The goal for ALA Publishing is to make their plans as open as possible and to receive feedback. **Linker** would like to have more conversations on this issue and encouraged people to share their opinions. **Linker** invited everyone to view the RSS feed. A virtual user group has been formed to facilitate communication and has had one successful session. Times of future sessions will be rotated so that international users have a chance to attend live sessions.

Linker reported that the RDA Toolkit Help has been revised, and an “RDA Toolkit Essentials” webinar series was launched; it is for beginners who are not familiar with the Toolkit. The series consists of the same webinar repeated in six live sessions per year, presented during rotating times. It will be archived. **Linker** also emphasized post-event access to RDA training events: organizers can contact ALA Publishing before a training event and arrange for attendees to have free 30-day access to the Toolkit after the event. Discounted training is also available for library schools (for up to 30-40 students) that purchase at least one subscription.

Linker reported on the RDA rewording project. Chris Oliver is the copy editor for this project, which will include chapters 6, 9, 10, 11, and 17. The goal is to have those chapters submitted to the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee by June 2012, but it is not known when these chapters will be added into the Toolkit. This could happen chapter by chapter as they are finished (perhaps the most likely scenario), or the five chapters as a batch. **Linker** said there was a great deal of cooperation among the JSC, the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee, and the copy editor, which is greatly appreciated by ALA Publishing. The individuals involved are rewording but not rewriting the rules. There will not be a public review of the reworded chapters, but **Linker** felt that such a review would not be necessary if the groups involved fulfill their charge.

Linker noted that the rewrites are substantial enough that the text will not flow properly unless all of the chapters are rewritten and expressed concern about whether it would be possible to reword all of the chapters in 12 months, which he thinks is a very ambitious timeline. He will have a better sense of the timeline once the Chapter 9 rewording is finished. The first chapter will take the longest to reword, and it should be possible to complete the other chapters at a faster rate.

Linker stated that another goal is to add more examples and make the existing examples easier to find in the Toolkit. ALA Publishing is also working on providing more user-selectable options in the “User Preferences,” such as a timeout of 30 minutes or an hour. The Library of Congress created a training module entitled “How to use the Toolkit” and will share it with ALA Publishing which will make it available. Translations into French, German, and Spanish are well underway.

Regarding the rewording project, **Scharff** asked whether there was a sense of any recurring problems that would offer guidance to people who are proposing revisions. **Attig** stated that as he had mentioned in his report, Chris Oliver is identifying recurring phrases that will not only inform the rewording effort but may be added to the editorial guide for RDA, and will therefore be documented for use in preparing proposals. **Linker** acknowledged that these were in the early stages and noted that it was challenging to have simultaneous work happening with RDA rewording, JSC updating, and CC:DA working on proposals; everything will need to be reconciled at the end.

Attig asked **Linker** to provide background information and his perspective on the ability to reorganize the instructions and change instruction numbers, i.e., what factors he had to consider in order to respond to such issues. **Linker** said that he recognizes the need for a shorthand system to identify the rules. While he understands the need for reorganizing numbers to reflect changes and thus wants to avoid forbidding reorganization, it can be problematic to have an ID that also denotes sort order. The problem is that when ALA Publishing built the system, it expected that re-numbering would not happen, that numbers would expire and not be re-used. Nanette Naught wrote a proposal on the amount of work that would need to be done, which includes re-doing some things that have been done already. The real downside is that re-numbering and changing the information that numbers represent negatively affects the user experience. For example, if 2.2.x means something now and later represents something else, that's a problem, as links have been created to certain numbers. The issue is more the user experience and the amount of work that needs to be done in the background, although **Linker** doesn't want to forbid changes. He thinks they will need to add a type of redirect system behind the scenes, or add a total results search, and the user picks the one wanted. He added that it is a shame that the sort order is connected to the numbering scheme, because otherwise, if the numbers were disconnected, there would be no need to re-use numbers, and they could be sorted in any way. The problem is that there's no simple solution for developing a numbering scheme that doesn't involve sort order.

Attig stated that technical ways exist for doing this but as **Linker** had made clear, it requires development work. He added that **Linker** is responsible for ensuring that we as customers get the value for the money we pay for the product. **Linker** stated that the cost to make these changes will be in the six figures. ALA is in the red right now and will need to recoup the money somehow; the cost will come back to the subscriber later in some way. **Rendall** replied that he understood the problem, but limiting our ability to revise the rules is a real problem. **Linker** stated that he wasn't saying that we have to, but he was trying to suggest a way to limit costs as best we can.

For **Randall**, considering the user experience meant getting all of the relevant instructions and using the best instructions possible, which is what CC:DA is doing by revising. The point is to improve the user experience. He doesn't think the primary goal should be to keep the rule numbers as constant as possible. **Randall** stated that similarities existed between identifying information in the background and the authority record ID number; and the 1XX in the authority record and the rule number, in that we can change the rule number as we can change the 1XX in

a fully linked system that will automatically change any references in the bibliographic records. **Rolla** stated that the document was conceived from the beginning as something that would undergo constant revision. He did not find it acceptable that we need to keep in mind the question of whether it is worth making rule revisions that will make our work better, because it will cost six figures to change. **Linker** replied that the document was always expected to be a living document that would be revised and changed. The assumption was made erroneously that ID numbers would not be reused but retired. It was known that there would be additions and deletions but unfortunately not that there would be complete reorganization. Both **Linker** and the **Chair** encouraged additional feedback about revisions.

Paul Weiss from the audience announced that he will do an online course in March on how to plan and prepare for RDA. The target audience is managers, not catalogers who need to learn about how to catalog in RDA. He referred people to the ALA Editions website for more information.

1178. Report from the RDA Planning and Training TF: Robare for Harcourt

The **Chair** presented highlights from Harcourt's report. Several webinars will be presented in the spring: Kelley McGrath on "RDA and Moving Images" and "Cataloging Three-Dimensional Objects and Kits with RDA;" Robert Maxwell and John Attig on "Rare Materials and RDA: Exploring the Issues;" and Cory Nimer on "Archival Materials: Using RDA with DACS." ALCTS webinars are available for free six months after the original broadcast. The Chair has requested that this information be made more prominent on the ALCTS website; this should happen after the migration of the website from Collage to Drupal. The Task Force has been discussing how to keep archived versions of the webinars accurate and current and how to work with LC and the PCC to repurpose content for training. The **Chair** invited comments from CC:DA on these issues and welcomed ideas for webinars and presenters. The **Chair** stated that she would pass on feedback to the Task Force and that people could also give their feedback directly to Kate Harcourt or Mary Woodley (co-chairs) or to any Task Force member.

1179. Report from the Chair on CaMMS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

The **Chair** gave an update on the Procedures revision. CaMMS Executive suggested that in the Meetings section, we could perhaps change the language to allow more flexibility and the possibility of virtual meetings, for example "at least twice a year at ALA conferences or in virtual meetings." **Attig** commented that it does no harm if the Procedures allow for virtual meetings, but the prospect of doing that with a meeting this large was daunting. **Rendall** said that if we intend to continue meeting in person twice a year, the Procedures should say that. **Attig** commented that this also shows what we expect of members, attendance at these two meetings. **Hostage** noted that we effectively already have virtual meetings, as we do a lot of work between conferences. **Myers** said that virtual meetings would if anything be a supplement to standing meetings, because too much happens in the room that would be lost in a virtual context. **DeSantis** said that the question about virtual meetings for this committee might be

moot, because ALCTS surveyed committees to ask whether virtual meetings were appropriate or not and it was answered in the negative for this committee.

The **Chair** also discussed information about the SAC liaison with CaMMS Executive. The information could go in the Eligibility document, but this is a high level document without much detail about specific liaisons, and CaMMS Executive thought it could also stay in the Procedures document. The **Chair** preferred keeping it in the Procedures because that is more frequently consulted. The **Chair** will prepare another revision and share it with the committee over email.

The **Chair** invited the JSC Representative to conclude his report from Saturday. **Attig** stated that **Linker** has provided information about updates to the RDA Toolkit. The JSC will meet once per year, probably in October, but there should be two opportunities for substantive revisions per year. The next opportunity for revisions will be the update to be released in October, so people will need to work back from that date. The deadline for submitting proposals to be considered for that release will most likely be in April; he will announce a specific date after it is confirmed. This will enable the group to finish some work in progress on proposals and submit them in time to be considered for that update. The deadline for submitting proposals for consideration at the October meeting will likely be in early August. The **Chair** asked if we should expect a round of constituency proposals that will require a response sometime after April; **Attig** said yes. In response to a question from **Maxwell**, **Attig** clarified that there will be two opportunities for submitting proposals per year: one for a face-to-face meeting of the JSC in the fall, and one in the spring for which the JSC will not meet in person.

Attig added that in addition to his report, he submitted two documents for consideration by CC:DA. The first document is CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2011/4 to deal with an issue that ALA identified in a response to a proposal regarding dates of treaties. ALA noted that it is not unusual for multiple treaties to be signed between the same parties on the same day, and that RDA does not provide explicit instructions for distinguishing them. There is an LCPS that deals with this, which is the basis for this draft proposal. He invited comments on the proposal. **Maxwell** commented that normally we choose whatever qualifier is the best. Are there situations where the words in the title would be a better qualifier? **Winzer** said that usually the title has distinctive words; she supposed a generic title is possible but she hasn't seen one. **Hostage** liked the proposal and agreed with it except for the word "uniquely;" the intent is that the access point will identify it uniquely. **Attig** suggested the wording "distinguishes it from other treaties between the same parties, signed on the same date" rather than "identifies it uniquely;" **Hostage** agreed. **Maxwell** identified a typo.

The **Chair** said that she heard general agreement with the proposal, and with the intent of those few changes that were suggested. She invited a motion to approve the proposal with the corrections discussed. Moved by **Winzer**; seconded by **Wolverton**. **Randall** commented on the possible rewording of a phrase. **Attig** welcomed the suggestion and added that if the final text was significantly different, he would return it to the Committee for a final check. The **Chair** called for a vote; the motion carried.

Attig said that the second paper dealt with continued difficulty with finding the RDA equivalent of the instructions on contents notes and accompanying material, and whether the ISBD accompanying materials note is allowed or supported in any way by RDA. It suggests a gap in the rules. There are no instructions for creating structured descriptions of relationships. **Attig** asked whether CC:DA feels this is worth pursuing. **Glennan** and **Winzer** said yes; **Winzer** noted that point 10 was especially important and these terms should be in the index. **Attig** said that if we set up a task force to work on this, one of the issues is that a lot of specifics about relationships are in Appendices I, J, and K; perhaps we can improve on how to get catalogers from one place to the other in order to record these things.

Schiff said that the Examples Group that supplied examples of these types of descriptions also had a hard time figuring out what the examples should look like. Tom Delsey re-did them because the group didn't know what they should look like. **Scharff** expressed interest in number 5, and whether there needs to be a distinction between description for transcribed and recorded elements. **Attig** said that assuming there's interest in continuing, a task force could be formed to work on it, and we'll decide if we're going to pursue this at that point.

The **Chair** summarized the potential work ahead for CC:DA, including ideas for new task forces:

- the already-approved TF to investigate changes affecting RDA in the *Chicago Manual of Style 16th edition*
- a TF to revise the document *Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards*
- a TF to follow up on the proposal on Artistic &/or Technical Credit (regarding information that goes in the statement of responsibility vs. notes)
- a TF on structured descriptions of relationships
- a suggestion from Schiff for a TF to propose new relationship designators for Appendix K

The Chair also noted that **Schiff** has raised issues about the recently approved proposal on initial articles, which dealt with titles of works, persons, and corporate bodies, but not place names. A task force is not needed for this; **Attig** and **Schiff** will work together to develop a proposal. The **Chair** invited discussion on these ideas for CC:DA's work and suggested we discuss each briefly and then vote on whether to form a task force.

Maxwell was enthusiastic about the proposed work on relationship designators for Appendix K. **Attig** stated that the rationale for doing this is that Schiff has identified at least one source (the Getty thesaurus) which has already done a lot of this work. This may allow us to enrich this vocabulary in significant ways. **Paul Weiss** suggested that we involve archivists and museum people, because they use a lot of these terms.

The **Chair** then invited discussion on the issue of follow-up work on Artistic and/or Technical Credit, making the distinction between what goes in the statement of responsibility and what goes in the notes. **McGrath** stated that OLAC members are interested in this issue, but she was not sure how many people would be available to work on it now. They are overtaxed working on

documentation and best practices, and hopefully working on other proposals in response to the RDA test. She said that it is somewhat unprincipled as it is now. **Scharff** thinks that the real problems are with moving images aspects of this issue; the extension is not problematic for music in the same way. **Schiff** stated that there were problems with some sound recording examples, such as dealing with two types of recording engineers; it was unclear whether both types belonged in notes or in the statements of responsibility.

Attig sensed that what is needed is not necessarily specific tinkering with any of the instructions, but to look at the broader issue: should we make distinctions between some types of statements of responsibility that are treated as such; and other types of statements of responsibility that are treated as notes. Also, the problem now is that both the performer and technical credits rules are attributes of the expression, and that limits what you can do; the most difficult part of using the examples is making sure they are contributors to the expression, not creators of the work or performing any role associated with the manifestation.

Maxwell said that the problem is not how to teach AV or music catalogers how to do this, but generalist catalogers who occasionally need to catalog this sort of thing. It is important to resolve not for specialist catalogers, but for others. **Schiff** stated that for textual monographs, we typically put the name of the editor in a statement of responsibility; the editor is at the level of expression. What is the principle here? Do we treat textual objects differently than visual resources? **McGrath** stated that most likely, the historical reason for this is that there are so many statements for moving images; to put them all in the statement of responsibility could be a disservice to users because it's very hard to read and parse. The Internet Movie Database (IMDB) typically doesn't give statements of responsibility in the order in which they appear, but in a standard order. Also there has been a historical, practical distinction in terms of how many people do you want to trace? Rather than keep adding to the order of names, the idea was not to overburden the user with the number of statements in the statement of responsibility.

Attig sensed that people don't object to dealing with this; the question is whether we need to form a task force now or can we wait to do it later? Is it important to do it as close to RDA implementation as possible, or after? **Tarango** suggested that OLAC seemed to be the best community to deal with it and we should defer to them as to the timing. **Attig** agreed and added that MLA also has an interest in the treatment of performer information. **Scharff** commented that it didn't seem so urgent, because the performer is where MLA wants to put it. **McGrath** said that OLAC has a task force that is compiling a list of potential proposals that they are trying to prioritize; she could ask them in terms of priorities where this fits, but they are a little overwhelmed. The **Chair** suggested that **McGrath** do that, and that we take no action on forming a task force on this topic today. If OLAC is not inclined to work on it separately, and we do feel some urgency, we could work on it via the discussion list.

The **Chair** returned discussion to the three items where there was clearly interest: investigating new relationship designators for Appendix K; exploring structured descriptions of relationships; and revising "*Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards.*" The **Chair** invited a motion to establish a task force to investigate relationship designators for Appendix K. Moved by **Randall**; seconded by **Rolla**. The motion carried. The **Chair** invited a motion to establish a

task force on descriptions of relationships. Moved by **Rolla**; seconded by **Wolverton**. The motion carried. The **Chair** invited a motion to establish a task force to revise the document, “*Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards*.” Moved by **Rendall**; seconded by **Winzer**. The motion carried. The **Chair** circulated clipboards with four volunteer signup sheets, the fourth being for the task force on the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

The **Chair** reported on the CaMMS Executive meeting. A concern was raised about the committee’s use of the wiki for discussions of revision proposals. The **Chair** reminded the committee that the rules list was created to allow people who are interested in CC:DA discussions to follow the discussions in read-only mode and not be allowed to comment. Some of those discussions now take place off the list, on the wiki, and two concerns were mentioned: 1. Some people would really like to hear all of CC:DA’s deliberations; 2. For some who track CC:DA activity on the list only, sometimes the context of the discussion is missing, especially during the big round of responses to constituency proposals when there was often the phrase “incorporating discussion from the wiki” and people didn’t know what that was. She thinks the issue is partly one of timing, because the discussion list became public when the committee was winding down from intensive review of the RDA drafts. From that point on, people saw all of CC:DA’s business until this past summer, when we started using the wiki again to work on proposals, and it felt like a door closed. These concerns were discussed in the CaMMS Executive meeting, wherein the **Chair** stressed the need for a working space for the committee. A discussion list cannot substitute for the wiki. CaMMS Executive requested that we try to provide context where possible and do as many things on the list as possible, but they did not want to create impediments to the effectiveness of our committee work. However, it does raise the question of the possibility of making the wiki publicly available as a read-only source of information. The **Chair** invited comments.

Rolla stated that he would support making the wiki public and did not realize that it wasn’t public already. He suggested that we have the proposal text at the top of the page, with the comments that came before, whereas on email, it would have been very difficult to keep track of whether a comment was part of the original text.

Winzer disagreed and felt that it would interfere with the committee members’ candor as we try to advance issues. She would prefer that a summary be created on the discussion list. She said that some people have wanted to see the wiki for years, but it should be closed to the public. **Attig** expressed uncertainty about the current situation with the wiki; it may in fact already be public. The **Chair** explained that this had only recently come to light; we had understood that a top-level login was required, but that appears not to be the case. **Winzer** said that it was important to have clarity about that.

Glennan shared **Winzer**’s concern and added that she was willing to write her ideas on the wiki for other people to react to, but she didn’t want outside people to see it because of concerns about what the broader community might read into it. Related to that, last summer, she was quoted out of context from the rules list on another discussion list; although she was not personally named, she recognized her own language. She was concerned that there was no “read-only but do not

distribute elsewhere” statement on the wiki and said that would need to be added. She also suggested that the list have “best practice” policies especially if the wiki is made public.

Lipcan said that this was a potential benefit of using WordPress as the wiki; we could have the proposal text display to the public but not the comments unless the user was logged in. Then the public could have a place to go to get the context but members could still speak freely about the proposal. **Polutta** noted that that software makes it possible to have threaded comments. The **Chair** agreed that it would be useful to look into possibilities once we have the WordPress software installed.

Paul Weiss stated that the wiki should be publicly available; having it private violates the ALA open meetings policy. He felt that in the wiki, even though we are not technically meeting, we are conversing online. The only information that should be dealt with in Executive session is that which relates to personnel. **Maxwell** agreed and added that these are not, and should not be, secret deliberations; they should be open.

Rendall stated that we do represent our peers; we make decisions that affect our peers, and they should be able to see what we’re saying and to be able to give us feedback. The **Chair** requested a straw poll on the issue of whether the wiki should be publicly available as “read only” vs. committee space only; more answered that it should be public. In terms of ALA policy, **Attig** stressed the need to make a distinction between virtual meetings and virtual activities. He cautioned that we need to be very careful especially during the decision-making part. If we feel there are good enough reasons not to share everything we do, then it can be justified. The **Chair** agreed.

Adam Schiff from the audience announced that he just found the CC:DA wiki on his phone and could access it. The **Chair** added that **Rendall** had also found he could access it without logging in. She will investigate the current settings. It is likely that we will publicize the capability of public access to the wiki; she will notify the committee before she does so. It seems the appropriate thing to do, and we will need to manage it as best we can, including looking into future options with the WordPress software.

Randall asked about the implications for documents under copyright that we discuss on the wiki, such as a large part of chapter 11. **Attig** stated that ALA Publishing seems to be very open to allowing CC:DA to do whatever facilitates its charge to maintain the instructions. He thinks that the parts of the text under revision are not large parts of the text overall and doubts that anything the committee is likely to do would be objectionable. The **Chair** offered to check with Linker about this.

The **Chair** also discussed the use of ALA Connect with CaMMS Executive. ALA wants committees to use ALA Connect as their main web presence; she explained the limitations of ALA Connect for the work of this committee and our plans and efforts over several years to migrate the website to the ALA server. CaMMS Executive was receptive to that and should be pleased about the progress made in clarifying plans for the migration.

The **Chair's** term will end in June; she encouraged anyone interested in the position to contact her for information. The **Chair** announced that the next CC:DA meetings will be held Saturday at 1:30 p.m. and Monday at 8:00 a.m. in June in Anaheim. The agenda is likely to be very full, and the Chair wondered whether an extra meeting might be needed, as there will not be much time after the conference to finalize revision proposals. She reminded members about the sign-up sheets for task forces.

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 12:00 noon.

Respectfully submitted,
Gayle Porter, Intern