

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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2007 Annual Conference in Washington, DC
June 22, 23, and 25, 2007**

Members present:

Cheri Folkner, Chair
Kathy Glennan
Robert Maxwell
Elizabeth Mangan
John Myers
Laura Smart
Patricia Thurston
Paul Weiss

Felicity Dykas, Intern
Penny Welbourne, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

John Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Glenn Patton, OCLC [*represented by Jay Weitz 6/22 & 6/25/2007*]
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress [*absent 6/22/2007*]

ALA Liaisons present:

Bob Lesh, ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
[*absent 6/22 & 6/23/2007*]
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Greta De Groat, ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section [*absent 6/22/2007*]
Kevin Randall, ALCTS/Serials Section
Manon Th roux, ALA/Association of College & Research Libraries
Susan Pinckard, ALA/Government Documents Round Table
Shelby Harken, ALA/Library & Information Technology Association [*absent 6/22/2007*]
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/Map & Geography Round Table
Robert Hall, ALA/Public Library Association
Ken Wade, ALA/Reference & User Services Association

Non ALA Liaisons present:

Kathy Winzer, American Association of Law Libraries
Judy Knop, American Theological Library Association
Elizabeth Lilker, Art Libraries Society of North America
Laurel Jizba, Association for Recorded Sound Collections
Daniel Lovins, Association of Jewish Libraries

Thomas Duszak, Catholic Library Association
Diane Hillmann, Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [*absent 6/23/2007*]
John Hostage, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
Chamya Kincy, Medical Library Association
Mark Scharff, Music Library Association
Greta De Groat, Online Audiovisual Catalogers
Peter Fletcher, Program for Cooperative Cataloging [*absent 6/22/2007*]
Mary Lacy, Society of American Archivists [*absent 6/23 & 6/25/2007*]
Dorothy McGarry, Special Libraries Association

CC:DA Webmaster:

John Attig

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 some cases are exact quotes included.
- 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, but 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 acronyms used in these minutes include:
 - AACR** = *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*
 - AACR2** = *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 2nd ed., 2002 revision
 - AACR3** = Proposed *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules*, 3rd ed. [*process discontinued*]
 - AALL** = American Association of Law Libraries
 - ALA** = American Library Association
 - ALCTS** = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
 - CC:AAM** = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
 - CC:DA** = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
 - CCC** = LC Cooperative Cataloging Council
 - CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
 - CDS** = LC Cataloging Distribution Service
 - CONSER** = Cooperative Online Serials Program
 - CoP** = Committee of Principals for AACR
 - CPSO** = LC Cataloging Policy and Support Office
 - FRAD** = IFLA’s *Functional Requirements for Authority Data*
 - FRANAR** = IFLA Working Group on Functional Requirements and Numbering of Authority Records
 - FRBR** = IFLA’s *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
 - IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
 - ILS** = Integrated library system
 - ISBD** = International Standard Bibliographic Description

ISBD(CR) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description (Continuing Resources)*
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
ISSN = International Standard Serial Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LCRI = Library of Congress rule interpretation
LITA = Library and Information Technology Association
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
OCLC = Online Computer Library Center
ONIX = Online Information Exchange; ONIX International
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RFP = Request for proposal
RLG = Research Libraries Group [*combined with OCLC on July 1, 2006*]
UNIMARC = Universal MARC Format
URL = Uniform Resource Locator

Friday, June 22, 2007 — 1:00 to 5:30 p.m.
Renaissance M Street, New Hampshire Ballroom

993. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, Chair, opened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. She welcomed Committee voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

994. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

[CC:DA/Roster/2006/July/Rev]

Committee voting members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

995. Discussion of draft of Chapter 3 of RDA: *Resource Description and Access*

[Draft of RDA Part A, Chapter 3]

Attig said he would go through the JSC decisions related to the March 2007 draft of Chapter 3. He was not prepared to go into a lot of the background information regarding those decisions. Most of the following issues were raised in the cover letter that accompanied the draft.

Punctuation within Elements

Category 1 relates to punctuation used to segment data within a sequence of like data in order to make the meaning of the data clear. The JSC decided to remove such punctuation instructions from Chapter 3 and to add general instructions to Chapter 1 stating that internal punctuation should be used as necessary for clarity.

Category 2 refers to punctuation used to separate data that are related, but different in kind. The data could be viewed either as separate elements or as sub-elements. Attig indicated that there were comments in support of each perspective.

Mangan pointed out that multiple dimension statements were added to cartographic elements per Chapter 3 of AACR. Punctuation is used to clarify where each part of the statement begins and ends, and is necessary to understand the character string even if it is not needed for parsing the data into separate elements.

Weiss commented that, in general, if the elements are clearly separable, they should be treated that way. Otherwise it will be more difficult to separate them into individual data elements later. He argued for breaking the elements down to whatever extent is possible.

Myers noted a whole range of complexities in these situations. He did not endorse the idea of implementing the complexities. For the sake of simplicity, he proposed recording the dimensions as one element. McGarry endorsed Myers' position.

Weiss reiterated it was simpler to parse the data more. Mangan disagreed. In support of parsing, Weiss gave an example of the benefit of parsing. If someone who is reshelving wanted to pull up books with particular dimensions, he or she could construct a search more easily if measurements were treated as separate elements. Hillmann replied that to some extent the value of parsing depended upon whether that element was used as a linkage to another entity. Attig explained that Chapter 3 did not deal with these situations. Hillmann said that even if it did not, for related resources the information might need to be displayed in both places.

Attig concluded the discussion by noting that there was not a consensus on the issue.

Attig stated that in the current draft of Chapter 3, the JSC limited the use of square brackets to a few instances that occur within an element or sub-element: 3.4.4.2.1a and 3.4.4.2.4a; 3.4.4.4.; and 3.4.4.7.1b. Also, when an entire element is supplied by the cataloger, e.g. when information is taken from outside the resource, square brackets are used to identify that fact since no other method has been accepted in its stead.

Attig asked if that sounded like a reasonable approach.

Hillmann pointed out that it was her understanding that Tom Delsey was working on the question of annotation, which is reflected in the table he distributed. If a cataloger has information that comes from a separate source or information that is supplied outside of the item, there will be a way to identify where it comes from. She thought Delsey had not yet defined how that would be done, but she stated that he was "on the right track" in prescribing some form of annotation that would indicate that more clearly than square brackets do.

Attig added that this would apply to many cases where there is a need to interpolate information, but not to all such cases.

Maxwell said that this sounded like the rules for rare books, and suggested that a major question is whether people who read these data will know what square brackets mean.

Weiss agreed and added that we need to decide whether the information is for catalogers or users. If it is for catalogers, they will understand what the brackets mean. If it is for users, they may or may not understand. He asked if this was part of the data about metadata that will appear in Part C. Attig responded that it probably is, because it pertains more to data about data, but Part C is not yet fully developed.

McGarry said that while not every user will know what the use of square brackets means, those for whom it is important will. She suggested that they continue to be used. Weiss agreed with McGarry.

Maxwell expressed his concern about using square brackets for two different purposes, to which Attig responded that they would probably just be used for interpolation.

Use of Abbreviations

Attig asked Glennan to comment on the use of abbreviations since she is on the Appendices Working Group.

Glennan said that, in general, abbreviations are not being used in RDA, but there are certain exceptions. The JSC tentatively agreed to allow abbreviations for terms of measurement, such as “linear ft.” since those are “terms of common use,” and for terms such as “mono” and “stereo,” which are no longer considered abbreviations. Abbreviations will not be used in bibliographic records for terms that are not well known, such as “IBM PC” (for International Business Machines Personal Computer), etc. Attig agreed and added that where this affects Chapter 3 is in the use of abbreviations for units of measurement. Scharff asked if “abbreviations” included acronyms. Glennan clarified that the idea is basically to spell things out. She added that abbreviations were used in AACR because the information was initially designed for a card catalog environment. However, people do not always know the AACR2 abbreviations. For example, “col.” could mean either “color” or “column” to users. The intention in RDA is to disambiguate the data.

Mangan asked if the change was intended to affect the current use of AACR2 standard abbreviations in lieu of what appears on the item — i.e., with the proposed change, if a word appears in full on an item, then we do not abbreviate it; but if a word appears on an item as an abbreviation, e.g., in a title, then we will use the abbreviation as it appears on the source.

Weiss questioned if the scope of this was about cataloger-generated text and not transcribed data. Attig replied that it is not about transcribed text. It is about the abbreviations appendix in AACR2 that lists words that will be abbreviated when included in the description. The appendix will still be in RDA but the list will be shorter.

Maxwell said he would like to see the principle behind the use of abbreviations: either we allow them or we do not. Glennan replied that abbreviations would be used only when and if the abbreviation is commonly known. Maxwell asked again about the principle behind the decision, indicating he thought that such a decision was arbitrary.

Myers mentioned the constraint of the efficiency of data entry. He asked if the implementation costs associated with eliminating abbreviations had been considered. There are costs associated with the additional keystrokes required to spell out these terms.

Weiss stated that he advocated getting rid of the abbreviation appendix. Catalogers should transcribe what they see and should use common sense for elements that are not transcribed. He added that we might need a shared vocabulary if someone wants to convert data, etc. Mangan replied that we could have a shared vocabulary if words are spelled out, too. Weiss agreed.

Spelling

Attig said that a distinction was made between spelling used in the instructions and spelling used in the examples. The current examples use British spellings. He asked if the rules did not require British spellings in description, would the use of British spellings in the examples cause confusion. Weiss and others said they would assume that it would not matter.

Attig asked if the examples — unlike in those sections of RDA that are talking about how something is to be recorded — should use variant spellings.

Mangan suggested that one option would be to use both spellings together — e.g. “color/colour” or “color or colour”. That would indicate that both spellings are acceptable. She thought a mix of spellings in the examples would be confusing. AACR had a British text and an American text to differentiate the language. When they were combined, the U.S. went with the British text. The labels in RDA need to be clear that, if the cataloger is in the U.S., “color” is not spelled with a “u”.

Hillmann added we should recognize that not all the data would be created by people who use these rules in their entirety. There was agreement at the Data Model Meeting (London, April 30–May 1, 2007) that the element names will be a separate vocabulary and the vocabulary management team will have both spellings available to them. The spellings can be encoded. How that gets done has yet to be decided, but the capability to do it is there.

Scharff indicated that we should encourage the use of technology that would allow for whatever spellings the user expects to see. Hillmann responded that this feature would be available, but that its implementation is dependent on the application software.

Attig suggested that we revisit the question about spelling as it occurs in the writing of the instructions of the rule: specifically “color/colour,” since that same principle can then be applied elsewhere. How important is it that this be consistent? Is this a case where it would be OK to be different?

Maxwell said that although we have not often shared records across the ocean in the past, we would likely be doing more of that in the future. While it may not matter to us, it might matter to our users. British catalogers will have to change the spelling if they use U.S. records and vice versa. What does it mean if we assume we will all do our own thing?

Weiss pointed out that it comes down to a question of what we get out of the element. If the element is for identification, most speakers of English can figure out either spelling. If it is for searching, that is a reason to be consistent. Jizba added that software applications could take the variations into consideration. Weiss said that sometimes content vs. syntax is a fine line. He thought this element is more for identification than for searching.

Pinckard suggested looking at this from a practical perspective. At Emory University they get British records via an approval plan and add them to the catalog. To keep the value of shelf ready and PromptCat, they do not edit the records. Hillmann indicated that she agreed we are going to have to get used to dealing with small variations. The backend system should be able to accommodate searching on alternative spellings.

Jizba suggested that the introduction should state that the spelling used in the description should follow the conventions of the country in which the cataloging agency is located. Weiss agreed and suggested that it state that both British and American spellings were deliberately used in examples to indicate that neither one was preferred over the other.

Media Type

Attig noted that the question here was whether the data element called “media type” is of use to anyone. The general thinking was that it was not. However, those values are recorded in Leader 6 of the MARC record, so anyone using MARC records will be encoding them.

Weiss asked why that logic should affect this element any more than any other element. Attig responded that in RDA coded values could be substituted for text strings. In order to take back control from MARC, it might be a good idea to leave this in as an option, with the understanding that it might not be recorded as text.

Weiss pointed out that it's already optional, and we should leave it that way and see if people want to use it. Hillmann agreed and added that this is something that appears in MARC and people will want something to crosswalk to it. Most likely it will be treated as a controlled vocabulary and not as a code.

Mangan asked for clarification as to whether the suggestion was to eliminate "media type" or to keep it. Attig replied that LC saw it as not very useful and leaned towards getting rid of it. Mangan said that she did not have any problem with that; it is unnecessary to have a catch-all for everything that does not require mediation. Also, using the word "unmediated" for everything that is not in the list does not have much meaning to anyone. Weiss agreed that "unmediated" is not a useful term and noted it came out of the RDA/ONIX framework.

Hillmann said that when we deal with encoded values as controlled vocabulary, we are discussing whether the values are useful. If we decide there is a place for an optional media type, but we do not like some of the values used, that is a separate question. Arguing for different values did not address the question about including "media type."

Attig added that it is very important to make a distinction between the categories and the terms that we are using to identify those categories. Once the categories are identified, we can work on terminology. He added that we are at the category stage now.

Weiss summed up the previous points by indicating there were three issues here: the element, the categories for values, and the names for values.

Carrier Characteristics

Attig began by noting that, at its October 2006 meeting, the JSC made a preliminary decision regarding changes in carrier characteristics (3.21), but the conversation was never completed. It was not discussed further at the April 2007 JSC meeting, so Attig could not report on the thinking of the JSC members. He wanted to find out what CC:DA thought about changes in carrier characteristics. He thought he heard that changes in carriers do not make a new manifestation that must be separately described, but he felt a categorical statement like that went too far.

Hillmann pointed out that it was hard to make a general, all purpose rule about changes. Much of the challenge has come from individual communities. The music community, for example, has argued that ink and CD are not the same; for the rest of us it may not make a difference. The determination about where those boundaries lie will have to be made at the specialist community level. As long as we know who made the decision, we should be able to interpret the decision for our own use.

Myers, in reflecting on the music example, said we should go back to the FRBR user tasks: the defining issue should be change that impacts a user's ability to select a resource.

Weiss said that this is not a Chapter 3 question, but rather a Chapter 0 or Chapter 1 question. Scharff suggested that the larger question and viewpoint was important. He added that in addition to the FRBR user tasks (find, identify, select, and obtain), an unstated task is "use."

Glennan added that 3.21 is about serials, integrating resources, multi-part monographs, etc. She thought that the example Hillmann gave did not apply.

Weiss pointed out that for this rule we have to decide if the items are the same thing or if they are different things, i.e., a change in manifestation. Attig asked if a change in any characteristic related to a manifestation requires a new manifestation. He saw a gray area there.

Hillmann said that we do not have to agree on when a change requires a new manifestation, as long as we know the criteria used in making the decision.

Weiss said that 3.16 and 3.21 indicate what to do when dealing with a change. Chapter 0 and Chapter 1 will indicate whether there is a change. Attig pointed out that the JSC has not yet made a decision about if there is to be a rule in Chapter 1 about when to make a new record.

Allgood said that he agreed with most of what had been said and that we need agreement about describing things at the manifestation level before getting to sub-rules.

Attig indicated that he received comments from Martha Yee stating that there were certain data elements that were in the wrong chapters, and he wanted to go through them for decisions about whether they are content or carrier. One example is 3.12, which deals with color. If something was conceived of as a “colored resource,” it could be conceived of that way at the work level, but much of what we are discussing are details that are at the manifestation level. Attig asked Yee to state her argument about color. Yee [from audience] said that the concept of “color” is one that is oriented towards visual material rather than textual material and the color is essential to the work. A difference would require at least creating a new expression if not a new manifestation. The same thing is true with sound. Sound is integral to the work as a whole. A silent film and a silent film with a sound track are significantly different. If sound is integral to the item as a whole, like silent films, then it needs to be brought out at the expression level.

Attig agreed that something conceived of as color is definitely more an expression than a manifestation. “A lot of things recorded in this section are carrier issues, but not all of them.” Yee clarified that Attig was talking about types of color rather than black and white.

Weiss pointed out that a failing of FRBR is that it does not repeat elements enough. Something like color goes across all four levels. Color was not the only example that applies here and this is exemplary of the “mishmash” of Part A.

Allgood suggested as an example a black and white film that was later colorized. Was this an example of a new expression? What if it is colorized 50 years later? Yee said that was a missing piece in FRBR. In WorldCat people are treating those as expression changes: wide screen or full screen or both. But what is an “expression change” and what is a “damaged manifestation”? Archivists think a colorized copy is damaged.

Hillmann indicated the discussion supported her contention that much of this is contextual to the community describing the data, e.g., the archival community vs. a public library.

Yee agreed with Weiss that the overall organization of Part A is not clear; we need to be clear about whether we are organizing by FRBR task or content vs. carrier.

Attig wrapped up stating what is indicated as “required” in 3.12 is primarily content. He recommended that it be moved to Chapter 4 [Content]. Weiss agreed and said that order is not a big consideration. Chapter 3 seemed to describe more work level elements.

Sound Characteristics (3.17)

With respect to 3.17, Sound characteristics, Weiss indicated that sound is more complicated and can be considered at any of the four levels. Attig pointed out that speaking as a pragmatist, there is not going to be a restructuring of Part A.

Weiss said that while music is sound-based, it could be argued whether language is sound-based or not. He gave as an example an audio recording of a text being read. This is content that is at the work level. He stated that sound should be moved back. Attig added that part of what was being recorded under sound characteristics was playing speed so some elements are clearly content and some clearly carrier.

Scharff indicated that there is a conceptual consideration for splitting sound characteristics, but he wondered how that would work for catalogers. Order might not matter in a web-based product.

Glennan pointed out that 3.17.0.3.1 says that if the sound is not integral, then the cataloger is allowed to describe the carrier of the sound as instructed in 3.1.4. Attig replied that the presence of sound is content. Yee [from audience] said she agreed with Weiss that the presence of sound is a content issue. The characteristics of sound (e.g., stereo) are part of the manifestation. She explained that as a rule of thumb, look at what remains after something is digitized. If a 35 mm film is digitized, it still has sound characteristics. If you digitize something that was analog and a characteristic is still there, then that is part of the content. Weiss noted that if you digitize text, the font type is not preserved; but if you do page images, then that is still considered part of the manifestation.

Projection Characteristics (proportion of the image to the screen)

Yee suggested that if you took a wide screen production and released it for television, you lose some proportion and that is a major change. A wide screen film released as full screen by chopping off the edges produces a change in visual content. Attig added that projection speed, as an example, would be the carrier rather than an expression. Yee disagreed with Attig on that point and discussion ensued.

Jizba supported Attig's position and said that she appreciated what Yee said about it being important to different communities. She pointed out that AACR2 Rule 0.24 is about the 'Principle of flexibility,' and allows for an enormous degree of flexibility. De Groat added that there was not always agreement as to the correct projection speed.

After much discussion and no consensus, Attig said that he had what he needed to take back to the JSC.

Required Elements and Sub-elements

There have been suggested additions to the list of required elements. Attig asked if CC:DA supported the proposal of some additional visual elements suggested by De Groat or should the list be kept as short as possible? Weiss responded that the list of required elements should be kept as small as possible and that specific communities should make their own additions. Attig said that he would be comfortable with that decision unless other members of CC:DA disagreed. De Groat said that elements should be included in the list if they are applicable to the resource being discussed. If not, even though they are applicable, they may not be known.

Content Type

Attig said that "Content type" related to Chapter 4, which dealt with categories of content. He added that the current rule is to record as many categories as are applicable. The alternative rule says to record whatever is dominant. A suggestion was made that the alternative rule should become the rule.

Weiss asked about the philosophical difference between the main rule and the alternative rule. Do we prefer the one that is not the alternative? How much effort should be put into discussing which one is the main rule? Attig agreed that this was an interesting point. An option would be to list these as two different alternatives.

Attig said that some of these alternatives would wind up being what we now call LC rule interpretations, i.e. rules that are made at a national policy level. Others will be made at the level of the individual cataloger.

Randall stated that it was a value judgment as to what is considered substantial. The answer could depend on why an item was acquired by the library. Having the alternative as a rule would not answer the needs of the special communities.

Hillmann pointed out that it depends on how we think about the process of building information and how that occurs. We are not going to be able to make general rules that will apply to everyone and rule interpretations from a central source may not happen either.

McGarry added that if specialized communities do different things, then it does not matter what the general rule for RDA is. The decision that does matter is which will be the main rule and which will be the alternative rule.

Weiss indicated that he would entertain reducing this section to one sentence: indicate that one alternative must be applied. Different communities can identify what they need to do. Hillmann agreed.

Jizba stated that the value of the rules and how flexible they are has to be made clear early in RDA, as they are in AACR2 0.24. Weiss wondered if the JSC had agreed that there would be something like that up front.

Attig asked if the general consensus was that the JSC should simplify and merge main and alternative rules. "State that 'this is a required element' and indicate what those required elements are. We need to make it clear that it is ok to use more than one term to cover different parts or different aspects." Weiss pointed out that that was stated in the first sentence. "Chop the rest off." Attig supported that solution and based on nods and silence saw general agreement.

Terms to Use to Record Characteristics

Attig stated that almost every list of terms in chapter 3 is a closed list. The comment that those lists were incomplete does not answer the question that will be asked about what is missing. "Do we have a general understanding as to how we perceive these lists? Are they RDA's internal controlled vocabulary? Or do we consider them somewhat more informally and treat them as suggestions?"

Mangan said they should be more informal and treated as suggestions. Some elements are missing such as the materials that maps are created on. Nobody is going to be looking for a specific material (such as "cloth" rather than "silk" or "linen"). The current list of materials is incomplete and includes materials that would never be used.

Hillmann agreed with Mangan's last points, but not her first ones. The need for controlled vocabulary may be important. If this is for general content, we want some consistency in the specific terms that are embedded in the text. A specialized community will need its own vocabulary with clear explanations as to when it is going to use that vocabulary

Myers commented that the lists are intentionally incomplete because this is not intended to be a document just for today but a document that can be used in the future as well. Closed lists are inflexible and antithetical to the idea that this is a principles-based document. We want future vocabularies to be developed within the framework of RDA.

Weiss added the RDA/ONIX Framework document gives three categories of lists. They are:

- Open list: all the values are user-defined
- Controlled list: gives a set of values that can be extended
- Covering list: exhaustive; includes all terms that can be used.

Weiss expounded that just because a vocabulary is closed does not mean that it is immutable; it means that terms can only be added via committee, etc. We need to identify what type of list each is. Where people want to search using terms, they should use a controlled vocabulary.

Attig said that there is a difference between a controlled vocabulary and a closed list and there are a variety of ways for maintaining a controlled vocabulary. One would be within the text of RDA itself, but

we are identifying reasons why that is not a good idea. We need to identify when a controlled vocabulary can be useful.

Jizba said that we need to consider the entire pie. The portion of the pie that does not fit into lists is smaller. We need rules on how to treat these terms. She added that controlled lists are ok, but what RDA is trying to do in principle is not attempt to account for past, present and future needs. RDA needs to address what to do when a cataloger is confronted with a blank box. She also noted the importance of principle-based instructions to consult when coming up against something new. That is one of the reasons why RDA has such a broad scope at this point. We should extrapolate from other principles and add principles here.

Woodley [from audience] suggested changing “closed list” to “controlled vocabulary.” RDA should provide suggestions for using controlled vocabulary and instructions as to where to go to find a term; it does not need to establish the term. Weiss agreed. Jizba pointed out that there are terms that need to be included, but we need to make room for other terms to be added as well.

Attig said that, for every element, RDA needs to include a principle about what to do when encountering something that is not included.

Hillmann suggested that it would be much better to use natural language text for something that is not included in RDA. The category “other” does not indicate what the person thought it was. The cataloger should give a term that will allow analysis after the fact and could become a new term or an alternative term.

Glennan added that we also needed to make sure that something is only called a “new term” when it is something truly new, and not just because one library is calling the same thing by a different word. Hillmann agreed and noted that’s why we want to use controlled vocabularies that will have entry vocabulary to the controlled terms.

Weiss pointed out that there are times when RDA should not be trying to come up with a list, that sometimes it is more appropriate to just say “use someone else’s vocabulary.” Maxwell stated that we should not be sending someone off to all these other places to find information. There should at least be a short list within RDA itself. Scharff added that he would not overestimate the homogeneity and consensus in communities. “There are plenty of people cataloging music who do not consider themselves part of the music community.”

Attig concluded the discussion on Chapter 3 by noting he had already reduced 120 pages of raw comments to about 65 pages of comments. He had a lot of work to do before he had a response. He told CC:DA that it would probably not see the actual text of the comments before they are submitted due to time constraints.

996. Discussion of revised draft of Chapters 6 and 7 of RDA: *Resource Description and Access*

[Draft of RDA Part A, Chapters 6 & 7]

[RDA Prospectus]

The Chair stated that August 8, 2007 was the deadline for public comments to be made (through the Web form) on Chapters 6 and 7. CC:DA comments are due in the wiki on August 12 and there will be one week for “agree” and “disagree” comments. She indicated that comments about examples or typos could be flagged in the wiki with “editorial typo” and “example issue.” For Chapter 3 comments, Attig added that except for those two categories, he edited out the other flags.

The Chair said that the wiki would be ready by July 9.

The Chair indicated that the discussion on Chapters 6 and 7 would follow a structure similar to that used in the past by the previous chair, Mary Larsgaard. There would be approximately fifty minutes of general comments for each chapter. CC:DA voting members would comment first, then liaisons, followed by comments from the audience.

Chapter 6

Weiss began by saying that the JSC made a lot of substantive changes in the revised versions of both Chapters 6 and 7.

Myers reflected that reading Chapter 6 made him wistful for Rule #2 in Michael Gorman's "The Most Concise AACR2" [i.e., "Make as many copies of the description as are necessary and add to each the name of the author and of other persons or bodies associated with the work," from *American Libraries*, September 1981]. He said that he saw little in the Chapter after 6.3.0.1 that added anything constructive. The rest of it seemed to be an expansion on the opening statement.

Weiss agreed and added that perhaps the number of examples could be reduced. He found the organization to be a bit "funky," with too much sub-sectioning. 6.3.1 and 6.3.2 were Group 2 entities, whereas 6.3.3 related more to relationships than to resources.

Glennan said that she appreciated the work that had gone into providing new and up-to-date examples, plus the corrections that were made to those examples that appeared in previous versions.

Attig requested that people pay particular attention to the types of examples used in Chapter 6. "The JSC intentionally tried to use examples in a very generic way that would not hint at the access point, but then decided on the more traditional way. The examples are intended to illustrate the choice of access point, not the form." The examples should be reviewed closely to see if there are other ways they might be presented.

Mangan indicated that she had a problem with 6.3.2, "Originating body," which is the section that corresponds to the area in AACR2 that deals with corporate bodies. Some corporate bodies will need to have access points. "The examples in 6.3.2 under 'creator' should appear under 'originator.' The distinction is neither correct nor necessary."

Maxwell indicated that he liked the "originator thing." He skipped over creator, but thought that did include corporate body. He asked about the difference between "creator" and "originating body."

Mangan interjected that she wanted to provide a little history on the subject. When AACR2 was originally published, there was limited use of corporate bodies as main entry. Most cartographic materials do have corporate authorship, and so it was added. If this had not been done, then cartographic materials would have all been entered under title and that would have been unsatisfactory.

Maxwell clarified that a corporate body is a creator and he did not see the need for a separate category. Weiss said that this is like the "primary access point" in Chapter 6.

Adam Schiff, Chair of Part A, Chapters 6-7 and Part B Examples Group [from audience] said that the Examples Group submitted some examples with corporate bodies as creators that did not show up in the draft. In the original, the term "authorship," not "creator," was used. He noted that he did not see a difference between a "creator" and an "authorizing body," but after speaking to the cartographic folks, it became clear to him that cartographic agencies can be creators in the same way that musical groups can be creators.

Schiff agreed with Weiss that the term "creator" was being used to show that it is a 1XX [main entry]. He said that he would be perfectly happy to see "corporate body" omitted in lieu of "creator." Mangan said that she assumed that "originating body" would apply to all corporate bodies.

Pinckard wondered about a recent document that discussed RDA as a metadata schema; was not this part of the discussion with metadata communities? Attig indicated that this topic had not been discussed directly.

Schiff replied that some things under “originating body” were not creators. For example, a conference is not the creator of the work. Weiss disagreed, and said that some would consider a conference the creator. He added that he would prefer combining the concepts “creator” and “collaborator” so all the information would be in one place. He wondered why “contributor” is found under “expression.” He added a compliment: “Bravo for how well the JSC dealt with the concept of ‘expression.’” Allgood “dittoed” Weiss’ comment about expression.

Attig said that the primary access points associated with the work appear in 6.3. The primary access points associated with the manifestation appear in 6.4. This is the underlying organizing factor.

Maxwell asked if that meant that both creator and originating body are required, or are they required as appropriate.

Weiss reiterated that he would argue to put them together under “responsibility,” with only one of them as a data element. Attig added that this was what the JSC decided to do, but it obviously was not what was done. This provided even more argument for not making a distinction between “creator” and “originating body.” Randall asked about the choice of the term “responsible entity,” which is generic. Weiss said that he suggested that in the comments he made the last time.

Attig requested that when it came time to add comments to the wiki, please be very specific. He added that Chapter 6 was arranged in terms of how the names of persons, families, and corporate bodies are related to the resource rather than by how specific types of relationships are associated with the resource. This approach was taken in part because there has been disagreement internationally as to whether corporate bodies can create works. Attig also asked that CC:DA members look at the definitions, “because the definitions are not necessarily what you would expect them to be.” In 6.4.1.0.1, a “contributor” is defined as “a person, family, or corporate body contributing to the realization of a work through an expression” — but does that mean it is an expression level element?

Weiss said that Chapter 7 was well organized and that Chapter 6 should be organized along the same principles.

Glennan said that it was difficult to determine what “required” actually means. This was throwing her off, even if it did appear at the beginning of the section. Why was a creator required for an anonymous work?

Maxwell added that he was troubled by the special rules that appeared at the end that did not seem to go with the entity. Weiss pointed out that 6.7 [legal] and 6.8 [religious] are works. It was not clear what 6.9 [official communications] was. Maxwell agreed with Weiss.

Allgood reminded everyone that Chapters 1–5 deal basically with “description,” while 6 and 7 are about “relationships.” It should be made clearer whether entities are involved in creation or with other resources. It was important in describing relationships to be explicit about what we are describing.

Hostage agreed with the comments that had been made that a good portion of Chapter 6 could be condensed and it would make it a lot simpler to use.

Shawne Miksa, University of North Texas [from audience], asked if the word “emanate” had deliberately not been used. Attig replied that it had come up in the JSC’s discussion, and they had agreed that it was a term to be avoided. Miksa said that she found that word useful.

Jizba said that 6.3 and 6.4 seemed to suffer from a lack of technical writing. Also, in 6.4 there were both arrows and squares used intermittently to mean apparently the same thing. She did see the value of using numbered paragraphs, so they can be referred to from other parts of the text.

Myers added a comment that he forgot to make earlier: within the 6.1.3 section of rules, the same 24 words appear more than once with only minor variations for “the item in hand.” Although that may be needed for the electronic version, it makes the print version unwieldy.

Scharff said that it would be helpful for Chapter 6 to have more non-English examples. He noted in particular the section on editors and compilers in which every single example is in English. While there are other sections that lack non-English examples, this is a section in which they would be useful. Schiff [from audience] noted that there is a definite preference for English examples.

Scharff said that he was still bothered by the “Other contributor” element. He thought there were problems with that term and that it had been put there almost as a catch-all — and yet it is in a section that is dealing specifically with persons, families and corporate bodies associated with an expression.

An audience member from the German National Library indicated that Chapter 6 was going in the right direction, especially in terms of “creator.” The “originating body” — a term used in section 6.3.2 — was just a special type of creator and not another kind of relationship. It would be good to have other types of creators, although the JSC might be trying to define cases in which a person or corporate body is the creator. Regardless, the definition should be made clearer. In Germany, they were not happy to see issues with the entity being viewed as “corporate body” or “family.”

Maxwell indicated that if Germany thought of a corporate body more as a creator, then it might be a better move towards internationalization to keep this.

Since there were no more comments on Chapter 6, CC:DA moved on to Chapter 7.

Chapter 7

Weiss said that he liked Chapter 7. “The organization is much more helpful, clearer, and will be easier to use in training.”

Martha Yee [from audience] said that she found Chapter 7 confusing, because it is describing relationships with other works when the other works are not identified until Chapter 13. She said she would like to see Chapter 13 moved back to Chapter 1.

Maxwell noted that he would like to see all the relationships listed, including shared characteristics. Attig pointed out that “shared characteristics” was added at 7.0.4, but not in a substantive way.

Mangan indicated that she did not quite understand the use of the term “Primary relationship” when there were no secondary relationships. Attig replied that Tillett was trying to get the JSC to use the term “Inherent relationship.” Weiss explained that every item has a relationship to at least one manifestation, one expression, and one work. The other ones are optional. Mangan said that the term “primary” made her want to look for other “non-primary” relationships.

Maxwell pointed out that in 7.3.2 [Relationship between a manifestation and a work or expression embodied in the manifestation], he thought that “manifestation” in FRBR did not have a direct relationship with “work.” Attig indicated that there “were pragmatic reasons why intermediate steps are not explained.” This is an issue that was raised in ALA comments on an earlier draft.

Weiss agreed with Maxwell and said that the relationship of manifestation to expression must be made. Manifestation and expression should both be required data elements. Attig added that if you were doing this in terms of access points, you would always have to create an access point for the expression. Allgood thought that it might be helpful to bring in the FRBR concept of “inheritance” to clarify this.

Jizba said that it would be helpful to have a practical and accurate illustration at this point — “a picture is worth a thousand words.”

Maxwell indicated that we need to follow the hierarchy. A manifestation relates to an expression and not to a work. He assumed that in a relational database we will have this. They may be connected by an added entry. Attig said that there were several different sets of conventions or techniques that could be used. The rules support them all. A linked record technique is one of them, though it might not be possible to implement that technique at the time of RDA’s release.

Maxwell added that there needs to be a default when something is unknown, for example, a translation for which one does not know which expression was translated.

Attig replied that many of these issues are going to have to be handled in working with catalogers as RDA is implemented. RDA requires understanding FRBR, but how much FRBR has to be explained in RDA has not been decided. Weiss thought it would be helpful to see the introduction.

Mangan noted the discussion of descriptions as structured or unstructured in 7.1.5. Then “composite descriptions” are mentioned without an explanation of what that is. Attig said that this is under the third of the three implementation schemes; everything is put in the same record. Mangan asked if that would not be a structured description.

Weiss added that the organization of 7.1 could be improved. The definition of “composite description” is at 7.3.1.0.1c.1. Mangan responded that there are only two types of description listed in 7.1.5.0.1.

Myers noted that the composite description identifies the work and expression or manifestation, per 7.3.1.0.1c.1 and 7.3.2.0.1c.1. Attig replied that the composite is the description of either the work or the manifestation “globbed onto” the description of the manifestation.

Scharff said that initially he was confused by the formatting of the pages, but eventually saw that composite descriptions belonged here. He indicated that what is missing for the music cataloger is the \$ [Arranged statement for music]. Music catalogers would use the same work identifier if the work was arranged for a different combination of instruments, although they have not traditionally added that level of specificity to the work identifier.

Nor, added Attig, have we identified a particular translation; we have simply considered it a translation. “This is really a Chapter 13 issue. Some access points are for the work and the original or default expression. One of the issues we have to deal with is not distinguishing expressions from each other, but whether we want to distinguish the expression from the work.”

Weiss clarified that we aren’t distinguishing them in headings, but we are distinguishing them in descriptions.

Attig said that the JSC is exploring how to organize this. The JSC did notice that the list of conventions under the “primary relationships” was different than the others, and that it is going to go back to reexamine that issue.

Maxwell stated that he could not understand 7.2 [Designation of relationship] and asked what Tom Delsey wanted to do here. Attig responded that this was a placeholder because the actual lists are still being worked on, much like what is happening with Designations of role in Chapter 6. Hopefully, a draft will be out in late August.

Weiss said that he likes 6.2 better than 7.2 and would rewrite 7.2 using 6.2 as the model. He added that he did not understand what was being said at 7.1.2.3 [... range of conventions used to record relationships ...] and he wondered why it applied to Chapter 7. Attig said that the JSC was skeptical about whether or not it belonged here. He explained that it is simply recognizing the three implementation scenarios. The JSC would like to get to identifiers but the cataloging environment has not progressed that far.

Randall indicated that 7.2 was not well placed. References within 7.3-7.9 will be needed to indicate that appropriate terms should be used.

Attig explained that 7.2 is a separate data element and the JSC thought it was applicable to the conventions in several of the sub-rules in 7.1. He added that the element analysis table is governing more and more of the JSC's decisions.

Weiss replied that he liked having 7.2 separate, at a high level.

Schiff [from audience] said that in 7.2, the instructions indicate to go to a list; an option will be to go to some other special community's list. He noted that there is not a mechanism for the cataloger to get new terms on a list, which might force a cataloger into using unstructured description. For example, 7.4.1.1.a.1 includes the example "PDF version online." This is a generic phrase." A cataloger might want to be more descriptive, such as "Australian mirror site."

Weiss said that there are two different kinds of relationships in that example. "Mirror site" is about a relationship. "Australian" is not.

Attig added that "there may be times when you are breaking up things we are used to putting together. There will be more parsing. That is not good or bad; it is just a fact of life." He stated that the JSC is trying to make sure that it gets things into the right boxes.

Maxwell said that he liked the placement of 7.2 because it exactly parallels 6.2. He also noted that it was important to remember that there is only one relationship, irrespective of the direction you are going. For example, there is one relationship whether it is a supplement or has a supplement.

Weiss commented that in entity-relationship modeling it is important to know when one is doing which thing.

Scharff said that the JSC needs to be sure that the definitions are clear, especially if some relationships are specific to particular materials. The definition for "Succeeding relationship" is broad. It could be applied to a series of works by a composer with the same title and no other relationship.

Attig indicated that he realized this when he received some comments from Maxwell in which Maxwell talked about the pages of a book as a manifestation-level sequential relationship. "Relationships are very generally defined, and that is part of their strength. It is in their implementation and in our decision as to what we are going to do that we will get down to the detail."

Jizba wanted to know how Chapter 7 would handle a situation in which the first edition of a textbook was published with a teacher's guide bound in, and then in the next edition, the two parts are bound separately. Weiss said that this was a situation where the hierarchy works: the same relationship still exists at the work or expression level, whether the items are physically bound together or not. Jizba replied that it was still not clear to her.

Glennan said that she was thrilled to see the terms "expression" and "work" in some of the headings. She indicated that she struggled with understanding all of the references back to 7.1.4 [Naming related resources]. The examples are for access points and that could be very unfamiliar to someone used to working with AACR2. She gave the example of 7.5.1.1.b.1a: based on, adaptation of, etc. The examples were helpful, but were not coming from access points as she knew them.

Attig explained that these designate relationships; the JSC has not fully worked out how the relationships should be reflected. Only a few days before the examples were due, the JSC considered the form of examples, which presented the Examples Group with challenges. He assumed that we are looking for some technique in our coding standards, such as MARC, for designating relationships and using that in conjunction with the actual access point. Possibilities for coding include \$e or \$i in 7xx.

Glennan said that after reading this chapter and Chapter 3, she is still not sure where accompanying program notes go; it is not clear how we deal with something that is a separate thing that is not separately described. Attig said that the description is something that you include in the record of the resource you are describing. It is the equivalent of making notes. Contents notes can show whole-part relationships. 510s can cite a description of the resource in other sources. Other things have been moved out of description to access points. Assuming that you do not make it an access point, you can do the same thing you are doing now.

Maxwell added that such was the case in the composite record relationship. The composite record is essentially what we are doing now. Relationships shown in the record are between individual works. Attig agreed.

Attig stated he had had a hard time convincing the JSC that it is an issue that “all relationships are reciprocal, and you have to be careful that you have it going in the right direction — from the resource you are describing and the related resource, or the other way.” Weiss and Schiff both said that they did not think the examples are consistently showing the same direction of reciprocity.

Attig clarified that an access point works differently than either a link or an identifier.

Weiss said that Chapters 6 and 7 are opposite. In Chapter 6, entity is followed by role. In Chapter 7, the role is first and then the entity being described. He described this as “bizarre.”

Attig responded that “if it is an access point, you are approaching it from the other direction and you are not approaching it from the record in which you are recording the description. If you are defining the role, you are going to get it wrong. Chapter 7 is from the perspective of the item being described.”

Attig asked that CC:DA let the JSC know of ways that the chapters could be improved and the information made clearer. “Chapter 7 is a very rich and full chapter and there are things in here that we are not used to doing at this point.”

Myers indicated that this was much improved over what CC:DA saw previously.

Schiff [from audience] said that the examples show links when we do not normally make links in that direction. An example under 7.19 gives a link from the original to the derivative. He asked for guidance as to which kind of relationships catalogers should make.

Allgood responded that some communities are used to indicating more relationships even under AACR2. The serials community is an example.

Weiss said that the examples should be broad and should show options.

Scharff pointed out that 7.7.1 [Whole work (or expression)] was a case in which we should not catalog from examples, since all of the examples are for serials. Other sections included examples for other types of materials.

Weiss said that the part about sources of information in Chapter 6 (6.1.1) should be broadened and modeled after Chapter 7. Also, it is four paragraphs and could be shortened and made simpler as it is about one thing. Glennan expressed the same concern.

Attig indicated that this goes back to AACR2. He asked if there were good reasons for giving a preference to the source of information. Weiss replied that it would be simpler to indicate that information could be taken from “whatever” place. He still thought that there were places where the document repeats itself unnecessarily. He argued for consistency, clarity, and simplicity.

Scharff asked about formulating access points without any explanation as to why and from where catalogers take it. Now the basis is usage as it appears in works. Weiss replied that form and choice are

different. Scharff replied that form is still based on usage; “if it is not, this is a big change.” The source of information does matter.

Myers said that there is “muddling” between form and choice of entry in Chapter 6. Winzer said that a lot of the problems stemmed from the location of the information. “If Chapters 6 and 13 had come out at the same time, it wouldn’t be so confusing.” She agreed with Scharff that now we take information from a prescribed source when we establish names.

Maxwell said that 6.1.1 is not about form; it is about, “Does this person exist?” There may be practical reasons not to search extensively for a piece of information. On the other hand, there may be reasons to search for a creator.

Schiff [from audience] said that the second part [6.2] is about identifying roles, so this is about more than identification.

Weiss noted that CC:DA had five different sets of interpretations and indicated that this underscored the need for clarification. Attig agreed with Weiss and said that the information is sometimes inaccurate, ambiguous, or not present. Clarification is needed.

Myers said that Chapter 6 is about choice of access points. The cataloger should use the preferred source, unless that is ambiguous or inadequate. He suggested indicating that one should use the sources available

Glennan indicated that Chapter 7 was not supposed to be for determining transcription and statement of responsibility. It is much too complicated to use for determining names that you would like to identify as access points. She noted that it is set up for a cataloger to go down a list, with the final choice being “any source.”

Weiss said that the statement of responsibility should be moved to Chapter 6. He pointed out that the name of Chapter 6 is “Persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource,” whereas the name of Chapter 7 is “Related resources.” Chapter 7 deals with different ways of recording relationships; Chapter 6 should do the same thing.

Myers indicated that he wanted to formally thank Adam Schiff and the Examples Group “for their heroic efforts,” and added that he thought it was the result of a “huge labor of love (or endurance and insanity)” to have been able to do what they did when the guidelines they were following were not always clear.

Schiff thanked Myers for his comments and said he would share them with others in the group.

The Chair called for a motion that the meeting be adjourned for the day. Mangan made the motion and it was approved unanimously.

The session was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Saturday, June 23, 2007 — 1:30 to 5:30 p.m.
Renaissance M Street, New Hampshire Ballroom

997. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, Chair, opened the meeting at 1:30 p.m. She welcomed Committee voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

998. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

Committee voting members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

999. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[CC:DA/A/55]

Mangan moved to adopt the agenda. The motion passed and the agenda was adopted.

1000. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2007 Midwinter Meeting, Seattle, WA, January 20 and 22, 2007: Chair

The Chair noted that she received corrections from McGarry and Dykas prior to this meeting. She asked if there were any additional corrections but there were none.

Myers moved to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed.

1001. Report from the Chair

[CC:DA/Chair/2006-2007/5]

The Chair noted that the issues and votes taken between January 24, 2007-May 31, 2007 were documented in the Chair's report. Glennan moved to confirm the votes made electronically since the 2007 Midwinter meeting and to accept the Chair's report. A voice vote was held and the motion passed.

Other actions by CC:DA between January 24 and May 31, 2007 included the following. Further details are available in the Chair's report:

- **Review of Draft of RDA, Part A, Chapter 3 and other related JSC documents**
May 21, 2007 was the deadline for comments on Chapter 3 and the addendum to Chapter 4. Attig was using the comments to write the ALA response.
- **Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication formed**
As a result of a vote passed at its 2007 Midwinter meeting, CC:DA established a Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication. The roster and charge were completed at the end of February 2007.
- **Response to the proposed LCRI changes regarding "AACR2 Compatible" headings**
CC:DA sent in a response to the proposed LCRI changes regarding "AACR2 Compatible" headings on April 20, 2007. The Chair thanked Maxwell for preparing the draft response.
- **Task Force to Review the Draft of Functional Requirements for Authority Data formed**
A Task Force to Review the Draft of Functional Requirements for Authority Data was formed in response to the IFLA invitation for review comments. The roster and charge were completed on April 26, 2007. A response based on the Task Force's review report will be sent to the IFLA working group by its deadline of July 15, 2007.
- **CC:DA wiki transition**
CC:DA successfully migrated to the ALA-hosted wiki, which uses MediaWiki software (the same as that used by Wikipedia). Wiki documents still on the server at the University of California, Santa Barbara should be migrated to the ALA server by the end of 2007. The Chair thanked Mary Larsgaard, past Chair of CC:DA, and the Davidson Library at the University of California, Santa Barbara for their patience and willingness to host the work of CC:DA until the transition and migration is complete.

▪ ***Public CC:DA email discussion list***

The Chair reviewed the status of a read-only public CC:DA email list. The tested version is not archiving and there is not a method to notify someone that his/her message is not being posted. The Chair is working with ALCTS to resolve the problems. The target date for this going “live” is July 23, 2007. Patricia Thurston volunteered to write up a description of the new public list and to work with the Chair on publicizing the new list when it is available.

▪ ***Procedures documents for CC:DA interns***

The Chair thanked one of the interns, Felicity Dykas, for having taken on a project to create formal documentation for the responsibilities of CC:DA interns, including what is (and what is not) required to be included in the minutes, and some suggestions for making the job more standardized. On behalf of Dykas, the Chair requested that any past interns who wanted to comment on the document do so. Weiss indicated that such a document would also prove to be of immense help to individuals interested in becoming CC:DA interns, but who are not certain as to exactly what the responsibilities of the position entail.

Introduction of Resolution

Myers moved to adopt the following resolution concerning Glenn Patton:

Whereas Glenn Patton has served on this committee for twenty-five years, 1982-2007, as *ex officio* representative to CC:DA from OCLC;

Whereas he plunged into service on the committee almost immediately after his arrival at OCLC (little did he know just what he was getting into!);

Whereas he has consistently and routinely brought both a calm and thoughtful approach to actions of the committee, as well as unfailingly contributed accurate comments to its deliberations, for which he enjoys universal solonian regard;

Whereas he has consistently brought to CC:DA the news and insights from his work with IFLA;

Therefore be it resolved that CC:DA recognizes Glenn Patton with its profound respect and thanks for his many years of hard work and contributions to CC:DA as OCLC’s *ex officio* representative to CC:DA.

The Chair asked for a show of all in favor [which was followed by loud applause from everyone!], and she announced that the motion had carried.

1002. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 1: Attig

Attig began by acknowledging several individuals for the help they provided him as he began his new role as the ALA representative to the JSC. He first identified Jennifer Bowen, who allowed him “in” while she continued to be involved. He thanked two people for their review of the internal JSC documents: Kathy Glennan for her help on Chapter 6 and Bob Maxwell for his work on Chapter 7. The JSC has not yet begun to review these comments on Chapter 7. Attig stated that he thinks CC:DA has made a good start in its review. He indicated that he hoped he would have more acknowledgements to make to other individuals in the future because he feels certain he can rely on volunteers to help.

Attig said that he wanted to alert CC:DA that one of the things he should have been told before accepting this position was exactly what was involved in being a member of the JSC. For example, he should have been told that he would have to review three drafts of Chapters 6 and 7 before the “final” draft was released. He noted that sort of thing will increase as the deadline for completion of RDA gets closer.

The JSC is having almost weekly conference calls to help get through the backlog of comments it has received. These conference calls present particularly interesting problems in terms of timing, given that the calls involve representatives from the East Coast of North America, Chicago, IL, England, and Australia.

There is a lot of work going on behind the scenes. The JSC has been working on Chapters 1-5 for a long time and Chapters 6 and 7 for a relatively short time. A lot of work and decision-making has been going into those efforts. CC:DA is beginning to see the results of those efforts. RDA as it is currently conceived is taking shape.

The JSC is also now taking a higher-level view of the RDA process. Attig said that it had not anticipated the RDA element analysis table, but that has become a very important document. It is a way of looking at the structure and content of RDA that is becoming fundamental and highly significant in deliberations by the JSC.

Attig reviewed events that took place during and since the JSC meeting in Ottawa, Canada in April 2007, beginning with the *RDA – Resource Description and Access: Scope and Structure* document [CC:DA/JSC Rep/JCA/2007/1].

CC:DA spent a great deal of time at Midwinter and thereafter discussing the need for consistency throughout RDA. *RDA Scope and Structure* reflects current JSC thinking. CC:DA should see major differences between the older and current draft documents. As additional drafts come out, Attig indicated that he hoped everyone would recognize that the JSC was being more consistent in its approach. In Ottawa, the JSC discussed the *RDA Scope and Structure* and the ALA comments in *5JSC/ALA/5*.

One of the reasons the editor prepared the RDA element analysis table was to be very precise about the RDA elements for use in comparing RDA to other models. That has allowed the JSC to describe better when it is using the model and when it is going beyond the model. The detailed analysis of the RDA elements was done partly in response to the *RDA Scope and Structure*, but its purpose was also to look at RDA elements as a form of metadata in preparation for the discussion at the Data Model Meeting. It was important to show that a metadata schema can be extracted from RDA. The JSC has begun using this document as an analysis tool for making its decisions. It is almost more fundamental than the drafts at this point. It is a working document, a tool. Attig expressed his hope that members of CC:DA will become familiar with it and use it as a tool in evaluating some of the drafts.

Weiss added that once you understand the mapping document — “when you read it at least twice” — it does make sense. He cautioned CC:DA members not to be turned off by the highly technical nature of it. Attig said that he finds certain pieces of it to be more accessible and useful than others. For example, he has questions about the *indecs* attribute type, among other things. The original draft had the FRBR comparison, which is of particular interest.

A second document that the editor prepared in anticipation of the Data Model Meeting is called *Encoding RDA Data*. Even though RDA is to be encoding-standard neutral, RDA is more than a content standard.

As Attig reported on the Data Model Meeting, he pointed out that one of the criticisms of RDA has been that the metadata is not well formed, and that there are standard ways of doing metadata for online resources that are not being followed. CC:DA had already begun to do outreach to resource description communities by adding representatives from the Dublin Core and IEEE communities. JSC is pursuing outreach to these and other communities. Don Chatham was a key person in setting this up. He attended the Dublin Core meeting in Mexico last year, and saw the importance of talking to the Dublin Core community. He encouraged the JSC to meet with people from other metadata communities and provided funding.

At its Ottawa meeting, the JSC was not sure about interest in its work from other metadata communities. Following the Data Model Meeting, the members were gratified at the extent of agreement, the willingness to work together, and the identification of some useful products. Three useful products were identified:

1. RDA element vocabulary defined in a specific way as a metadata schema;
2. RDA application profile (more of a Dublin Core category, but useful to have in terms of defining a point of view about RDA as metadata);
3. Formal disclosure of all of the internal vocabularies used within RDA in order to will encourage the widest use within and beyond the library cataloging community.

There was general agreement among the participants that the outcome of the meeting offered the potential for collaboration. It also raised a number of issues that have to be considered. The JSC and the CoP are still looking at these recommendations.

Attig noted that reactions to the outcome of the meeting are generally positive. The JSC and CoP are equally committed to completing the RDA project as it is already defined and scheduled, and to making sure that these additional projects do not get in the way of accomplishing that. The JSC is hoping that the additional projects can be done with limited involvement on the part of those people who are already heavily involved in RDA content development. Diane Hillmann and Gordon Dunsire (University of Strathclyde and part of the UK advisory group for RDA) are jointly chairing the steering group.

Hillmann added that a task group has been started that will include all the people from the meeting and anyone from the JSC who wishes to participate. She said that they also have a volunteer, Corey Harper, Metadata Services Librarian, New York University, who is working with library people interested in having access to the first output of the element vocabulary. They will test it and see how it works.

An initial proposal was developed for funding to build the element vocabulary and application profile. The application profile is coming along at a good time because the Dublin Core community is currently working on an application model profile that can be read by machine that is hoped to be unveiled at the August meeting in Singapore. If delayed a little, the JSC model might get the benefit of the Dublin Core work. Group members are hoping for funding so that they can get started in the fall and have something for people to look at by the end of the year. Also, the profile can then be used to inform RDA. Hillmann added that the group has already identified a couple of consultants from outside of the JSC to help them develop the profile.

Attig asked Hillmann how the steering group saw the vocabularies interacting with RDA. Was this something that could be integrated, or were they two separate processes? Hillmann replied that they were two separate processes. The group will work with the JSC and others on how to assign a Uniform Resource Identifier that is persistent. The ability to expose that on the web is pretty much there. Once there is a group to work on the registered product, a web product can be developed that can cope with changes to the vocabulary. Web products will be major clients of the service. It will be web-based and machine-driven and can be used by an ILS vendor, a library, or any other group that wants to use the RDA elements and vocabularies in potentially all or part of a business.

Attig summarized by saying that the JSC and the CoP are going to have some issues to go through and one of those will most certainly be funding and the degree to which they will participate in the work of the steering group.

He explained that the RDA initiative — which is fully financed by the sale of RDA products — might have to be reconceived in some way. The project Hillmann described will move significant parts of RDA to the public domain. This will have huge implications on the business model.

Finally, ALA repeated its concern that the relationship between RDA and FRBR does not explain why things are organized in RDA the way they are. On behalf of CC:DA, Attig offered to work on that problem and to come up with something more acceptable. He said he would come back to this on Monday and would see what the interest was in taking on this task.

Attig returned to reporting on the JSC meeting in Ottawa. The JSC looked at all parts of RDA except for the general introduction and the index. Some appendices were still being drafted by a Working Group and have not been shared with the JSC. All other parts were on the table in Ottawa, and (with the exception of Chapter 3, which is out for review) all were discussed to some extent.

The discussion on Part A, Chapters 1, 2, 4 and 5 was based on two streams:

1. The remaining comments from constituencies' responses that were made when those chapters went out for review about a year and a half ago.
2. A group of specific proposals from different constituencies.

One specific proposal dealt with internationalization. The JSC is attempting to provide flexible instructions that will allow catalogers to record information in a way that is most appropriate to the needs of their users, without putting barriers in the way with specific conventions for recording things like dates, for example.

The JSC also looked at a proposal for persistent identifiers. The decision was not to distinguish between standard identifiers and other resource identifiers. RDA will distinguish between identifiers, which will be in Chapter 2, and URLs, which will be in Chapter 5.

The JSC agreed to the ALA proposal on notated music with some refinements. They have already consulted with Music Library Association members who expressed varying degrees of enthusiasm.

One of the initial mapping efforts between MARC and RDA led to the identification of a list of MARC data elements to be considered for addition to RDA. The list included preferred citation, scale for graphic content, and the date and time of an event. RDA may incorporate a different way of entering this information.

Alternative instructions for the numbering of serials were considered. Separate elements for beginning and ending chronology and enumeration were suggested. The use of four separate elements would allow the elements to be combined in whatever way was most useful and would provide the greatest flexibility for display of the information.

The JSC decided not to respond to the CONSER Standard Record proposal because it did not seem appropriate to anticipate whether the standard would be compatible with RDA. The JSC was interested in specific suggestions that were made and will be looking at them to see if there are any that would require changes to be made to RDA.

The JSC also dealt with comments from the Response Table [5JSC/RDA/Part I (9 Dec. 2005)] which were very miscellaneous, and included:

1. **Mode of issuance.** The JSC agreed that there needs to be a specific data element for "Mode of issuance" (i.e., whether a resource is issued as a single unit, issued in two or more parts simultaneously, issued in successive parts, or issued as an integrating resource). This would most likely be in Chapter 2.
2. **Sources of information.** This continues to be a difficult area and the JSC made some steps towards resolving issues.
3. **Concept of provenance.** The JSC decided to avoid the use of the term "provenance" in RDA since its meaning is not the same in different user communities. Revised instructions were

discussed regarding description of a collection or an archival resource; recording custodial history; and recording immediate source of acquisition. The word “provenance” might apply to all three of those concepts.

Weiss asked Attig if instructions would apply to archives, collections, and rare books. Attig responded that except for “creation,” which was a somewhat limited term, the other terms would be generally applicable.

4. The JSC decided that **alternative titles** would no longer be considered part of the title proper. Instead an element sub-type for “Alternative title” will be added. The JSC is looking at other types of titles to treat as element sub-types as well.

The RDA editor pointed out to the JSC that if you remove the alternative title and treat it as a separate sub-type, there is not a place for the “or” which is neither part of the title proper or the alternative title. This issue will be part of the mapping to ensure that it can be presented for display.

Constituency comments on the draft of Part I suggested a number of English language alternatives to the use of the term “unknown” when information is not available (e.g. “publisher unknown,” “place of publication unknown,” etc.). Because of the ambiguity of some of the alternatives and the placement of the instructions in the chapter on identification, it was decided to use “not identified” (e.g. “Publisher not identified,” “Place of publication not identified,” etc.).

Weiss raised the question about what would be done when the item we have is damaged, i.e., it is not that the information was not identified originally, but we do not have it available on the copy we are cataloging.

Attig agreed that this was a tricky situation since we share records and it needs to be looked at separately. If another copy is available, the cataloger could take advantage of it to identify what does not exist on the item the cataloger is working with.

Attig moved on to report on the discussion of the revised Chapters 6 and 7.

Legal works, religious works, official communications, and academic disputations will remain as separate rules in Chapter 6. CC:DA had recommended that they be integrated. Weiss asked if that would still be the case with respect to “academic disputations,” which Tillett pointed out had been deleted from the section on “additional instructions” and were now covered by the general instructions. The examples pertaining to “academic disputations” have been relocated to the appropriate general instruction in section 6.3.

Attig said that the JSC decided to leave “legal works” as a separate section of the rules. At the CC:DA meeting on Friday there were comments that it would be possible to identify and perhaps integrate them, but that did not appear to be the direction the JSC would follow.

Kathy Winzer indicated that a full discussion of this was held and she questioned whether that was what was said the day before about legal rules. Attig indicated that if this is still an issue, then it needs further discussion as it was just brought up tangentially on Friday.

Attig continued that in both Chapters 6 and 7 a decision was made to add terms for designation of role (6.2) and relationship (7.2). Work has begun on developing lists and definitions of the terms, which will be made available to the constituencies in the form of a discussion paper for constituency response. A limited number of examples have been included in the draft for Chapters 6 and 7 to illustrate how these terms might be used, although the terms given in these examples may not match the terms in the controlled vocabulary when it is developed. These terms will appear as an Appendix to RDA rather than

being imbedded in the actual rules. The Appendix will not be available until the end of the comment period for Chapter 7.

Attig then turned to Part B on Access Point Control. Because of the impact changes would have on existing access points and records, the JSC had a general discussion about the degree of change it was prepared to recommend. The more the JSC delved into specific questions, the more reasons it found to make changes. The question actually became: How good a reason does there have to be to recommend a change?

There was a lengthy discussion on such things as uniform titles: should they be required and, if so, what elements ought to be included? What would be the impact on existing practices and existing data? The JSC is trying to follow the draft of the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, which makes uniform titles an indispensable element and calls for uniform titles to be based on titles commonly known in the language of the catalog. Both of these features would be significant changes from current Anglo-American practice.

Weiss asked if the JSC was aware of how many people were averse to making major changes to the rules. Attig indicated that at the Big Heads [Heads of Technical Services of Large Research Libraries Discussion Group] meeting on Friday, there was agreement that we are in a much better position to deal with changes to the rules now than was true last time changes to Part B of AACR were implemented. Even so, the JSC is not making changes without careful consideration.

Attig mentioned the work of the Task Force on Non-English Access. His understanding is that RDA will call for data to be transcribed in the language and script of the resource, with alternatives to substitute or add transliterated data. This provides maximum flexibility and will allow customization for communities. Before anything is finalized, there are other decisions that have to be made.

Allgood indicated that this is a "principles" issue and it is difficult to determine what will work for all users. Catalogers may interpret data and use records differently than end-users. Mixing transcription, description, and access causes problems. He stated that it is useful to have principles to address this type of issue.

Weiss added that the RDA Element Analysis should make clear which elements are transcribed or supplied by the cataloger. Even if that cannot be done every time, the "permission" to allow it needs to be there. Attig agreed and said that it is well worth looking at as an issue. The JSC will be clear about this.

Weiss continued that it is important in our current environment to talk about the fact that the same record can be used for multiple purposes. He suggested we consider whether we want multiple records for different languages (as in WorldCat) or one record.

Attig said that the JSC has not dealt with this yet. Although the initial scope of RDA does not include data management, data management data will be increasingly important in a global shared cataloging environment.

Attig reminded CC:DA that Chapter 6 does not include rules for selecting a primary access point, and that nothing in Chapter 6 should be construed as pointing in that direction. If anything looks as if it is doing so, CC:DA needs to comment on where that occurs. The selection of primary access point will be covered in Chapter 13, which will include most of what was in AACR2 Chapters 21, 25 and 26. These will be a complicated set of specifications that will probably present the most dramatic changes from the comparable rules in AACR2.

At its meeting, the JSC also dealt with other specific issues relating to Part B, such as how to cover the naming of a work for an agreement between two or more national governments and one or more other jurisdictions. Attig will review these on Monday.

AACR2 has no chapter on family names. Family is a FRAD type 2 entity, and there is a placeholder for family names in RDA. Although the JSC discussed the nature of the instructions that should be included in RDA on formulating access points for family names, there is some question as to whether a set of rules can be pulled together since the international conventions for doing this are different from country to country. This might be an area that might need to be added after the initial release of RDA. On the other hand, this is a real opportunity to get something important into the rules. Some JSC members will be working on it. Weiss stressed that he wanted to make certain that the JSC was aware of the significant dissension in ALA on the topic. He suggested that the rules be simplified and less restrictive. Attig said that this falls into the same category that CC:DA just discussed in terms of needing to examine carefully the effects of changes on existing data and on the existing time frame for completion of RDA. There will be an opportunity for comment when the drafts are released, and Attig indicated that there was a great deal of sympathy on the part of the JSC for simplifying the rules.

Attig reported on the proposal relating to Bible uniform titles. The primary goal of the proposal was to remove the Christian and Protestant bias that is the basis for Bible headings. The issue turned out to be complicated and the JSC decided that the solutions that were proposed fell short of the goal.

One recommendation is to spell out “Old Testament” and “New Testament,” rather than using the existing AACR2 abbreviations “O.T.” and “N.T.” Another recommendation is to enter the titles of books in the Bible immediately following the heading “Bible” and not to include interpose “New Testament” or “Old Testament” in a hierarchical fashion. Weiss indicated that those were significant and positive decisions. Attig continued that the JSC wanted to know — given that there were so many other things that could have gone further — if these are changes worth implementing. Weiss said that they were. Attig indicated that CC:DA should continue the discussion on Monday.

Attig noted that RDA makes it clear at 1.4 that an element labeled as “required” is required only if applicable to the resource being described — i.e., there will now only be two labels: “required” and “optional.” The “required if applicable” label will no longer be used.

Weiss indicated that the two “required” categories are necessary. It is not always clear if a rule applies to a particular type of resource, so to indicate, for example, “required if this is a serial” would be helpful.

Randall asked if anyone would consider the title as not being applicable. Hillmann said that to a certain extent the determination of what is required belongs with special communities. In her experience it is easier to decide what to put into gaps in a record than it is to sort through what other people have put in. She suggested that the JSC label as few areas “required” as possible. She would even say nothing more than an identifier is required. Particular communities should define the level of detail needed.

Myers replied that as a generalist cataloger who deals primarily with monographs and then has to rapidly shift gears in order to deal with unfamiliar types of materials, he sees benefit in providing guidance for particular elements and for determining whether an element applies to a particular type of material. He clarified that he was not suggesting reverting back to the use of the term “required if applicable,” but that there needs to be consideration for how to convey information and RDA should indicate whether the element is applicable or not to different types of materials.

Attig replied that he was trying to figure out how best to bring this point to the JSC, if this is, in fact, what CC:DA wants him to do. He suggested that we think about “required” and “optional” in the context of Chapters 6 and 7. Weiss indicated that it would be easier to apply this to earlier chapters, and Attig agreed, but said that those chapters were not the chapters on the table. Hillmann reiterated that these decisions should be made in communities of interest. The decisions need to be made in the context of the materials being cataloged — not in the context of the rules in general.

Attig responded that in part what CC:DA was seeing was an attempt on the part of the JSC to maintain the generality of the rules, to which Weiss replied that he agreed with Hillmann.

Glennan said that while she generally agreed with Hillmann, the interested communities might not have the resources to do what Hillmann suggests. She did not see how the Music Library Association, for example, would create this. Also, there are plenty of generalists who have to deal with these “special” materials who will not go to other documents.

Attig moved on and reported the change of name of the JSC to the “Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA.” The CoP decided to invite the National Library of Australia to join the CoP. Its membership became effective immediately upon their acceptance of the invitation.

The Co-Publishers are proceeding with the development of the RDA product. The JSC and the Co-Publishers looked at a draft of the RFP for an online version, which went out in April. A vendor will be selected and will start work sometime in July. The JSC expects to see the results at the October JSC meeting.

The JSC asked the Co-Publishers to provide a revised prototype that can be used as a marketing tool. The Co-Publishers agreed to do this, but have not been clear as to whether this will be based on the actual system that is in development or if it will be another “canned” presentation. The JSC is hopeful that the revised prototype will better reflect the most recent decisions that have been made and that it will be available by spring, which would mean that we should be able to see it at the 2008 ALA Annual Conference.

Attig concluded that it had been a busy three months for him.

1003. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

[<http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/lc0706.doc>]

Barbara Tillett distributed copies of the LC Report. She reviewed sections of particular interest to CC:DA including the following: Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control (p. 2), Cataloging in Publication (p. 4-5), Cataloging Policy (p. 5), Subject authority records (p. 7), Library of Congress Classification (p. 7), and the Database Improvement Unit (p. 7). She indicated that the Bibliographic Access Divisions and Serials Records Division (p. 11) have lost staff, but are producing more because they are finding ways to automate tasks.

Tillett noted that the Cataloging Distribution Service continues to experience slower than desirable service to customers, due to a greater than 40% decrease in staff. However, no new staff can be hired at this time because of an administrative decision that was made to wait until the completion of LC’s centralized reorganization before hiring. Tillett indicated that she would appreciate hearing from anyone encountering problems with CDS.

Schmierer asked if the Task Force on the Future of Bibliographic Control would post a web cast of its July 9th meeting. It is her hope to see “democracy in action.” Tillett responded that while she did not have the specifics with her at the moment, the information could be found at a special public web site at the URL <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future>.

1004. Report from the CC:DA Task Force to Maintain “Differences Between, Changes Within”: Randall

Kevin Randall provided a report on the progress of the Task Force to Maintain “Differences Between, Changes Within.”

Because the Task Force already agreed upon changes to the original publication, the only work that remained to be done at the time of the 2007 Midwinter ALA Meeting was careful proofreading of the draft, submission of further corrections based on the original list of changes, proofreading the corrected revision, etc. until final publication. It had been anticipated that the final document would be available by

the 2007 Annual ALA Conference. This, however, did not turn out to be the case. ALCTS has not produced the product.

The Chair reported on two of the four recommendations that were included in the Final Report of the Task Force. Recommendation #3 stated that “Publications emanating from CC:DA should be self-published by CC:DA under a Creative Commons license, and made freely available in PDF format on the CC:DA web site.” Because the products of ALCTS groups are the intellectual property of ALA, recommendation #3 could not be implemented. Recommendation #4 indicated that “If documents cannot be self-published by CC:DA, there must be a clear plan in place for working with ALCTS on editing and proofreading, to ensure accurate and timely publication (and revisions, when appropriate). The Chair stated that ALCTS is willing to work with CC:DA on this recommendation; CC:DA can do its own editing and producing of documents.

Schmierer requested that a version without color be made available as not everyone has a color printer available. Randall did not recall if color was used; he noted that shading was used.

This document will be made freely available to everyone and not just to ALCTS members. Randall will send out announcements when the corrected version is available.

Rhonda K. Lawrence [from audience] from the Law Library at the University of California, Los Angeles, identified herself as a member of the Task Force. She stated that Randall deserved “so much credit for shepherding this through, you have no idea.” She indicated that she was the co-author of three library-related publications. Never before has she seen such a nightmare: there did not even appear to be an automatic spell check in operation. The intervention with ALCTS that Randall had to go through included submitting a document that kept coming back with errors that had not been there before, including extraneous characters. Revisions that the Task Force requested a year ago were only now being made. The intrusion of ALCTS effectively delayed the product by more than a year. Lawrence requested that the Chair of CC:DA take this matter up with ALCTS. She clarified that this was “her opinion and not necessarily that of the Task Force.”

Allgood indicated that he shared Lawrence’s view, and underscored the fact that Randall had to do things over and over, and “above the call of duty.” There was resounding applause for Randall’s work on this.

The Chair said that she could go back to the CCS Executive Committee and request a clear statement of the ALCTS publishing process policy, with specific guidelines to be followed. This information should be publicly available, and identify specific deliverables.

Weiss agreed that it would be good for the ALCTS office to hear CC:DA’s concerns about the way this Task Force’s publication was handled by ALCTS. The Chair said that she could take the matter before the CCS Executive Committee and reinforce the nature of the problems that the Task Force encountered. Schmierer suggested that the Chair might want to add that if ALCTS had its guidelines publicly available, it could avoid many of these problems.

The Chair thanked Randall again.

1005. Report from the CC:DA Task Force to Review the Draft “Functional Requirements for Authority Records”: Thérroux

[CC:DA/TF/FRAD/3]

Thérroux indicated that the Task Force had only a relatively short time to review the draft. Her own contribution consisted of compiling the comments to the draft into a 24-page document. She initially thought about separating the editorial comments, but decided it would be simpler just to put all the comments together.

Weiss moved that “CC:DA authorize the ALA response to the draft of the Functional Requirements for Authority Data based on the final report of the Task Force.” The Chair asked for discussion.

Weiss expressed concern with the use of the entity-relationship model. He was concerned that the document was trying to model data and not trying to model the entities upon which our systems work. He also was troubled by the “library centrism.” Those were important things, “so bravo for writing that” in the report.

McGarry said that the comment about “terms of reference” in the report should be deleted because “terms of reference” is just the IFLA phrase for “charge.”

Schmierer added that having worked on the CC:DA Task Force that produced the first report, she was interested in knowing if the members of the Task Force working on the second report thought progress was being made. It seemed to her that the second report offered the same comments and objections as the first one.

Thérout replied that members thought some progress was made, but not as much as they would have liked. Glennan agreed. There had been some clean up and some reorganization. The draft did not reflect everything the Task Force suggested. The things not acted upon are in the current report. Thérout said that there had been discussions about whether the relationship between creator and work was addressed and the Task Force did not think it had been addressed specifically. The Task Force wondered if this should be brought out a little more and would accept suggestions for language about that.

The Chair asked what CC:DA thought about adding additional language about that and Weiss indicated he would support it. Schmierer added that the last report and this report did not address the issues “squarely.”

Patton said that one of the interesting things about working on this document was to be involved with people who come out of cataloging traditions that are very different from the one in which we work, i.e., the MARC21 environment. Most of what is seen in the document is as much related to the UNIMARC tradition as it is to MARC21. In some cases UNIMARC differs structurally from MARC21. In addition, other traditions have different perspectives on things like pseudonyms. In some traditions the concept of multiple identities separately named does not exist. So “we are juggling a lot of different views of the world.”

Patton added that one of the comments that he remembered from the first report was about the whole area of the management of information through series authority records. If you do not come out of that tradition, there is no concept of a series authority record and no information about how you would trace the information or whether you record publication data as part of it.

Weiss pointed out that the fact that there are such different traditions makes it even more important that we worry about modeling the entities first and the data later.

Thérout said that while there may be good reasons for naming a separate entity as opposed to an attribute, the Task Force did not think the reasons were expressed clearly enough and it was not worth introducing all of the extra complexity that it would have taken. That was an extension of FRBR that was questioned.

Allgood added that part of the difficulty was that they were to note practices as they existed as opposed to looking at the entity relationship. In some sense the CC:DA Task Force was trying to push things more in that direction, but doing so goes against the charge of FRANAR. He thought that if the charge could be revised, then the entity relationship could be more fully realized. He also pointed out that many of the entities within the FRAD report were combined with both entities and attributes of other entities and that seemed confusing.

Schmierer said that she did not think it was appropriate for CC:DA to write to IFLA and suggest that they change the charge. She did think it would be appropriate to suggest something along the lines of what Weiss said about a better product being achieved if an entity-attribute model was issued and distributed for comment before fleshing out the entire thing. That approach could be more fruitful.

Martha Yee [from audience] replied that she wondered if the entity-relationship model was the problem. What we need to be able to do is to identify works by their principle creator and we also need to think of the principle creator as an entity. The entity-relationship model assumes that you have to make something an entity or a relationship. Yee said she does not think that works for the way we identify works. She questioned whether this was the right model for our data.

Allgood said that he agreed with Schmierer: that if the words more approximated “entity,” then FRAD would be more closely paralleled with FRBR.

Weiss replied that hindsight is 20/20. What we now can see about these models is that when modeling data we should not have FRBR and FRAD. We should have functional requirements for bibliographic entities and functional requirements for responsible entities (or whatever we call them). Things like series should be dealt with in one place. Whether that is in the bibliographic record or the authority record is not important to the model. The question is about entities; then we can think about how to implement the data.

The Chair asked if there was other discussion. Since no one had anything to add, she called for a vote. The motion carried.

Weiss asked if the Task Force would be discharged. The Chair replied that the Task Force would be discharged once the comments from the discussion were incorporated into the response for IFLA.

Weiss said that he thought the operating assumption was that this would be the last round of reviewing this draft. Patton replied that this was his assumption as well.

1006. Report of the ALA representative to NISO: Landesman

The Chair announced that the next item was to be a report from the NISO representative, who was not currently present. As a result, the Committee would move on to the last item of the day until the NISO representative was present.

[Note: the NISO Representative, Betty Landesman, was unavoidably detained and did not make the CC:DA meeting; she did, however, submit the following report.]

1. Standards update

All ISO standards

International Standard Music Number (March) – CC:DA indicated we should support it; U.S. vote was yes with comments

The 5 ISO standards up for five-year review – no comments

- Guidelines for the content, organization and presentation of indexes – U.S. vote was to confirm
- Guidelines for the establishment and development of monolingual thesauri – U.S. vote was to revise
- Methods for examining documents, determining their subjects, and selecting indexing terms – U.S. vote was to revise
- Guidelines for the establishment and development of multilingual thesauri – U.S. vote was to revise

- International Standard Audiovisual Number – U.S. vote was to confirm

Let me know if anyone wants copies of the comments submitted for the 3 “revised” standards.

2. NISO news

NISO headquarters moved to Baltimore. Phone numbers etc. remain the same. Karen Wetzel was named Standards Program Manager. An Education Committee was formed, chaired by Karen Wetzel.

3. SERU

A working group on Shared E-Resource Understanding [SERU] has been formed, to develop a best practices statement that will support a new license-free mechanism for buying and selling electronic resources. The draft best practices document is available on the NISO web site.

4. Proposed bylaws changes

Highlights:

The Standards Development Committee was replaced by an Architecture Committee, charged with maintaining the NISO Framework and using it to direct the overall standards program. The Architecture Committee recommends the creation of Topic Committees which create detailed plans for an area of standards work and manage standards development and maintenance in those areas.

The existing structure of the entire voting membership constituting the Consensus Body was replaced by the creation of a Voting Pool for each potential action (creating new standard, approving revision of a standard, reaffirming a standard, withdrawing a standard). All members may join the voting pool for any action. For new standards, the Topic Committee creates the initial voting pool; for 5-year reviews, NISO creates the voting pools before work begins on evaluating the existing standard. The member designates the individual who will act as the voting representative for this action.

Members are currently asked to vote every 5 years on every standard. In the proposed procedures, the NISO office notifies members of all standards that are up for reaffirmation in any year. Voting members may join the voting pool for any standard. When the voting pool is formed, a Topic Committee or the NISO Office will task an individual or group with reviewing the existing standard and making a recommendation to the voting pool.

The proposed changes are undergoing a comment period, to end July 13.

5. ALA events

After a hiatus, NISO has resumed its presentations and meetings during ALA. At this conference:

On Friday afternoon, there was a NISO/Book Industry Study Group forum on the changing standards landscape.

On Sunday the NISO update will be from 4-5:30 at the Mayflower, New York Room.

On Monday the Automation Vendors Information Advisory Committee will meet from 2-3:30 at the Renaissance, Room 7.

6. Goodbye ...

This concludes my 4th year (2 terms) as the ALCTS representative to NISO. I'm sorry I was not there to thank CC:DA in person for all the input they have provided over these years. This was often the only committee I heard from, and I really appreciate CC:DA's interest and support in the standards process.

The new representative is Cindy Hepfer from the University of Buffalo.

Thanks (and apologies) again!
Betty Landesman

1007. Discussion on responding to LCRI change proposals: Chair

The Chair asked if CC:DA wanted to respond to LCRI change proposals. By way of background, the Chair explained that CC:DA responded to the proposed LCRI changes regarding AACR2-compatible headings. In the past, CC:DA did not comment on LCRIs. Did CC:DA want to make comments on all or some LCRI change proposals? If only some, how will CC:DA decide which to comment upon? She asked that CC:DA keep its workload in mind.

Maxwell said that he liked the idea of CC:DA making comments. Weiss agreed with Maxwell that responding to LCRIs was certainly within the charge of CC:DA. He suggested that CC:DA deal with this on a case-by-case basis. The Chair or one of the interns could keep track of the proposed LCRIs. He thought CC:DA could decide whether to respond based on time and interest.

Mangan indicated that the question was not if responding to LCRIs was within the CC:DA's charge. She noted that LC does not always request comments, and she wondered what their position on this is.

Weiss said that CC:DA should respond whenever LC requests comments. This only happens a few times a year.

Schmierer said that if CC:DA was going to respond to one LCRI, then CC:DA should respond to all of them, even if just to comment that CC:DA did not have the expertise to comment. She noted that asking for comments might be a new mode of operation for LC and issuing responses might become a strenuous activity for CC:DA.

Myers added that given the rarity of instances that responses are requested, he recommended that CC:DA follow the suggestion made by Weiss: i.e., keep an eye out for any LCRI proposals that are issued and decide if we want to respond or not. As Schmierer said, there will be some for which the only response CC:DA can give is to say that we do not have anything to contribute to the exchange.

Weiss disagreed with Schmierer. CC:DA chooses issues it wants to work on all the time. He said that LC does not need extra emails. Maxwell said that he agreed with Weiss and noted that if there are issues about which constituencies feel left out, they can send a response, too.

Glennan said that there was recently an LCRI under discussion that concerned music, and individuals within the Music Library Association were encouraged to respond, both as individuals and as a group. She indicated we also do not know how LC weighs responses from individuals vs. groups.

Théroux said that her experience was very similar to Glennan's. Some individuals have multiple channels through which they can respond, for example, she has access to the CCC and PCC lists, and can contribute to an overall Yale response. As long as LC does not care if it gets some of these same comments over and over again, she has no objection to CC:DA responding. Maxwell interjected that he did not think it was CC:DA's role to find out what LC thinks. If LC requests a response, then CC:DA should provide one.

Weiss added that sometimes the response from LC says that "we got a number of comments on ...", so obviously they do read the comments.

Judith Kuhagen, LC [from audience], said that usually there are a dearth of comments. LC is glad to get them. LC usually knows that if a person sends an individual response, his/her perspective might be different than the perspective of the membership to which he/she belongs. She indicated that what Weiss

was saying was correct: do not worry about sending duplicate responses since they all go into a “hopper” and LC makes the decisions.

The Chair indicated that the problem with LCRIs is the timeframe, since there is usually a short turnaround.

Weiss suggested that if someone cared about a specific issue, we would respond, and if there was not special interest, then CC:DA would not respond.

The Chair said she will apply the consensus decision as was stated.

Introduction of Resolution

Myers moved to adopt the following resolution:

Whereas Mary Larsgaard served in multiple capacities on CC:DA between 1997 and 2007, to wit, voting member, chair, and special consultant;

Whereas she has served as member and chair on several committee Task Forces (including chairing several outside of her normal area of expertise when no one else could be drafted), to wit, the Task Force on the Rule of Three, the Task Force for the Review of “Guidance on the Structure, Content, and Application of Metadata Records for Digital Resources and Collections,” the Task Force to Investigate CC:DA’s Web Presence, the Task Force to review ISBD(CR), and the Task Force on SMDs, among others;

Whereas she has imparted her warm and perspective-inducing sense of humor on all of her committee work, as well as provided wise and cheerful counsel to all, but especially to interns and incoming chair alike;

Whereas she was instrumental in offering to host and establishing the initial use of a wiki product to facilitate greatly the extensive committee discussions between meetings, particularly those on the drafts of the nascent AACR3 and RDA;

Whereas she channeled Solomon while chairing the discussions of the drafts of the same, seeing that the committee met its charge to provide concrete feedback on the content of the drafts but also allowing a place at the table for voices to express concerns with the overall process and general makeup of the drafts;

Therefore be it resolved that CC:DA recognizes Mary Larsgaard with our hearty thanks and appreciation for her years of invaluable service during a crucial period of the committee’s work.”

The Chair asked for a voice vote. The motion carried and was met with much applause.

The session was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.

Monday, June 25, 2007 — 8:00 to 10:00 a.m.
Renaissance M Street, New Hampshire Ballroom

1008. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Cheri Folkner, Chair, opened the meeting at 8:00 a.m. She welcomed Committee voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1009. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Donald E. Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Chatham said that he would talk about several issues first, and then open it up for questions. The topics to be covered included the RFP that went out to prospective vendors; the RDA development plan in general; the survey on print needs; marketing plans and expectations for RDA; project management; and data modeling. He said that he would begin with the RFP, which he thought was the most important item.

The project of developing the RFP for the online RDA product was extensive, and was reviewed with the JSC, the CoP, and the Co-Publishers. It included a summary of the technical requirements.

The RFP was sent out to seven vendors, three of whom met the basic requirements. At the moment internal discussions are still ongoing, so none of the three vendors have been contacted. Chatham said he would be happy to relay further information about that process at a later time when it is appropriate to do so.

Of the three top vendors, one is from the U.S., one from the UK, and one from Canada, “which is a nice international twist.” The RFP was analyzed by a database consultant, Nannette Naught, from IMT (Information Management Team), hired by ALA on behalf of the Co-Publishers. She was very helpful in identifying those vendors who most closely matched the requirements. IMT also reviewed the standards and met with Chatham’s team several times.

The three vendors are scheduled to make presentations on July 9, 2007. The RFP includes an authoring/editing system which will provide a dual screen, allowing the JSC and constituent groups (under the direction of the JSC) to revise or edit the content. It appears that this is a good software system. It will be introduced at the October meeting of the JSC.

It is expected that the product will be released in spring 2009. Until that time the database developer will work with draft content, recognizing that there may be changes required at the end of the process. The hope is that the framework for the functional requirements will be close to finished by that time.

The Co-Publishers will hold several application design sessions in advance of programming in order to capture the logic behind the cataloging process and identify additional metadata tags. The robust functionality — the creation of the metadata — will be the “most tricky and the most valuable part.” Vendor requirements must be coordinated to make the system work together, and the metadata will help the development group to speak to a nonlinear online product as well as to a print product. “So a lot of the work will just be taking it out and talking about the process, and the requirements for programming that went into the product.” This will be accomplished by developing and testing several prototypes throughout the process to make certain that it works, in a conscious effort to think through everything and keep down the costs before the actual programming is started.

Chatham reported that the development group is working with a marketing advisory group that will discuss marketing issues with the JSC and help to develop some of the messages that will resonate with the various customers.

The marketing advisory group, “which is proving to be tremendously helpful,” includes:

- Andrea Kappler, Technical Services, Evansville, IN
- Diane Casey, Governors State University
- Ed Jones, Bibliographic and Metadata Services Coordinator, National University, San Diego, CA
- Cheryl Tarsala, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
- Joseph Kiegel, Head of Acquisitions, Monographic Services Division, University of Washington
- Mary Charles Lasater, Vanderbilt University
- Mary Larsgaard, past chair, CC:DA, University of California, Santa Barbara

- Deborah Fritz, MARC database consultant
- Magda El-Sherbini, Associate Professor, Head, Cataloging Department, The Ohio State University Libraries

There will be a functioning prototype at the IFLA meeting in August 2008.

Development includes periodic updates to vendors so that they can be working with their ILS products to arrange for any system modifications. The preliminary feedback has been that this relationship is going well. It is also important to keep the vendors well apprised of what is going on with the online product. The plan is to have the functionalities in place by the time that the final manuscript is completed.

Implementation plans will be coordinated with the Implementation Task Force.

A survey — which is available at <http://rdaonline.org> — is being used to get a sense of perceived needs. It includes the prototype that was developed about a year ago. In part, the survey will find out the need for a print product, but it is also being used to get a feel for possible features and needs of the online product.

Although the survey indicated that there was broad support for an online option, between 21 and 27% of the respondents still prefer print. A conscious effort is being made not to overproduce a print product because of the update costs, the problems with synchronization, etc. There also is an attempt to move in the direction of the ultimate objective, which would be to provide for the print needs in the online product.

One of the issues being investigated is to account for how people behave in an online environment. A good example is social tagging. A number of discussions are taking place to talk about including such an option, and to see how it would operate in a cataloging environment. The proponents of social tagging never talk about it as a substitute, but rather as the kind of thing that would be brought into an online catalog. Such features could be available in an online format but not in a print format. The online product is important to the way RDA will develop in the future.

As for marketing, a number of conference calls have taken place with the Co-Publishers. It has been important to analyze and discuss pre-sell efforts as well as product promotion across markets. The goal is to develop and coordinate an international marketing plan.

Project management is coordinating with the JSC and the Co-Publishers and is focusing on converting project plans to Microsoft Project. That work is underway but not yet in place. Work on four of the five project plans has begun.

A logo is being designed. It is important to make certain that the logo can capture the message about what the product is trying to do and to help convey what the product is. The Canadian Library Association is working on this.

Chatham said that he wanted to reinforce the Co-Publishers's appreciation to everyone who participated in the Data Model Meeting. It created a lot of enthusiasm for the potential of the RDA product. "A lot of meeting of the minds took place and we were very happy with the outcome, and the move towards coordination." Tillet and Tom Delsey have already started to work on some of the ideas that came out of this meeting.

Chatham pointed out that Jenni Fry, the internal editor for the product, has done a lot of good work on the RFP. She is a librarian and has an electronic publishing background, and is the expert in technology.

The print survey, the results of which should be available on July 15, was the next item to be discussed by Chatham.

Two surveys were conducted: one with catalogers and the other with library educators. As stated earlier, the results indicated that while the majority of respondents were anticipating the advantages of an online version, 21 to 27% still prefer a print version.

Chatham provided an overview of the general survey—i.e., the one that was given to non-educators.

1. Do you prefer online access to reference works in general (definitely preferred, mostly preferred, or were fine with either online or print): 71% preferred online, while 22% preferred print (7% indicated that it depended on the content).
2. Would you use the online version if you did not have ready access to a print version: 67% said “yes.”
3. Would an online version be a suitable alternative to print: 46% anticipated that it would be, while 27% indicated that it would not be.
4. Would an online version be more reliable than a print version: 41% anticipated that it would be, while 24% thought it would not be.

With respect to the educators’ survey:

1. Do you prefer online access to reference works in general (definitely preferred, mostly preferred, or were fine with either online or print): 76% preferred online, while 22% preferred print.
2. Would you use the online version if you did not have ready access to a print version: 70% said “yes.”
3. Would you like an educational view of RDA for cataloging instruction: 73% said “yes.”

Chatham said that it was a good response from a number of respondents.

Weiss asked approximately how many educators responded, and did Chatham think that the word got out to educators about the survey? Chatham responded that he was not sure.

An audience member replied to Weiss’ question, stating that the library education community did get the word about the survey; it was announced through the Association for Library and Information Science Education. Once that announcement went out, there were a number of educators who targeted specific email discussion lists that are read by that community.

Hillmann raised a question about the marketing effort: were the UK partners making an effort to discuss the potential use of RDA in other western European countries? She added that there is a strong interest in RDA, especially in Germany and France, and that it would be good to determine the concerns in other countries vs. English-only concerns. She added that this was particularly important in terms of future development.

Chatham replied that the UK territory includes all of Europe and Australia, and he knew that Helen Carley, his counterpart in publishing in the UK, is conscious of the needs of different European countries.

Hillmann reiterated that the emphasis needed to be on the internationalization of RDA.

Weiss asked about translation plans, since there is only a short time between publication and implementation of RDA. Chatham responded that he did not have a good answer to that except to say that everyone is conscious of the need to address this issue.

Tillett said that volunteers from groups are available to do translations in French, German, and Spanish and noted that they were in contact with these international groups. The JSC recognizes that this is an important aspect of outreach and it is making an effort to do this. The internationalization of RDA is a vital aspect of the whole project.

Groups will get documents for translating presumably when the publishers get them, i.e., when they are complete. Chatham indicated that he has had requests to see drafts, but that it is not appropriate to

distribute these as yet. The Co-Publishers want to get a better sense of what they are doing with the online project first.

Chatham confirmed that outreach efforts have been central to this whole process, and that marketing is an especially important aspect. He indicated that “we are focusing almost on a street level; we are going out to see who are our customers and how do we engage them in this process. We are not exactly selling this, but we are trying to see how we can make the most of the outreach efforts that the JSC has been doing, and then incorporate that into the overall outreach process.” The marketing personnel discuss who the customers are, how to engage them, what their needs are, and how RDA will meet those needs. This will result in sales.

Weiss asked if the translators will have access to the software, or just the print, and wondered if the Co-Publishers had thought about that aspect. Chatham replied that a lot would depend on local needs, but that the Co-Publishers would like to see the translators take the lead to develop an online product. He pointed out that there are a lot of unknowns with respect to the online version. He added that because of the nature of RDA, it was important to maintain a relationship with all the international communities who are participants.

Adam Schiff [from audience] asked if Chatham had any preliminary thoughts about the print product as a result of the tentative survey results? Was there any thinking that the Co-Publishers might not want any print product at all?

Chatham indicated that if anything, the survey results reinforce the fact that there has to be an option for print. The only concern is the possibility that once people see the online product and the variety of options that are available there, the requirement for a print product might not be as strong as it appears to be now.

Twenty-four months ago, Chatham thought that the print option was needed by reference publishers. Now he notes a “sea of change” in that impression. At the last meeting, all of the focus was the online product. The thinking is, that under any scenario, there will be some need for the print product. Questions remain as to how much need there is for print, and how difficult it will be to keep the online and print products in sync. What will be the needs for updating the print copy — after every change, or once or twice a year? It will be difficult to synchronize those efforts, so there could be a lot of complications, especially initially.

Allgood said that he just wanted to say as a follow-up to Chatham’s comments that if the results of the survey were showing that 22% of the general respondents were indicating that they preferred a print reference, then that said to him that there was, at least initially, a need for a print product.

Attig indicated that he wanted to make two statements by way of wrapping up. The first was that this group has traditionally held that the value of the cataloging rules was enhanced by integration with the other tools we use. He thought that CC:DA very much wanted to encourage the discussions that the Co-Publishers will be having about licensing RDA content to other developers.

Secondly, Attig wanted to reinforce and thank Chatham for his encouragement and support of the Data Model Meeting. “This meeting was tremendously important, and you had a lot to do with its success. And we all appreciate that.”

1010. Report from the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access: Beth Picknally Camden

[Report]

Camden thanked CC:DA for inviting her to provide this report, and said that she would give a brief overview and then move on to questions.

The ALCTS Executive Committee established the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access in October 2005 with the following charge:

The Task Force shall examine ALA's past, present, and potential future roles in enabling access to library resources in all languages and scripts and in addressing the needs of users of materials in all languages and scripts through the development of library standards and practices.

Information from ALCTS and outside groups, as well as CC:DA, RLG, OCLC, etc. was pulled together to write this report, which was not an exhaustive study but rather a summary of what took place. The comment period began in September 2006 and ran through the end of the year.

The Task Force also held a conference at the ALA 2007 Midwinter meeting, and provided a web form for people to provide additional comments. Many of the comments that were received concerned editorial changes. These, along with two recommendations, were added to a revised report. The final version was published on March 16 and is available on the ALCTS web site, along with all of the comments that were received. The Task Force was discharged and a new group appointed. One of the members of the original Task Force, Glenn Patton, is a member of the new steering committee, thus providing some continuity. The charge for the new steering committee is to keep moving on providing additional recommendations.

Two of the recommendations made specifically mention CC:DA:

- #3 Recommends that CC:AAM and/or the CC:DA be charged to work with PCC to review and update the core level supplement on "Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets", and set a high priority on getting started in Spring 2007.
- #4 Recommends that CC:DA and CC:AAM consider and comment on any impact that the new rules will have on cataloging non-English materials. This effort should begin as soon as possible for initial review, but continue throughout the programming and implementation periods, and beyond.

Those were the two sections that specifically referenced CC:DA, but the Committee could comment on any other sections as well.

Camden stressed again that the ALCTS Board was very interested in seeing follow-up to the recommendations of the Task Force begin, and that programming was already being planned for the 2008 ALA Annual involving both CCS and public library groups.

Attig said that the JSC discussed this issue at its April meeting, and thinks that the maximum flexibility will be provided for non-English access. "The rules will allow you to do a variety of things, but it won't be until the implementation phase that we will really know what people are going to do."

1011. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2007/2 (preliminary)]

Allgood said that he would take the documents in the order in which they were discussed at the MARBI meeting.

Proposal No. 2007-04: Use of field 520 for content advice statements in the MARC 21 bibliographic format:

- Approved unanimously, with minor editorial revision.

Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP06: Representation of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) system in the MARC 21 formats:

- Will come back as a series of proposals.

Proposal No. 2007-05: Definition of 022 subfields for recording the linking ISSN (ISSN-L) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority, and Holdings Formats

- Approved unanimously.

Discussion Paper No. 2007-DP05: Data elements needed to ascertain copyright fact:

- Engendered extensive discussions. This was the second time it came before the Committee and it will come back to MARBI as a proposal.

Proposal No. 2007-06: Changes for the German and Austrian conversion to MARC 21:

- Each of the thirteen separate proposals was approved except for one, 06/4, which deals with the normalization of names. No agreement could be reached on this proposal that addresses the specific needs of German and Austrian communities that are converting to MARC 21 from a format that they have used for many years, Maschinelles Austauschformat für Bibliotheken (MAB), Automated Library Exchange Format. Marjorie Bloss agreed to work with these communities towards achieving the goal of greater internationalization and sharing of information.

Attig reminded everyone that in terms of the MARC21 implementation for RDA, we are on a tight timeframe. He added that he was interested in any suggestions about how to make this work.

Allgood responded that there were actually a couple of conversations and comments relative to this that did come up, such as to split numbering for serials into different elements.

Attig said that another thing is that German and Austrian libraries rely heavily on identifiers and because of that the JSC formally added identifiers to RDA.

Myers asked about treating the alternative title as a separate data element: was there anything in the works for parsing the 245 into two separate sub-elements in the MARC format? Attig replied that this will be one of the issues on the JSC's list for further discussion. Field 245 is one of those fields that is the least amenable to revision in the current timeframe, and it also has a limited number of subfields. What has been done in breaking out various types of subtitles will be important in implementation.

Allgood said that came up Sunday at the CONSER meeting. The 245 field is transcription, but 246's are not always strictly aligned with transcription. He wondered if we are moving away from transcription to improve access, and where that puts us in the time in between.

The Chair asked if there were other questions for Allgood [there were none].

1012. Report from the CC:DA Task Force to Review the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles: Allgood

[CC:DA/TF/Statement of International Cataloguing Principles/3]

Allgood thanked CC:DA for this opportunity to speak. He said he especially wanted to thank the Task Force members because "they really kept me on target." Even though there were very interesting and wide-ranging discussions, the members made certain that the Task Force did not stray too far from the matter at hand.

The members of the Task Force are John Attig, Laurel Jizba, Ed Jones, Robert Maxwell, Hideyuki Morimoto, Dorothy McGarry, and Keiko Suzuki.

The Task Force met once during the 2007 ALA Midwinter meeting, and followed-up via e-mail and a wiki after that. Allgood indicated that the Task Force tried to limit their comments to the "big picture," and concentrated on:

- Issues of scope

- Access points and not identifiers
- Form of uniform title (Attig reiterated what he said on Friday: that there is a high degree of overlap of this issue with Part B in RDA)
- Language and script
- Issues concerning indispensable access points.

The Task Force also prepared a much more detailed analysis and will revisit it when the Statement is put out for worldwide review.

Tillett said she appreciated what the Task Force has been looking into and asked if programming for ALA was part of the Task Force's charge? The response was that programming is not explicitly stated in the Task Force charge.

Attig asked what the timeline was to be with respect to this endeavor.

Tillett said that at the Fifth IFLA Meeting of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code (IME ICC5) that is to be held August 14-15, 2007 in Pretoria, South Africa, they planned to have discussions about the same issues that are being discussed here. After those issues are resolved, there will be a final round of meetings sometime around November or December 2007. In January or February, more discussions will be held with the international communities and then in April or May—or even as late as June—the next draft will go back to IFLA's Cataloguing Section and they can respond as well.

A more broad-ranging distribution than IFLA is being considered for comment, but that would make the timeframe about 6 months. It is hoped that by September or October there will be some response back—i.e., before 2008. Tillett did not anticipate that anything will change significantly at this point, because the changes that have already been made are significant. She felt “pretty comfortable” at this pass, although uniform titles and controlled vocabulary—even though those issues were started in 2003—are still big concerns.

Tillett added that CC:DA will want to make a formal response.

Allgood said that this tied in with the RDA development schedule, and might allow more time for the ALA effort in that direction.

Schmierer indicated that it might be interesting to use this document to initiate a discussion on the perspective of access, and then use that as a bridge for further discussion on an international level.

1013. Report from the CC:DA Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication: Smart

[CC:DA/TF/Communication/3]

Smart began by saying that the Task Force has been busy working on all of the areas with which it has been charged.

The Task Force has established a wiki. It has been proceeding with its first charge (“Charge A”), which was to review the work of the relevant past task forces, including the Task Force on Communication and Outreach (operating 1994-1995) and the Task Force to Investigate CC:DA's Web Presence (operating 2004). The 1994-1995 Task Force created two printed brochures (with online versions) for external distribution:

- Building International Database and Cataloging Standards in Cooperation with American, Australian, British and Canadian Partners: The American Library Association (ALA) and the Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access (CC:DA), which described CC:DA's mandate and working process; and

- *How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA*, which provided instructions on contributing to the AACR2 editorial revision process.

The Task Force's recommendation is to update the first document to correspond with RDA. Prior to doing that, the Task Force would like to gather further information about the needs of American and international catalogers. There was a question as to whether or not such a document should be formally published, especially in light of problems that have been encountered with using ALCTS as a publisher. It might be better to keep it as an electronically distributed document.

The second document obviously cannot be revised until RDA is completed. At that time, small changes will need to be made to keep it consistent with RDA.

The Task Force assessed the nature of CC:DA's external communications ("Charge B"), most of which is accomplished via the CC:DA web presence and announcements sent to the CC:DA distribution list. In addition, CC:DA will be creating a public email list to propagate information about the committee's work further. Generally, CC:DA's external communication falls into three general areas: information about the committee's scope and charge; information about international cataloging standards and CC:DA's role in their creation and revision; and news of CC:DA's current activities.

With respect to internal communication ("Charge C"), most of that occurs via the CC:DA's email list, along with its wiki/web, and appears to be working well.

The Task Force would like to take a look at any emerging technologies that could be used to automate some of the work that is currently required to discuss and edit documents, which is extremely time consuming. Right now it requires volunteers to add documents to the wiki — an exercise in cutting and pasting from one format to another — and to review the wiki space once discussion ends in order to collect the comments and summarize the issues and proposed solutions. The current wiki environment does not allow concurrent commenting/editing, which leads to a small risk of committee members overwriting the work of each other.

The Task Force has not yet looked into the functional requirements for software ("Charge D") and will wait to do so until it can complete its evaluation of the full nature of CC:DA's internal and external communication.

"Charge E" involved assessing the nature of web site documents. Documents on the web sites serve both internal and external communication purposes. CC:DA documents exist in multiple formats — including HTML, PDF, and DOC. That can introduce errors. The Task Force plans to take a closer look at the various formats and choose one that everyone can use.

Another problem is that the CC:DA web space continues to be split between servers at ALA and at the Penn State University Library, and CC:DA has additional web space for wikis. Smart pointed out that Attig has done a wonderful job of indexing everything by subject so that people can have that kind of access across documents. The Task Force is hoping to consolidate the two web sites, and is thinking that there may be a better opportunity to do so now that ALCTS is redesigning its web site.

Smart said that in recognition of Attig's new position as ALA Representative to the JSC, the Task Force recommended that CC:DA appoint a new webmaster to be responsible for the migration of the CC:DA's various web sites to ALA servers and the ongoing maintenance of the new web site. This position should be formalized with the creation of an additional position on CC:DA (as an "ex-officio" member).

The Task Force would like to formalize "whatever knowledge is within John's head," such as how the document numbering scheme works, the retention schedule, the archiving and preservation of documents, etc. This information will impact the software that is selected for the web site.

The next step is to summarize what the Task Force has done and to evaluate some of the software that is being used. This includes looking at any of the internal lists from 1995 that might need to be updated, as well as looking at international cataloging principles and standards to see which of those require updating.

Schiff [from audience] asked if the new position would be an appointment for a limited time. Smart indicated that was what she thought would occur.

Attig said that if it is to be an ex-officio appointment, it may be governed by ALCTS rules. He suggested that it should be taken to the Executive Committee with a tentative recommendation.

The Chair replied that she had already talked with Charles Wilt, the Executive Director of ALCTS, and he approved of the idea. He suggested treating it like an editor position. The typical length of an appointment for an editor is three years. The position would be as a nonvoting member since the individual's sole responsibility would be the web site and nothing else.

Weiss moved that CC:DA appoint a nonvoting member to serve as webmaster. The Chair asked for further discussion.

Schiff indicated that the CC:DA procedures needed to be changed to put in this new position. He also said that the term of the appointment needed to be included.

Weiss pointed out that this would not be an "ex-officio" position, because it was not in virtue of another office. He added that he was fine with leaving the term of office up to the Chair [to which there was general agreement].

Maxwell indicated that there might need to be some negotiating with the individual.

Attig added that "the tricky thing will be getting someone up to speed."

Weiss asked Smart if the Task Force had any suggestions for a webmaster. Smart replied that it did not at the moment, but that it planned to come up with a suggestion in the near future.

The Chair asked for a voice vote on the motion. The motion carried.

Attig said that he wanted to comment on document format. Early on, because it was a web site, he tended to do a lot of the documents in HTML. Now almost all of these were produced as either word or PDF documents. The exceptions were documents like the agenda and the minutes, which are still done in HTML because they contain hyperlinks to other documents. His impression was that the links are not much used. If this is the case, then a decision could be made to do the minutes as Word documents without any of the links.

The rest of it, Attig continued, was not a tremendous amount of work.

To which Smart responded, "Every little bit helps," a sentiment that was repeated by Attig.

The Chair asked if CC:DA wanted to decide at this point whether the documents should be in Word or PDF format. The consensus was to go with PDF.

Schmierer asked if the person who is appointed as webmaster would try to use the ALA web site or continue to use the Penn State Library web site. Attig replied that this was a conversation that CC:DA was going to have to have with the new webmaster.

Smart indicated that she thought ALA had come up with a better way to maintain its web sites, and suggested taking a look at the LITA site. Attig said that he found the ALCTS style sheets to be inadequate for the CC:DA work, and indicated that he had problems with selecting the work forms. He received no response from ALA when he asked about this.

Smart responded that CC:DA could definitely collaborate with ALCTS in the job description. Attig pointed out that he did not sense there was any urgency to move off of the Penn State Library's server.

Introduction of Resolution

Myers moved for the adoption of the following resolution:

Whereas Jennifer Bowen served this committee as ex officio ALA representative to the JSC during 2004-2007;

Whereas she gracefully navigated between the veritable Scylla and Charibdis of competing demands from both the JSC and CC:DA, while simultaneously keeping her cool under the slings and arrows of strong rhetoric and viewpoints;

Whereas she capably and repeatedly distilled feedback that ran towards one thousand pages into much more manageably sized documents in rendering the ALA responses to the drafts of AACR3 and RDA;

Whereas she continually strove to make the RDA development process as open as possible, including efforts to make the RDA drafts publicly available and updating rank-and-file ALA members through institution of RDA Forums;

Whereas she has fostered a "cool" image to the AACR2 revision and RDA drafting process in her presentations by her apt metaphor involving a 1978 Cutlass Supreme;

Therefore be it resolved that CC:DA recognizes Jennifer Bowen with our deep appreciation for her incalculable role in positively shaping RDA and bringing it to eventual fruition.

The Chair asked for a voice vote. The motion carried and was met with much applause.

Jennifer Bowen [from audience] said that she wanted to thank everyone. She added that she had something she wanted to share. She held up a piece of paper and said that when she was cleaning out her office, she found "this yellowed document I have here. These are the minutes from the CC:DA meeting that was held in San Francisco on June 27-29, 1987. I went down the names, which included Helen Schmierer, Paul Weiss, John Attig, Glenn Patton, Laurel Jizba, and Dorothy McGarry. I don't say this to embarrass anyone but rather to say that we have a remarkable group of people here. And I could not have done the work without you. And I think it will be interesting to see if this table exists in twenty years from now — in 2027 — and, if so, who is sitting around it. But thank you very much."

1014. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 2

Attig indicated that he would go through the action list. He began by reminding people that the ALA response to Chapter 3 was due to the JSC on the 16th of July. He added that CC:DA discussed a lot of this on Friday, and he thought he had enough to pull together a response.

The Chair indicated that during the period July 9–12, there would be a motion, discussion, and a vote on the Chapter 3 response.

Attig said that he might not have a complete response by then, but he would have the introduction and other parts written.

August 6 was the deadline for sending new proposals to the JSC for discussion at the October 2007 JSC meeting. Again, he thought CC:DA already had a good deal of our information for that.

Bible uniform titles were discussed on Saturday, and a number of people indicated that the changes suggested by the JSC were acceptable to CC:DA: i.e., no longer using the abbreviations "N.T." and "O.T." in reference to the books of the Bible, but rather spell them out, ("New Testament" and "Old

Testament”), and entering books of the Bible directly under the heading “Bible.” He asked if there was any disagreement [no one disagreed].

Attig said that the next topic of discussion was the entry of treaties, and that while CC:DA had the opportunity to propose alternative solutions if it wanted to do so, the proposals had to be done by August 6th. He indicated that Kathy Winzer of the American Association of Law Libraries had consulted with her colleagues on this matter.

Winzer stated that when RDA first came out, the law library community was very much opposed to the proposed way to treat bilateral agreements, and has been talking about the matter amongst itself. Since no one has yet seen Chapter 13, it is difficult to talk about principles. If there is going to be a principle, the first named body should be treated as the “main entry.” There is a consistency issue involved in this viewpoint. A treaty is an agreement between two parties who are usually identified.

Winzer added that the JSC implied that this is not always the case, and therefore wants to enter bilateral agreements under title. The opinion of the law library community is that the rule is being driven by a very few exceptions.

Law librarians asked reference librarians at LC how users tended to ask for treaty material: did they ask for them by title? The answer was “no,” because titles are often vague and not known by users. Users know jurisdictions, the general subject, the parties involved, and an approximate date the treaty was written. LC reference librarians also said that it does not matter which jurisdiction is used as the primary access point. It does not have to be based on which is first alphabetically. It could be based on the first jurisdiction named on the piece or the first signatory.

A member of AALL looked at reference tools that provide access to treaties, such as lists of treaties that the U.S. signed. These tend to be organized first by the country with which the U.S. has the agreement, then by subject, and then by date. This showed how users ask for treaty information: first by country, then by subject, and then by date. Winzer added that this represented the thinking of the law community.

Ann Sitkin, Harvard Law Library [from audience] said that a user may not know the specific title of a treaty and so if the entry was by title, access would be lost.

Rhonda Lawrence, University of California, Los Angeles Law Library and Chair of the American Association of Law Librarians, Technical Services Special Interest Group, Cataloging and Classification Committee, Descriptive Cataloging Policy Advisory Working Group [from audience] said that most of the members of her working group (who are from major law libraries) were present. She indicated that they were all law librarian catalogers with whom Winzer has consulted over the past year and that they wished to underscore what Winzer was saying — that they thought her comments were correct.

Weiss asked if the issue, then, was with Chapter 13 [Works, expressions, manifestations, and items] and not with Chapter 6 [Persons, families, and corporate bodies associated with a resource].

Winzer replied that the issue was with naming the work. She added that it was also difficult for the law librarian community to deal with this issue, but that Attig had asked them to do it. There were things to be said in favor of each proposal. If titles were not so relatively unknown, they would not be so reluctant to use title as the primary access point.

Myers noted that, in her comments, Winzer pointed out that researchers seek treaties by jurisdiction, not by title. Chapter 6 has to do with the identification of an originating body or creator, and the chapter indicates that it is only required to choose one. Myers expressed his concern that the rules might not meet the needs of the AALL, and that vital access points could be lost.

Winzer indicated that choosing only one access point is optional. In addition, the rule indicates that access points be given for all signatories. In general all legal access points are optional. A treaty can be

signed by 150 countries. The same thing is true of laws. If a treaty is bilateral, both jurisdictions would be given as access points. All legal access points were optional, because there could be a treaty that is signed by 100 countries. The number of access points chosen will be a training issue and catalogers will have to use common sense. The law library community has a strong training component. The problem comes with general catalogers who might not even know that there are issues with treaties.

Myers added that this is one of his main concerns since he is coming at this as a generalist cataloger. "Generalists need guidance." Maxwell noted that this is true of many special materials.

While Weiss indicated that it was not a bad thing if the title was not cataloged exactly as a specialist would do it, Winzer indicated that it was a problem in a shared database: a law cataloger might not find the bibliographic record.

Marie Whited, LC Law Library [from audience] voiced support for Winzer's comments on behalf of the law librarians at LC. She supported bilateral treaties being entered under one of the countries: LC did not care which country.

Attig said that CC:DA had submitted these comments previously, and he asked if CC:DA wanted to resubmit the same proposal or make changes. Winzer replied that she thought that is what CC:DA should do and asked Attig what he would recommend for a response. Attig said that since Winzer said it does not matter which country is named, something arbitrary could be used instead. Winzer replied that in looking at parallels with other resources, the primary access point would be the first named. Treaties should be handled the same way both from a consistency and from a principle standpoint.

Attig asked CC:DA members if, given that this response was already made in the past and not accepted, they still wanted ALA to make it again.

Weiss suggested something in between: he would like Attig to say that CC:DA has concerns about this, but would like to see the rest of Chapter 13 before making a decision.

Hillmann said that as a former law librarian she was pleased that such an effort has been made to go back to general principles and to try to apply the legal principle to the general rule. She pointed out that if ALA concerns are not addressed by the JSC, there are alternatives. If you think about specialist communities making decisions for their communities that work, the rules for naming things are indeed important, but the access point is not always going to be dependent upon the rules. Access points express the relationship between things, making "things" more important than the item. "But the future may come faster than you think." In the short term, Hillmann agreed that these relationships are important, but in the long term they may not be. "You are going to know if something comes from a general cataloger rather than a law cataloger and know that you have to review those others more carefully. You are on the right track but I think things are going to change. So don't worry if you don't get it 'right' this time."

Winzer agreed that things were going to be different in the future, but for now she was concerned about the next year or two. Hillmann indicated that it could be moot.

Lawrence [from audience] replied that nothing moves as fast as we think it will. Rules have to be made for the way things are now. "We are not asking for an exception here; we are asking that they follow the general rules."

Weiss pointed out that we have not yet seen Chapter 13. Lawrence [from audience] agreed, but added that this issue needed to be addressed properly now, and that it was important to be in line with the general rules because no one has any idea of what is going to happen with Chapter 13. She agreed that there were a few treaties that were known by their names (e.g., the Treaty of Versailles), but for the most part, nobody really is familiar with the name of a particular treaty. "We, as the experts who handle this material, are asking you to make this in line with the general rules. I don't see what the problem is."

Attig pointed out that the discussion was running out of time and asked if there was a motion to support Winzer.

Maxwell moved that the CC:DA support what Kathy Winzer was asking the CC:DA to do. The motion was carried by voice vote.

Attig said that he would work with Winzer to prepare a response from ALA for the JSC.

Attig indicated there were five documents that he was fairly certain CC:DA would receive in August and be asked to respond to by September 17. These were on the last page of his report.

He added that ALA volunteered and was then asked to do some further work with the list of specialized cataloging materials. The product was due on December 31 of this year, so he thought CC:DA should form a task force or at least a group of people to work on this. Mangan moved to create a task force to explore the specialized list of cataloging materials.

Weiss said that this was a waste of CC:DA's time, and that it should be a job for the RDA editor. CC:DA already sent him a list. Attig responded that this was a separate product and not the editor's job. The list will be posted on the JSC site. Mangan agreed that ALA originally volunteered to come up with the list. Smart added that she did not think it would be a tremendous amount of work.

A voice vote was called. Allgood made a procedural comment: he noted that, given the acoustics of the room, it was difficult to determine how the vote was going with voice votes; the ayes and nays sounded indistinguishable. The Chair conducted a vote by show of hands. The motion carried 5 to 1.

Attig said that he volunteered that ALA would work on the language to explain the organization of RDA and its relationship to FRBR and FRAD. He asked if CC:DA wished to do this. He did not think that it needed to be a formal task force. Weiss agreed that it was important to do this, but he didn't think he had sufficient information on the topic. Schmierer asked what the deadline was for completing the task. Attig repeated that he did not think we needed a task force for this one, and that it was not necessarily a short deadline. It was not on the JSC project list, so any deadline would have to be negotiated.

The Chair asked if anyone thought we should do this.

Myers said that in theory it was a great idea, and that it seemed it would help move things along. He agreed with Weiss that there was still widespread confusion as to the underlying conceptual principles of RDA. Allgood agreed.

Schmierer asked if there were any reason why this had to be done by someone from CC:DA, or would it be more appropriate to ask someone other than CC:DA members?

Myers asked if the JSC representative could coordinate this effort.

Attig said that he was going to phrase it in a different way: that if no one was interested, he could just say that there was no interest. If anyone knew of someone who might be interested, he/she should let him know.

Tillett pointed out that there was a chapter on this subject in Arlene Taylor's book that would be out soon. She added that she was working on something similar and that if anyone wanted to come up with a package, she would be happy to help.

Shawne Miksa, University of North Texas [from audience] stated that she also was working on a similar project, entitled the MARC Content Designation Utilization (MCDU) Project, which is focusing on developing the mapping of RDA to MARC21. The Project also is looking at how the data it is gathering can be used to inform the RDA rules. Results should be available shortly.

Maxwell enquired as to the purpose of the work Attig was proposing, and asked if it would have any effect on RDA at all without a deadline. Tillett replied that we would be doing it for training purposes. Attig agreed with Tillett and said it would be useful in both training and implementation, but that it also could be worked into the introduction, or the *RDA Scope and Structure* document.

Hillmann stated that she was of two minds. She agreed that it was important that we have this kind of explanation for the people “who don’t eat and drink FRBR” and who come to this without much preparation.

She added that one of the things that struck her was that as we are working on the formal representation of FRBR elements, would this be part of that expression so that people would have it to look at as those drafts come out? She thought it would be a good idea to ask people to review this and to have an explanation as to how things have been expressed. She said that she knew that Tom Delsey had been working on this, although it was not on his “spreadsheet.” She was not sure this was adequate for understanding the rationale behind RDA.

The Chair indicated that anyone interested could contact Attig, to which Attig agreed.

Allgood concurred that it was important for people to have an idea of why we are doing these things and that this would tie together RDA and FRBR. “It could be useful in outreach and general awareness programs in talking about what is the purpose of RDA — especially for the many librarians who are not catalogers.”

1015. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business, reports from the floor, announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

The Chair reported that she attended the CCS Executive Committee meeting on Friday. ALCTS has developed a tactical database that will be used by ALCTS groups to show how they are meeting goals in the ALCTS strategic plan. The database will be available in the near future.

An RDA Implementation Task Force is being formed. The charge was written, and the membership is almost complete. The Chair will be Ann O’Neill, and members include Bill Harrison, Glenn Patton, John Attig, and Marjorie Bloss. Folkner is an ex-officio member. Special Libraries Association and Public Library Association representatives are still needed. The Task Force will work on modules for implementation and will present a program at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting, in conjunction with the RDA update. There will be a pre-conference held in 2009.

The Chair discharged the Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media, chaired by Greta De Groat.

Next the Chair briefly reviewed upcoming deadlines that she indicated she also would send out via email:

- July 9-12: motion, discussion, and vote on Chapter 3 response.
- August 6: new proposals for discussion at the October 2007 JSC meeting. CONSER will submit its proposals to CC:DA by July 10.
- August 8: public comments (through web form) on Chapters 6 & 7 due.
- August 12: CC:DA comments on Chapters 6 & 7 due in wiki.
- August 19: CC:DA members agree/disagree period ends (which she indicated gave Attig about three weeks to come up with a response)

Attig pointed out that at the Friday meeting, CC:DA members agreed that they would flag editorial comments and typos in the wiki. He would assume that other comments are related to major issues. He requested comments that apply to more than one rule, be given once with references to all the rules to which it referred.

The Chair announced the following changes in CC:DA membership. Of the two current CC:DA Interns, Felicity Dykas was elected incoming Vice Chair/Chair Elect of the Serials Section and would not be continuing on CC:DA; Penny Welbourne, the other intern, was appointed as a CC:DA voting member.

Two new interns have been appointed: Alexandra Crosier, from the Columbia University Libraries; and Daniel N. Joudrey, from Simmons College.

Weiss asked if there would be a Friday meeting at the 2008 ALA Midwinter in Philadelphia, since the draft of RDA's Part B would not be out until sometime early in December. The Chair responded that CC:DA members could count on a Friday meeting.

The Chair asked if there was any other new business [there was none].

Myers moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 10:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Felicity Dykas, Intern
Penny Welbourne, Intern