

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

**Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access**

**Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions  
January 17–June 6, 2008**

**Motions and votes**

The following is a record of motions made and votes taken between January 17 and June 6, 2008:

- A. 5JSC/LC/11/ALA response [Designation of roles in RDA; March 6, 2008]:** The motion was that CC:DA authorize an ALA response to 5JSC/LC/11, Designation of Roles in RDA, based on the draft response distributed and on comments made during CC:DA discussion. There were six votes yes and zero votes no; the motion carried.
- B. 5JSC/LC/12/ALA response [Proposed revision of RDA chap. 6, Additional instructions for musical works and expressions; March 11, 2008]:** The motion was that CC:DA authorize an ALA response to 5JSC/LC/12, Proposed revision of RDA chap. 6, Additional instructions for musical works and expressions, based on the draft response distributed and on comments made during CC:DA discussion. There were six votes yes and zero votes no; the motion carried.
- C. 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response and 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2–4, 9/ALA response/ALA follow-up [RDA: Resource Description and Access sections 2-4 and 9: Constituency review of December 2007 draft; March 14, 2008]:** The motion was that CC:DA authorize an ALA response to 5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9 based on: the email message "5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9/ALA response" written by the ALA representative to the JSC and posted to the CC:DA email list on Mar. 12, 2008; comments collected in the CC:DA wiki; and discussion by CC:DA. There were eight votes yes and zero votes no; the motion carried.
- D. [Establishment of task force to review DCRM(S); June 3, 2008]:** The motion was that CC:DA form a task force to review Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials), draft for review 20080530. There were seven votes yes and zero votes no; the motion carried.

## Other actions

### ▪ *Review of draft of RDA, sections 2-4 and 9, plus other related JSC documents*

During this time period CC:DA reviewed proposals from other JSC constituencies and responded to the draft of RDA sections 2-4 and 9. Comments for the review process were gathered in the CC:DA wiki. Deadlines for comment entry were staggered:

- Feb. 10: Initial comments on RDA sections 2-4 and 9
- Feb. 19: Review of initial comments on RDA sections 2-4 and 9
- Feb. 26: Comments on 5JSC/LC/11
- Feb. 29: Comments on 5JSC/LC/12

Comments on the draft of RDA sections 2-4, and 9 from non-CC:DA members in the United States were gathered using a form on the ALCTS website. Comments submitted via the form were emailed to the chair and interns and then entered into the CC:DA wiki. The deadline for comment submission was Feb. 7 to allow time to enter the comments into the wiki by Feb. 10 for review by CC:DA members.

Beginning in early March, email discussions of major issues arising from the comments in the wiki ensued on the CC:DA email discussion list. Major issues discussed included: selections, organization of RDA, required elements, scope guidelines, status of place entity, and reconsideration of significant features of AACR2. Responses to the JSC documents were written using the results of email discussions, discussions from CC:DA meetings at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting, and comments entered into the wiki. In writing the responses, the ALA Representative to the JSC, John Attig, was aided by many CC:DA members who drafted sections to use in the responses: Paul Weiss, John Hostage, Dorothy McGarry, Everett Allgood, Kathy Glennan, Kathy Winzer, Judy Knop, Manon Th  roux, Bob Maxwell, Kevin Randall, John Myers, Betsy Mangan, Mark Scharff, and Greta De Groat. The effort was tremendous, completed under a very limited time line, and very much appreciated.

### ▪ *CC:DA's Procedures*

The revision to CC:DA's *Procedures* (approved by CC:DA at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting) were approved by the CCS Executive Committee on March 10, 2008. The document is available on the CC:DA website.

During discussions with the current and former webmasters, the revised document was treated as a new document and assigned a new document number, CC:DA/Pro/13. The group decided that a document with only editorial revisions will retain the same document number and the date of the revision will be included. If revisions to a document require CCS Executive Committee approval, a new document number will be assigned. The previous document (CC:DA/Pro/12) is being retained on the website and is accessible through the indexes.

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

The public read-only email discussion list to allow non-CC:DA members to "view" committee discussions was announced on March 18, 2008. The announcement was sent to Autocat, RDA-L, and the MARC listserv and posted to the CC:DA website. As of June 5, 2008 there were 336 subscribers to the list, rules@ala.org. The private CC:DA email discussion list ala-ccda@ala.org is still maintained to allow for distribution of restricted documents and information on accessing restricted sites (e.g., passwords, userids, etc.).

As discussed at Midwinter, rules@ala.org will not archive messages at this time. The reason for this appears to be because the messages are being forwarded to rules@ala.org from ccda@ala.org. This method was the only way to restrict who could post to the list. The Sympa email list software was upgraded in March 2008 and the ability to restrict who can post to a list is now possible. The following email list options are now available.

**Option 1**

Migrate the public read-only subscribers from rules@ala.org to ccda@ala.org as read-only subscribers. This would make the message archive available to all subscribers to the ccda@ala.org list. The rules@ala.org list could cease to exist or could be re-purposed.

- Advantages:
- The ALCTS office will only have to maintain two subscriber lists (ccda@ala.org and ala-ccda@ala.org).
  - Reducing the number of CC:DA related email discussion lists may reduce confusion.
  - The public will have access to the message archive.

- Disadvantage:
- The public will have access to all archived messages posted to the ccda@ala.org list including those posted prior to the messages being available to the public via rules@ala.org (roughly Sept. 2006 through May 2007). There are messages from that time period that are confidential and will have to be manually sent to the ala-ccda@ala.org email list for archiving and then deleted from the ccda@ala.org message archive. If that is done, searching or browsing the ala-ccda@ala.org message archive by date will not be an effective mechanism to retrieve those messages. The weeding process could be time consuming since it isn't always apparent from the subject line that a message contains confidential information.

**Option 2**

Switch to using rules@ala.org as the main CC:DA list where CC:DA members can post and the public would be read-only subscribers. The ccda@ala.org email list would no longer be active, but the message archive would still be available to CC:DA members. The message archive for rules@ala.org would start at the date of the switchover.

- Advantages:
- Reducing the number of **active** CC:DA related email discussion lists may reduce confusion.
  - The public will have access to the message archive.

- Disadvantage:
- The ALCTS office will still have to maintain three subscriber lists -- the active lists (rules@ala.org and ala-ccda@ala.org) and the inactive list (ccda@ala.org). The inactive list will have to have CC:DA members as subscribers to allow access to the message archive.

### **Option 3**

Continue with CC:DA members using ccda@ala.org for public messages and have those messages be forwarded to the public read-only list rules@ala.org.

- Advantage:
- It is currently working.

- Disadvantages:
- The public will not have access to the message archive.
  - The ALCTS office will have to continue to maintain three subscriber lists -- (ccda@ala.org, ala-ccda@ala.org, and rules@ala.org).

Charles Wilt has said that maintaining the lists isn't all that cumbersome since he creates one update list and cuts and pastes the names into the subscribers page and it's generally a one time thing.

After the annual conference in Anaheim, CC:DA needs to inform the ALCTS office which option it would like to have implemented.