

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
2008 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
January 11, 12, and 14, 2008**

Members present:

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

Alexandra Crosier, Intern
Daniel N. Joudrey, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

John Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress [*absent 1/11*]
Glenn Patton, OCLC [*represented by Jay Weitz 1/11 & 1/14*]

ALA Liaisons present:

Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
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
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
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/Map & Geography Round Table
Robert Hall, ALA/Public Library Association [*absent 1/11*]
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 [*represented by Greta De Groat*]
Daniel Lovins, Association of Jewish Libraries
Thomas Duszak, Catholic Library Association
Diane Hillmann, Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
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
Lisa Carter, Society of American Archivists
Dorothy McGarry, Special Libraries Association

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, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.
- IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:
 - AACR** = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules
 - AACR2** = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision
 - 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
 - CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
 - CDS** = LC Cataloging Distribution Service
 - CoP** = Committee of Principals for AACR
 - CPSO** = LC Cataloging Policy and Support Office
 - FRAD** = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Authority Data
 - FRAR** = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Authority Records
 - FRBR** = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records
 - FRSAR** = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records
 - IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
 - ILS** = Integrated library system
 - ISO** = International Organization for Standardization
 - ISWC** = International Standard Musical Work Code
 - JSC** = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA

LC = Library of Congress
LCRI = Library of Congress rule interpretation
LIS = Library and information science
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
RDA = Resource Description and Access
URL = Uniform Resource Locator

Friday, January 11, 2008 — 1:30–5:30 pm
Holiday Inn Express Midtown, Terrace Ballroom

1016. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. She welcomed visitors and committee members to the meeting to discuss the draft of Sections 2-4 and 9.

1017. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

[[CC:DA/Roster/2007/July/Rev.](#)]

The Chair and members introduced themselves. The Chair routed the roster for members to sign in.

1018. Discussion of draft of Sections 2-4, 9 RDA: *Resource Description and Access*

[[5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9](#)]

The **Chair** outlined how the discussion would proceed, adding that the goal was to cover Sections 2 and 3 at this meeting and the remaining chapters at Monday's meeting. The Chair reviewed the schedule for contributing comments to the CC:DA wiki.

Attig noted that he would give his report as the ALA representative to the JSC on Saturday afternoon. It will focus on the new structure of RDA, so the committee should hold off on discussion of the overall structure until then. Attig stated there is much work for the JSC to do between now and July 2. The JSC still has not reviewed all of the comments on the other chapters. The JSC is not looking for a large response; it wants to focus on the big picture for RDA, not the minutiae. It tried not to change AACR2 rules in this draft, so any changes from AACR2 may be inadvertent. It will look at quick fixes for wording. General expressions of dissatisfaction (without specifics on why and suggestions on how to fix it) are not going to make it into the report.

Discussion of RDA draft

Maxwell was disappointed that so much of the new draft is taken directly from AACR2. Too little guidance on series was a big shortfall in AACR2 and that has been transferred to RDA. Because of this lack, there are elaborate LCRIs on series.

Weiss felt it is a big mistake simply to copy content from AACR2 and put it into RDA. An opportunity to make a big difference has been lost. He liked the use of placeholders; they help in understanding the overall structure even if there are holes in the actual content.

Myers expressed approval of the new structure, as well as the inclusion of Group 3 entities in RDA. He thinks the transition from a set of rules for headings to a set of instructions for authority records (that include the access points) has been less successful. They lose their way in elucidating and distinguishing the elements for the headings and the elements for records. **Attig** disagreed with Myers' characterization. **Myers** thinks heading/authority instructions are confusing with so much repetition and with non-continuous instructions for the treatment of the various elements. He feared this would pose a challenge for training and education, "and the detriments of this disorganized approach cannot be cured by hyperlinks." There are instructions in the sections on preferred access points, where it tells us to create two access points; clarification is needed as to which is preferred. He was concerned that the pedantic adherence to a structural hierarchy had led to some ridiculous results with unnecessary repetition of terminology, formatting, and fragmentation.

Glennan stated that defining standard terminology in the context of each chapter (i.e., the definition only applies to that chapter, whereas it should apply to the entire code) leads to inconsistency. There should not be different definitions for the same terms in different chapters. She asked if the instructions in Chapter 6 are for creating headings for bibliographic records or for creating authority records. Part of the problem is how rules from AACR2 have been rearranged. She is struggling to understand how RDA gets implemented in a context that is *not* MARC 21—the direction in which this whole process is going. **Attig** stated that, ultimately, these are neither bibliographic records nor authority records. We need to define a different category to put them into. **Maxwell** stated there is confusion about access points. The phrase *access points* is not referring to an access point for a resource like a main entry is, but they are talking about an access point for a work or an access point for an expression. He asked, "Preferred access point does not mean the same thing as main entry, correct?" **Attig** stated, "Yes and no. Glennan is right. The definitions are all contextual. So you have to consider which instruction you are referring to before answering the question. In general, we are referring to access point as a preferred name for the entity. It's all contextual. So it depends on which entity you are talking about. It's different in different implementation strategies. In scenario 1, implementation can be done with no access points whatsoever."

The **Chair** asked Attig to remind the committee about Scenario 1. **Attig** stated that, "Scenario 1 is the relational, object-oriented database. You can record the preferred name. You can record all the different attributes, and that is the defining information about the entity that you are describing. If you need something to display, it depends on how unique you insist that it be, you can use the preferred name and not have an access point. You can simply ignore those instructions for access points. This again is going to come down to implementation and deciding how we are going to do this. For now, we are talking about authority records, which are about controlling the form of the name. They are *not* records for the person; they are records for a particular name of the person. There are some tensions between implementing it that way and implementing it in the way RDA was intended to be implemented. We have turned the whole thing on its head. The access point is sort of an afterthought now, rather than the primary reason for the authority record. But, as long as we are using the current MARC 21 context, we are going to continue performing actions like we have been all along. We are looking for another way of organizing our data structures."

Weiss felt there is still too much emphasis on how to do the work, instead of on the end result of the work. It is still too much of a how-to manual, *not* a standard.

Mangan believes the scope and definitions are maddening. A term cannot be used to define itself, yet it continues in RDA. She is very concerned over the length of the draft. 463 pages is not a simplification. At this rate, the document will be three times the size of AACR2.

Thurston was also concerned about definition problems, noting that training and management issues involving implementation are huge. RDA looks like AACR2, but it is a wholly different presentation style.

Myers noted that the same text from AACR2 (which was acceptable) seems frustrating and confusing when it is in RDA. There is a loss of confidence in the instructions in this new form. And some instructions are broken up in ways that don't make sense anymore. **Attig** summed this up as "the structure makes the familiar seem unfamiliar." **Maxwell** argued that this is a positive development: the RDA text illuminates what was illogical in AACR2. If the rules don't make sense now, why perpetuate them? **Welbourne** said it is disappointing that RDA is not that different from AACR2. **Myers** noted that some of the instructions seem to lack principles, such as the rules for pre-1500 works and the three instructions for early Greek works. The principles need to be explained.

Weiss pointed out that RDA is meant to help catalogers deal with situations that are not explicitly stated in the code. That does not seem to be happening. He is not convinced that RDA is any easier for training—one of the major goals. The new structure/organization is making it far more complex. On a positive note, he likes that all the entities are treated equally.

Randall stated that he cannot find AACR2 rule 21.1B2. Corporate main entry seems to be scattered throughout the drafts. Instructions are contradictory and/or lost. **Maxwell** countered that corporate main entry has not been scattered, rather, it has been removed entirely. Now, there seems to be no real distinction between choosing personal or corporate body access points. It is a *major* change. The reason we have 21.1B2 is because of some rather important studies on the nature of corporate bodies by Eva Verona. Has someone done a study to show that she was wrong? We had this rule because of the question of whether corporate bodies could be authors or not. It is a major change, and the change should be justified. **Attig** agreed that this is an area the JSC needs to look at carefully, but he doesn't think it has necessarily been removed, but that it may have been rather well concealed among many places. Either way, it is an unhelpful change. **Adam Schiff** (from the audience) stated that AACR2 rule 21.1B2 appeared in Chapter 6 or 7 in the last draft in the instructions about who can be a creator. In the rule for naming a work, it does not repeat that instruction, but mentions creators. Perhaps the information from 21.1B2 needs to be added again.

Hillmann agreed with Weiss regarding the "how to" nature of the draft and the lack of a principled basis that had been promised. It is becoming more critical to think about how RDA will work in a less flat version (less textually organized version). People are going to be approaching these instructions on many different levels, and the fact that it does not proceed from principles is problematic. It is still too much from the perspective of printed, stable material, though she thinks things are heading in the right direction.

Mangan was concerned about bringing out both content and carrier in cataloging; content seems to have disappeared in this draft. The word *content* has been replaced by *additional attributes*. This is problematic for some materials. **Attig** was surprised by the change in the title of Chapter 7, but it is intended to be the same thing. He stated, "The primary places where we deal with both content and carrier are in Sections 1 and 2. They aren't in this draft, so they seem to be gone. FRBR group 1 entities fall into two groups: 1) Work and Expression, and 2) Manifestation and Item. To a certain extent, those parallel the distinction between content and carrier. The JSC felt it was better to use the terminology of FRBR entities rather than something less precise. It will be interesting to see whether the titles and scope statements remain as they are in the chapters we haven't seen yet. We should either use *content* and *carrier* consistently or remove them completely, but at the moment we have removed them in some places, but not others. This wasn't explicit in the JSC discussion, but it seems to me that the two groups of Group 1 entities are a substitute for *content* and *carrier*. It reflects Barbara Tillett's model, which is set up as a continuum from the very abstract super-work to the very concrete single item."

Weiss stated the wording is too abstruse throughout and gave some examples of difficult, unclear language. **Attig** announced that the JSC is looking at the possibility of doing some line editing. It is

difficult, however, to find time on the schedule to do this, and to find guidelines that are straightforward enough to use.

McGarry pointed out that RDA is not following the FRBR provision of mandatory and optional elements in many places. The JSC should be looking at the optional elements in RDA that were mandatory in FRBR. Also, there is a great deal of repetition in the text. If it is going to be machine-readable, then that repetition may be needed, but for a print version, some of the repetition should be removed. She noted that the instructions that state “Base X on title first received,” are not good for record-sharing; it depends on who receives which item first and who receives it second. Will the institution that receives the second title first think they have a different item? Is this a good basis for deciding whether you have two versions? Some instructions state that, when qualifying titles, and you “can use A, B, C, and/or D,” what does this mean? It again leads to a lack of consistency and people getting confused about whether they have the same item because options are used. **Attig** said that in NACO training, it states that you choose qualifiers based on the specific item in hand. You do what works and pick a qualifier based on the specific context. Some situations need multiple choices. **McGarry** asked that the wording be clarified. **Scharff** stated that in the past, priorities were clear when you had to make choices. That seems to be avoided in RDA. He understands that in some data structures this is a moot point, but for other communities/systems (like music) that need to construct strings for various reasons, these instructions are going to be tough since no preferences are given.

Smart stated she thinks it would be helpful if we qualified titles in the first instance, instead of waiting for a conflict to occur.

Hillmann warned against overloading the instructions with too much specialization. Specialized instructions should be decided and recorded on the individual community level. Let the specific domains have their implementation. There will have to be another step after RDA is published. It is a necessary thing and we should not be afraid of it.

Weiss stated that in the “first received” examples like McGarry mentioned, one of the problems is that RDA is still written as if an item is cataloged once and never is looked at again. The volatility of resources should be recognized, particularly Group 2 entities that change over time. So, for the “first received,” it may not matter which is first and which is second. Maybe it does not matter which one you choose as long as you select one. But, maybe we need a policy that says, once it has been selected, change it only if X, if we do not want people changing the preferred access point for a person’s name.

Hillmann commented that there may be some instances where one would be preferred in a certain context. We need to figure out how to encode the context. We need to get away from the idea that there must only be one.

Maxwell agreed that the instructions should be general, not too specialized. Balance is needed for an international result. There is an international, general body to make decisions for general instructions, but the specialist communities lack international bodies to represent their needs. We need to strike a balance and provide for specialized communities.

Schmierer noted that RDA needs to address series titles, even if it’s a modest reference. **Weiss** pointed out that the problem is not just series; the treatment of all Whole/Part relationships is very convoluted. There is no real overview of this type of relationship.

Randall commented on the length and complexity of the draft. He asked, “Will the online version be less complex?” He has doubts that a simplification could work due to the need to have consistent instruction numbers. He is concerned about the print version being too complex. Those relying on the print version are going to be those who cannot afford the online version or the training needed. They are going to have a much harder time and they might not have access to the rule interpretations or what we are now calling *implementation guidelines*. **Marjorie Bloss** stated that the co-publishers are close to signing a contract

with a company that is going to do the online version. They need to see what happens with that before moving on to the print version. The ultimate size is unknown, so there are no specifics at this point for the print version. **Attig** stated that the publishers are going to be willing to publish a concise version, since there will be a market for such a product. The JSC has looked at what could be in the concise version, but taking a portion and turning it into a set of instructions is less than straightforward. Preparing the content for the concise is not clear; they are not sure how, when or what a concise version would look like or who would do it. **Bloss** stated that for the libraries that want the whole print version, it is looking to be fairly bulky. There is a need to take out some of the repetition for a print version, but the focus right now is on the online version. The publishers may be willing to make pricing available for smaller libraries for the online version. **Myers** repeated a comment from an earlier meeting: "If we need to produce a concise version of RDA, then we have failed." **Weiss** stated that the online version should not need more repetition; it should have less since there are links to the information from other places.

Karen Coyle commented that she is hearing that some CC:DA members want two entirely different products. One is general with principles, and the other contains more instructions addressing the rules they will apply. If RDA is to be a very general, non-context-specific set of instructions, that is fine, but where is the other part of the plan (creating specific implementation guidelines for your community)? Is it part of the project timeline? People are talking at cross-purposes. What comes out is going to need some other activities. She does not see those as part of the plan and being explicit. So people are not expecting them. **Weiss** stated that was on purpose (not being part of the plan). It is up to those specialist communities to do it. **Coyle** is not sure they are aware of that. **Attig** stated many are aware of it and are frustrated by it. The implementation of these rules is going to affect us much more than what is in the actual code. Implementation decisions need to be made, and that process is starting. The national libraries are starting to coordinate implementation plans. No one should underestimate the work that will be needed for implementation because this is going to be critical. Now it is premature because we are not far enough along to know how RDA can be implemented.

Mary Charles Lasater stated, "As the chair of CCS, I am sitting here and feeling gloomy about this. I have appointed some folks to the RDA Implementation Committee and I have read the Report of the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. I am really wondering where we should go from here. And it seems that other international cataloging communities are more interested in this than we are. What should be the ALA response? It's looking grim." **Attig** confirmed that ALA is much less enthusiastic about RDA than the British, Australians, etc. The level of frustration about implementation (outside the US) is rising. He asked: What do we need to do? Should we step back? Should we obstruct the process? **Lasater** stated, "Based on what I have heard, what we will end up with is something that I as a cataloger cannot use. We are also going to have something else; we'll have to have something else. RDA is not enough. We could take a step back from this and focus on whatever else we might need to be able to actually do our jobs. I am not hearing any support for this process and the LC Working Group said stop. What do we do? I don't want to say that we should stop this. What do we need to start doing? There were three years between AACR2's publication and implementation. And, it may be a lot longer than that with RDA. Do we have better ideas? From what I can see here at this table and from around the library world, I think it's pretty grim right now." **Attig** stated, "I don't disagree with that. That conversation needs to happen some place, but I don't know if it's CC:DA. I think you are saying we need to focus on implementation and that we have underestimated the number of decisions and the numbers of steps we have to go through to get there. We cannot address the implementation, however, without something that is implementable. And that is in the hands of the national libraries, who are the ones pushing for an early implementation."

Rhonda Lawrence pointed out that the other cataloging communities are aware of the need for additional tools to support the process. She believes it is a problem that CC:DA members are not looking at the print version, nor are they looking at the Web version. **Attig** admitted that it is frustrating that we are designing

the content for a Web product based on printed drafts. The JSC is developing the *content* for both versions. The content will be the same. We hope that we will be able to see an online version soon. **Allgood** asked if the online version be available this summer. **Attig** stated that there is a chance; they have agreed to create a prototype, but the JSC has not even signed the contract with the publisher. **Bloss** stated they are working on a prototype for the Web version to roll the whole thing out for IFLA in Quebec City next August. She reminded everyone that this is an international code, not a US-only product.

James Weinheimer was concerned about RDA being as international as possible and having all sorts of communities involved. He argued that the product should be *free* if we want others to adopt it. **Attig** mentioned that some pieces will be freely available over the Internet. Most of it will not, because we need to recoup costs. **Hillmann** stated that the principles—the top level—should be free, but not all the detailed guidelines.

Ross Roberts was concerned about the rush to publish. Dublin Core is free; implementers are going to look for free products. If you publish a huge number of pages, then people are not going to accept it. **Hillmann** stated that there needs to be a distinction between the guidance and instructions and the ultimate structure. They are separate things. Some pieces (the important conceptual pieces) are going to be free.

General comments on Chapter 5: General guidelines on recording attributes of works and expressions

Weiss liked seeing the objectives and principles in each section.

Myers stated, “The term *Preferred Access Point* is defined in the context of each chapter. The language needs to change.”

Maxwell noted that despite the chapter title, there is nothing about *Expressions* in the chapter; it is all about works.

Weiss stated that section 5.5 is called *General guidelines on recording titles for works*. There should not be so much about the process (recording), but on the general guidelines on titles for works. There is too much emphasis on the “how to” not the “what.” The locations of 5.6 and 5.7 are odd. The chapter title mentions *Attributes*, but then there are a whole lot of instructions on access points. **Attig** agreed that this is a little strange. The idea was to put all of the general guidelines on the topic together.

Specific comments on Chapter 5: General guidelines on recording attributes of works and expressions

Glennan pointed out that in 5.2, the definition of *user* is unclear. There are a variety of users. Catalogers? Patrons?

Scharff noted that this is similar to the question about Chapter 6: Is this chapter designed for authority records or for bibliographic records? This causes confusion because some of this is related to bibliographic records, and then all of sudden things look like they apply to authority records. It is not clear if the phrase *variant access points* refers to 4XXs in authority records or to 246s in bibliographic records. **Attig** stated that the JSC wants to avoid talking about records. That is an implementation strategy, and there are various ways to do it. So do not assume it is a bibliographic or an authority record. It is recording attributes that can be aggregated into a description. The common thing is that they relate to either a work or an expression in this section. **Maxwell** thinks that authority records will wither away as we move into an FRBR/FRAD universe, because they will become something else. So there should not be an emphasis on authority records. This chapter is heavily influenced by authority work. **Attig** stated that when the JSC started to look at the users’ tasks in FRAD, they were written from the catalogers’ point of view, justifying the information in the heading. All of the other user tasks are from the perspective of the users approaching the results of what the cataloger does. Delsey tried to change these so they are from the

perspective of the user, not the cataloger. The JSC did not make distinctions between different categories of users.

Weiss concurred that the focus should be on entities and attributes rather than *records*. The text could be clearer in this regard. Also, 5.6.4 could be applied to series. And if interpreted this way, it seems to tell us to put the series title first and then individual title after, which is very different from what we do now. He believes that users are not going to search this way. **Attig** stated that the instruction is not intended to apply to series, which tends to be thought of as a different kind or category of title, though it fits the definition. He does not know how to exclude it. The intent was to follow the approach to parts used in the music community, where you enter the work through the title of the whole work, not the part. This inclusion was deliberate, but this was not intended for series.

Myers asked in 5.5.4.1 *Initial articles*: why is there no language pointing back to Chapter 2 where that chapter addresses description? 5.5.1.1 *Capitalization*: It says to capitalize the first word in the title and each subdivision of the title. Can you give an example or context? He thought it was dealing with *Other Title Information*, which is not capitalized currently. **Attig** stated that this is dealing with hierarchical title (parts and sections). **Maxwell** thought capitalization instructions in the main text were being removed. There is an example that is addressing Arabic and Hebrew capitalization. Where does it come from? **Hillmann** stated, “Capitalization rules don’t work with machine-created metadata.”

Randall asked: “Should there be a statement at 5.0 that these instructions aren’t dealing with descriptive elements, like recording the title proper of a manifestation (even though the title of the chapter mentions works and expressions)?” **Weiss** said, no. **Randall** replied, “Someone could apply this to a 245. The rules in 5.3 are split up and muddy. 5.3.2 has a rule, a footnote, and it’s also referring to chapter 6.” **Smart**, regarding footnote 2: *The elements listed may be recorded as additions to the access point representing the work, as separate elements, or as both*, stated, “If you take different approaches, it is going to affect interoperability. Maybe there needs to be more information on how to decide and when to choose which type of approach. It didn’t make a lot of sense.” **Attig** agreed that some clarification is needed about the attributes of the entity and the access point—and which ones are required. He stated: “What makes this unclear is the contention that access point is not a data element. It is something that you construct by choosing which data elements you are going to include in the access point. Access points are not elements and therefore cannot be required elements. We are trying to come to grips with this. The basic rule for access points: It consists of preferred name or preferred title of the entity and may also include other elements, as needed, to differentiate. Assuming you require a differentiated access point which is contentious.” **Weiss** felt that explanation made sense.

Maxwell noted that in 5.7.2: *Construct the variant access point using the preferred access point for that person, family, or corporate body preceding the variant title for the work*, there are many cases where title alone (without author’s name) is helpful as an access point (e.g., series). **Weiss** stated that 5.7.2 is inconsistent as to whether access points are data elements or not. “I agree with Delsey that access points are not separate data elements, but that we encode data elements for display or whatever. 5.7.2 does not make sense. You should be recording the title and variant forms of the title and the creator. Then you can combine those however you want to for indexing. The elements should be dealt with separately. Also, for Footnote 2 of 5.3.2, it says the elements may be added to the access point, which implies that the access point is a data element. It’s confusing. It should go away. Element should be separate, and then instructions can address how you combine them for other purposes. Another point is that in Chapter 5, the distinction between work and expression is very messy. It implies you have only a single title that applies to each, but with translations, you have a different one for each. All these general guidelines on capitalization, numerals, etc. do not belong in each chapter. It all belongs in Chapter 0 in the beginning.”

Mangan stated that 5.3.4: *When describing a work or expression more fully, include as a minimum the elements listed below that are applicable to that work or expression*, is confusing. She asked, *more fully*

than what? “And all of them are cartographic, which concerns me. We have a hard time distinguishing works, expression, and manifestation in cartographic materials. It looks like you include all of them.” **Weiss** stated it is either required or not. **Attig** replied “I think all along you have been arguing that these are attributes of an expression rather than a manifestation. You’ve finally won.”

General comments on Chapter 6: Identifying works and expressions

Glennan expressed concern about the length of Chapter 6, given that the purpose and scope at 6.0.1.1 states: *This chapter provides general guidelines*. She recommended dropping the word general.

Maxwell asked if it would be useful to have principles applicable to specific instructions repeated within each chapter or section. **Weiss** noted that the online product could include a *Principles* link. **Attig** replied that this—and most—chapters consist of appropriate, applicable instructions from AACR2 that were modified only when the JSC felt there was a specific reason to do so.

Myers found the sections on variant titles to be annoyingly repetitive (i.e. 6.18.0.1.1 duplicates 6.2.0.1.1 and 6.24.0.1.1). 6.18.0.1.1, **Attig** pointed out, is a special instruction for music. The JSC thought that special instructions for specific types of materials should be presented in a complete manner, even if that resulted in duplication of language. **Glennan** agreed with this assessment. **Weiss** pointed out that it’s difficult to maintain a document with a lot of repetition, as slight differences in different places compound over time. **Maxwell** mentioned that most users won’t be reading straight through RDA and, thus, won’t be irritated by the repetition.

Regarding 6.28.3.1.1, **Myers** noted that language is not included as an element. It is, however, addressed in other guidelines related to the Bible.

Weiss argued that access points aren’t attributes of works or expressions and, therefore, have no place in Chapter 6. Including *6.1 Constructing access points to represent works and expressions* here implies that the text is not record independent. **Attig** disagreed, arguing that we must have instructions for formulating access points, and this is the most appropriate place for them. “There are ways of conceptualizing the Scenario 1 implementation that does have a place for authority records, and it is precisely to control the form of access point, not anything else to do with the entity.” **Weiss** reiterated his point, adding that the definition of access point doesn’t make clear whether it’s referring to a data element or a set of data elements.

Schmierer asked **Attig** how he thought we could settle this access point conundrum. She thought it unfortunate that each chapter begins with a fairly long disquisition on this topic and wondered if RDA should acknowledge that access point is not an attribute, but a piece of information that is useful in discussing attributes, and take it out of the rest of the chapter. **Attig** thought we ought to decide how significant we think the access point is: some would argue that it is the most important thing in each of these chapters even though it is not a data element; and some of the rest of us would argue that it is an addendum. As such, there would be rules for formulating an access point using the other elements that have already been defined. **Weiss** argued that we have to define what an access point is before deciding what to do with it. **Schmierer** defined an access point as a reformulation of attributes designed to meet a user requirement. She noted that the text might be shortened by presenting it at the end of the chapter. **Attig** said that if you need to provide a text string that names an entity, there are instructions that tell you how to do that using one or more attributes of the entity as required to create the name. **Hillmann** responded that when creating an access point, constructing a human readable string is not the only goal. We may want to train a machine to derive these element strings; they may be better able to create a unique aggregation of attributes than humans. Machines can make decisions about uniqueness based on data. **Attig** noted that Tom Delsey describes access point in a scenario 1 implementation as a display issue. He cautioned against bringing “uniform title baggage” into the discussion, that we have always assumed that the goal of an access point is a unique name. If the preferred name is not unique, you add

something. But we may not need to add anything. This issue—the status and significance of access point within this set of instructions—is a major one and covers all chapters that we’ve been looking at.

Weiss commented that the JSC does not want RDA to be a data dictionary, but he thinks that is a better approach.

Lawrence objected to the inclusion of footnotes. **Hillmann** agreed. **Attig** noted that citations could still be handled in footnotes.

Specific comments on Chapter 6: Identifying works and expressions

Maxwell questioned why the instructions for collaborative works [6.1.1.2] now specify giving the compiler main entry. He’s not opposed to the change, but wanted to know the principle behind it.

Regarding dates [6.5], **Weiss** argued that the date of first publication or release is not an attribute of the work, but of a manifestation. The problem, however, is that it is not an attribute of *the* manifestation, but all manifestations of the work. **Attig** didn’t agree with that exact interpretation, but granted that it was problematic.

Weiss also commented on the repetition of sections dealing with dates throughout the rules. **Smart** agreed that “Dates associated with a work” is unclear and open to interpretation. **Allgood** expressed his confusion over what dates referred to in this chapter. **Hillmann**’s interpretation was that we are using date to cite the work, to make it unique, but it needn’t be defined as an attribute of a work to be used in this manner; it’s the kind of thing that we might want a machine to determine. **Weiss** noted that date is a computed attribute and is thus different from everything else in the chapter.

Myers asked how date of creation, 6.5.1.1.1, is differentiated from date of publication, release date, issuance date, or promulgation date. **Maxwell** noted that recording date of creation is drawn from FRBR, but without a working definition, it would be impractical for people to know how to record it.

Schiff argued that date of the work would only be required in order to distinguish one work from another.

Martha Yee commented that this kind of date may be much more readily available for non-book materials. **Lawrence** disagreed with the inclusion of a legal example in this section, preferring Yee’s film example.

Hillmann reflected that this discussion was a wonderful example of how different constituencies use different data elements in different contexts. We’ve been used to using dates without defining their type, whereas they should be considered in the same way we think of “role”. She noted that Dublin Core has multiple date types.

Myers quoted the footnote in 6.5: “*Date of creation is required when needed to distinguish an access point representing the work from another access point (see 6.1.1.7).*” The issue, he said, is not whether date will be included in the access point, but that date as an attribute is undefined. **Welbourne** agreed and noted that common practice is to think of creation date as publication date.

Maxwell identified a structural problem with 6.5.0.1, as it seems to require recording all of the specific types of dates, or none.

Randall suggested that, for serials and other multi-part resources, multiple dates should be included in the access point (i.e. 1940- or 1940-2002 rather than just 1940).

Weiss stated that date of *work* is only required as an attribute if needed for the access point. Date of creation and date of first publication are not necessarily sub-elements of date of work, just because they all happen to be dates. The definition of date of creation of a work was intentionally kept broad in the FRBR model because creation is an abstract intellectual process that is hard to define specifically. **Schiff**

wondered if increased granularity would be useful, as in dates of creation can include: date of promulgation, etc. **Sherman Clarke** said: “When Bob suggested *Date of work is a date associated with the work*, I thought that very ambiguous, but what kept coming to mind was that 6.5.0.1 should say: *Date of work is the best date associated with the work*. Introducing *best* means you have to define that, and then you need *according to the specific instructions below* and then discuss various types of dates associated with different types of resources. The date you would use in an access point would vary depending on context.” **Welbourne** added that *creation* is the term that needs defining. **Glennan** noted that creation occurs over a range of time, so we might want to put starting and ending dates in as separate elements. **Maxwell** stated that the work record should contain all these dates, as they are all useful for identifying a work or expression, even if they’re not needed in an access point. **Attig** warned against focusing too much on the *required* designation. It’s a semantic issue because date is not an element, but it might need to be part of the access point that *is* required.

General comments on Section 3: Recording attributes of person, family, and corporate body

Myers noted that in pages 9–16 and elsewhere, there are extensive footnotes that should be in the body of the text. In addition, Chapter 9 instructions for nobility are fragmented throughout the text. Though he understands that element analysis is driving the organization, the results are messy. **Attig** answered that titles of nobility are sometimes the preferred name and sometimes an alternative.

Maxwell cited an “egregious” footnote at 11.2.11.1.1. He also had a general comment about the JSC principles document, which says we use language preferred by the cataloging agency; RDA rules, on the other hand, say we are to use the original language. This seems unprincipled. **Attig** replied that the JSC is trying to reconcile the rules with IFLA principles. It is attempting to balance other objectives, such as uniformity, with stated principles. He said: “In the case of names of Group 2 entities, we are trying to emphasize the language preferred by the entity, rather than the agency and its users. It’s an exception based on a different principle.”

Weiss approved of the parallel structure and organization of Chapters 5 and 8. But later in 8.8, Scope of Usage, it’s not clear whether the information recorded applies to the person as an entity or to the bibliographic identity. **Attig** responded that the JSC needs to examine this issue carefully. Currently, any usage of different names calls for creating a separate bibliographic identity. This would cause problems for naming works if the same person uses different names within a single manifestation. The focus is on the entity being described, but we’re now treating people as we’ve treated corporate bodies.

Regarding 8.10, **Weiss** commented that the level of establishment is treated as an attribute of the entity’s name attribute, that is, as meta-metadata. The rule at 8.11 is even more unclear. **Attig** said that we shouldn’t treat multiple identities as a single, undifferentiated name. **Weiss** replied that we should be encouraged to differentiate people with the same name, not just by date, but by any other attribute that would be useful. It’s not principled to require differentiation of other entities, but not require it for persons.

Myers disagreed with using the term “undifferentiated” for access-point construction, as instructed in 9.1.1.1.3. Lack of differentiation should be recorded as an element, but should not be part of the access point. **Randall** suggested using phrases like “Author of...” or “Actor in...” **Attig** noted that relying on identifiers for differentiation would solve this problem. **Hostage** agreed. **Weiss** concurred that there is always information to differentiate; otherwise you wouldn’t know that they are not the same. Either we care about unique, human-readable identifiers for everything, or we don’t.

In 8.7.2, **Scharff** noted we are told to make additions considered important for identification; this seems obscure. In AACR2, we had different standards for different types of creators, but here there’s no distinction. **Attig** replied that the wording signals that additions are not required in every case. He agreed that it’s not a helpful guideline. **Maxwell** noted that it’s never considered important to identify differences

between variants. Conflicts between 4XXs are allowable. **Schmierer** said this principle exists to give national libraries flexibility, for practical purposes. **Hillmann** argued that focusing on the text string of the name doing double-duty as the identifier is counterproductive. The system isn't going to need the distinction in the display form of the name—or any entity—to know that they're different.

Weiss recalled Welbourne's point about creation. He argued that at the beginning of each chapter that covers entities and attributes, there should be general discussion about that entity, and of work and creation, even if they are covered in FRBR. **Attig** concurred that definitions should be provided in context, not just in the glossary. **Myers** agreed with Weiss, noting that high level documents inform RDA, "but the people who are going to be using RDA won't have had the benefit of sitting around this table for four years being forced to learn it."

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Saturday, January 12, 2007 — 1:30–5:30 pm
Sheraton Philadelphia City Center, Philadelphia Ballroom

1019. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. She welcomed visitors and committee members to the first general business meeting.

1020. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

[CC:DA/Roster/2007/July/Rev.]

The Chair and members introduced themselves. The Chair routed the roster for members to sign in.

1021. Adoption of agenda

[CC:DA/A/57]

There were no changes to the agenda. **Mangan** moved to adopt the agenda as issued; seconded by **Myers**. Motion carried unanimously (8 yeas; 0 nays).

1022. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2007 Annual Conference, June 22, 23, and 25, 2007

[CC:DA/M/993-1015]

There were no changes to the minutes. Motion to accept the minutes by **Myers**; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously (8 yeas; 0 nays).

1023. Report from the Chair

[CC:DA/Chair/2007-2008/3]

ALA procedures require confirmation of electronic votes that occur between Annual and Midwinter. There were a series of motions voted on by electronic ballot that are described in the Chair's report. Motion by **Maxwell** to approve the votes in the Chair's report; seconded by **Myers**. Motion carried unanimously (8 yeas; 0 nays).

The Chair reviewed the report, noting that the bulk of the work focused on reviewing drafts of RDA. Comments from CC:DA members were collected in the wiki; comments from the public were compiled and entered into the wiki, which were reviewed by CC:DA members. Comments were then compiled into the ALA response. CC:DA also completed review of FRAD and discussed it at Annual. Theroux helped

compile the comments from that discussion and a response was sent to IFLA. The task force was discharged.

The Chair was contacted by the Steering Committee responsible for implementing the recommendations of the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access regarding the two recommendations related to CC:DA. Recommendation 3 addresses reviewing the core-level supplement on “Guidelines for multiple character sets,” a PCC document. During Monday’s CC:DA meeting, the PCC liaison will report on the status of that review and whether help is needed on getting it updated. The other was Recommendation 4, which is related to RDA’s impact on cataloging Non-English language materials—a charge CC:DA is already addressing. Glenn Patton will use meeting minutes and the wiki to follow CC:DA’s progress and report to the steering committee.

The Chair had hoped to implement the public CC:DA listserv in mid-summer, but there were issues with archiving and with creating a message to notify recipients that they cannot post to the list. A software update planned for November was hoped to help solve the problem, but the software update did not get implemented as planned. It will be implemented after Midwinter. The Chair has been working with Wilt on the description and welcome message, which has been harder than expected. She is optimistic it can be done by January 25 and would like to move forward with implementation even though there will not be an archive. The committee felt it was better to proceed and explain that there are some archiving issues. There is some confusion among committee members about the two lists. Basically, CC:DA procedures will not change. Everyone on the committee is on both lists. Since there is some confusion about which list is which, the Chair will send out information about which email addresses to use for private and public emails. Since most CC:DA documents are going to be put on the Website, they could go out over the public list. The private list would be used for passwords and for any private documents such as restricted JSC documents.

In October, Patricia Hatch was appointed CC:DA Webmaster.

The Task Force on Specialist Cataloguing Manuals had a change in its charge due to a request by the JSC. A report from that task force will be made later today.

The Task Force to Maintain the CC:DA Publication *Differences between, Changes within* has been officially discharged. The Chair thanked the members of the task force.

The CC:DA Confluence documents will be archived, but the Chair is unsure of the time frame. She is working with the ALCTS office to migrate that information to an ALA-hosted server.

1024. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 1: Attig

[A new organization for RDA]
[5JSC/RDA/Sections 2-4, 9]
[5JSC/RDA/Prospectus/Rev/5]
[5JSC/RDA/Objectives and Principles/Rev]
[5JSC/Editor/2]

Attig will be using the distributed handout for the RDA Update Forum on Sunday. There is no formal report for CC:DA for this meeting.

There is a new logo for RDA which has been accepted by the co-publishers and will start appearing in promotional materials.. It’s primarily green with dark blue lettering,

The Update Forum will cover four topics:

- 1) At October meeting, a new organization for RDA was created; will explain why.
- 2) Put the previous drafts in the context of the new organization.

- 3) Will discuss other decisions made by the JSC at October meeting.
- 4) Next steps.

It is hard to believe that twelve months from now, the text should be in the hands of the publishers and out of our hands (at least temporarily).

New organization for RDA

The new organization stems from the JSC getting a stronger grasp on what it is trying to accomplish with RDA. With previous drafts, some things just didn't fit with the objectives; with the way the JSC sees future implementations of RDA and of metadata in general; and with the relationship of RDA to the underlying FRBR and FRAD models. Hopefully, this is a "final" adjustment of the organization to make things fit better. A major factor was consideration of the implementation scenarios published last year. RDA must be implemented within a broader context that includes a lot that goes beyond RDA. This deals with encoding of the data and building data structures for the storing and exchanging of RDA data. Discussions have been informed by three high level views of how to store and encode RDA data. While we want RDA to support all three, we don't want RDA to be limited by our current capabilities. We must look toward the future. Three scenarios:

- 1) Scenario #3 – For any given resource, there is a single record describing all group 1 entities (work, expression, manifestations, and items), group 2, and group 3 entities.
- 2) Scenario #2 - Composite bibliographic record, but with access points connected to authority records. Controls form of access point, but not really a reflection of the entity itself.
- 3) Scenario # 1 – The future of bibliographic control will take place in an environment that will include separate descriptions of each entity (each work, expression, manifestation, person, body, concept, etc.). These descriptions are neither bibliographic records nor authority records (not quite sure what to call them—maybe just records). These separate descriptions are linked to show relationships by using resource identifiers (at least record IDs in a given system or at most persistent uniform resource indicators using Internet connections). Descriptions may include access points for the entity described, but the real work of establishing relationships comes from the system not from humans comparing text strings. Role of authority records unclear at this time. Authority records may still have a role, but one could implement Scenario 1 without establishing access points. It is the record ID number that is unique, not necessarily the text string.

If this relational, object-oriented relationship model is where we are going, the previous RDA structure seemed to favor the other implementation scenarios, not the future view. The JSC wants RDA to point to the future. Scenario 2 is an intermediate stage to a more robust approach. Also, the previous organization of RDA chapters and their relationship to FRBR was hard to explain. The new organization is better because it explicitly relates all sections and chapters to the FRBR user tasks and the entities (including sections on the Group 3 entities to be developed later). In the handout, following the slides, there is a table mapping the contents of each section and chapter to the user tasks and the entities, and the record structure that would exist in each of the three implementation scenarios. The JSC and observers immediately saw the benefits of the new organization based on how it is laid out in this table. It shows what RDA is designed to accomplish and how it goes about doing that.

General comments on the new organization

Weiss felt the new organization to be a vast improvement. **Attig** replied that Delsey was largely responsible for the change. **Weiss** asked why the JSC didn't go further in breaking apart the FRBR entities? In some places, Group 1 entities are combined and in others they have their own chapter. It is unclear why some content is in this or that particular chapter. Regarding the naming of chapters, not

everything in the chapters reflects the chapter titles and isn't necessarily related to that particular user task. He suggested the tasks be taken out of the titles or simplify the titles. He supported that Group 1, 2, and 3 entities all are dealt with in the same way. **Attig** responded that the grouping of work and expression reflects the more abstract entities and reflects the *content*, and the grouping of the more concrete manifestation and item reflects the *carrier*. Some places needed to be broken apart more than in other places. **Maxwell** agreed that the new structure is a great improvement. He said that in considering implementation scenarios, we should focus on describing entities rather than on access point control records. **Attig** agreed that calling these access point control records does not help us. There is a need to look more rigorously at what role authority control has to play in Scenario 1 implementations.

Myers noted that since the overall scheme moves from the general to the specific, shouldn't Sections 1 and 2 be switched to reflect the FRBR model? **Weiss** supported this proposal. **Attig** replied that Section 2 relies heavily on Section 1. **Weiss** noted that RDA needs to support reference needs, *not* training needs. Linearity is less important. Some text in Section 2 does assume that you have read Section 1. This and references back and forth within the text must be minimized. **Randall** was not convinced that the FRBR user tasks (Find, Identify, Select, Obtain) are really that helpful in structuring RDA. Any element can fulfill almost any user task. **Attig** disagreed, noting that this method comes directly from FRBR Chapter 6. **Weiss** countered that FRBR Chapter 6 doesn't order the attributes by user tasks. **Randall** agreed with **Weiss**. **Weiss** argued that people should be able to access the data elements either through the entity types or the user tasks. It would be simpler if there were one chapter on works, one on expressions, etc. **Glennan** noted that naming the work attributes before dealing with the entity that created it is counterintuitive with the type of works she catalogs. **Weiss** suggested taking all the access points and making that a chapter after the relationships, so you have the pieces covered before you get to the combination. The consistency is fantastic. **Weiss** asked how the other constituencies felt about the re-organization of the text? **Attig** replied that the representatives have all supported it, but they are taking it back to their home organizations. He anticipates positive responses.

Maxwell asked if there were plans for filling in the placeholders? **Attig** responded that the only decision made is that it won't be part of the initial release of RDA. He was not sure what the placeholder will look like. **Weiss** said he likes the placeholders and the holistic approach. **Attig** stated that there's still more work to be done with subject entities (in FRSAR and FRAD). Until it is accepted and published, we must proceed with caution. **Allgood** commented that there is precedence for placeholders in specialist cataloging manuals and they put the overall context in place.

Welbourne argued that because RDA is so dependent on FRBR and FRAD, the philosophy needs to be clearer to the reader. You cannot understand RDA without understanding FRBR and FRAD. **Attig** said this belongs in the general introduction. **Schmierer** noted that since people don't understand all they need to know about FRBR and since RDA's alignment with FRBR is causing trepidation, we need more training or workshops to get people more comfortable. **Attig** replied that the RDA Implementation Task Force is looking at this. **Schmierer** reiterated that CC:DA needs to suggest to ALCTS that there be more FRBR workshops and information. The **Chair** remarked that this subject will come up when Miksa reports later this afternoon on the RDA Implementation Task Force (which is a CCS-level group).

Weiss reflected on the need to talk more about conference entities as to whether they are Events or Corporate bodies, as well as entities in general.

Returning to the handout, in the update on Sunday, **Attig** will cover the new top-level organization. The outline follows the two main parts: Attributes and Relationships of entities. There are separate sections for each group of entities, plus some general instructions in each section. Attributes are in Sections 1-4.

- Section 1 – Attributes of manifestation and item
- Section 2 – Attributes of work and expression

Section 3 – Group 2 entities
Section 4 – Group 3 entities

Relationships are in Sections 5-10.

Section 5 – Inherent relationships between Group 1 entities
Section 6 – Relationships between Group 2 entities and resources
Section 7 – Subject relationships
Sections 8-10 – Recording relationships between instances of group 1, 2 or 3 entities

Attig will also cover how the new organization links to what's in the current draft.

Section 2 – Chapter 5 General guidelines,
Chapter 6 – Identifying works and expressions,
Chapter 7 – additional attributes (Chapter 4 in Dec 2004 draft)
Section 3 – Attributes of Group 2 entities
Section 4 – Only Chapter 16 (Place names) included in Section 4; it reflects Chapter 23 in AACR2. It will be expanded later.
Section 9 – Relationships between Group 2 entities
Three appendices deal with special instructions moved out of other chapters. These will hopefully be moved into other tools later.

Attig stated that the JSC's thinking on authority control is still evolving, especially when looking at implementation scenario 1. In current practice, decisions and facts about variants and chosen forms of names are recorded in authority records. Most are recorded in 670s, not in separate content designators. There are lots of elements all dumped into a large bucket. There may need to be further granularity in authority records and this will be discussed with MARBI.

Following FRAD, RDA seems to turn this upside down. Now RDA chapters are concerned with instructions for recording the attributes of the entities being described. This is the factual information that is recorded in the 670s to justify headings and for conflict resolution. This factual information seems to be the focus of usage today: name usage, preferred and variants, scope of coverage, other identifying information, occupation, etc.

The chapters also include instructions for formulating a preferred access point for the entity, but it is not an element in the description; rather, it is constructed based on the preferred name element (and may be qualified by other elements if a unique name is needed). In some Scenario 1 implementations, you may not need a unique name. For undifferentiated headings, we may be leaning toward creating an individual record for each entity, even though the heading is the same in all of those records (instead of one heading for an undifferentiated name). What elements will be required in this area is questionable. Since an access point isn't an element, it may not be required, but some other attributes may be required.

Myers commented that the RDA Implementation Task Force is going to have lots of work to do. We have moved into uncharted territory (no longer the familiar road map). **Attig** said that while emphasizing the more forward-looking Scenario 1, we must also support the other implementation scenarios. We won't be getting to Scenario 1 by 2009; it's not going to happen next year. We will be dealing with more familiar implementations in the near term. The national libraries are starting to think about what a coordinated implementation effort is going to look like and all that entails.

Weiss noted that some folks want a mapping from AACR2 to RDA, but he thinks this may be a bad idea. RDA is conceptually different. **Attig** replied that the developers are working on a system that allows you to search AACR2 and RDA simultaneously. He thinks it will help with users' comfort level, but agrees that it may prevent deeper understanding. **Welbourne** stated that a map between RDA and AACR2 is the last thing we want to do. The **Chair** noted that there are people who want it. **Schiff** believed that it is more important to identify the changes between RDA and AACR2. Some instructions with access points

will be different. There are some changes, such as with initialisms, institution names in conference names will be dropped, etc., that people need to understand. **Attig** said that concentrating on the differences would be difficult. It may be better for everyone to start over with RDA on its own terms.

Weiss stated that it's great to be scenario-independent, but Scenario 1 is the way we do things all over the world (not just in LIS). It's the way all databases work. We are just catching up. **Attig** agreed that we have to break out of the box we have been in. **Hillmann** reflected that, in reality, there are a lot more than three implementation scenarios. If we are talking about Scenario 1, which is the furthest-thinking one, we need to think about implementations in the non-MARC world. It also helps to remember this is not just a replacement to AACR2; it is an attempt to go beyond the library world. Even in traditional libraries, there are groups doing non-MARC metadata for digital projects. They need an implementation plan too. **Attig** agreed that the scenarios are oversimplified. They aren't an attempt to describe the environment, but a tool for us as developers. We are going to run into areas where we will bring some requirements that will stretch the standards of current Internet protocols. For our data, it's not only about identifying the objects you are linking to, but also about defining the nature of that relationship as well, which is not standard. **Hillmann** said that we have to be careful about imposing requirements at the general level of the standard. A lot of those requirements must happen at the implementation/domain/application level. Those required fields are barriers to wide implementation.

Allgood noted that the final RDA product will be online. We need to see the online product, instead of these paper drafts. It's terrifying that it is just one year away. **Attig** said he hoped the draft that comes out in July would be in that form.

Other decisions of the JSC

The JSC spent most of its time on Part B. They confirmed changes to Bible uniform titles, to primary access points for treaties, and instructions that read "in English" were changed to "in the language of the cataloguing agency." The JSC also addressed the issue of when to make a new record (change in mode of issuances or media type) for all resources, and for integrating resources when there is a new base set. The introductory words proposal was rejected; introductory words are not part of the title proper.

The JSC asked ALA as to their intentions in publishing *Differences between, Changes within* with regard to RDA. **Attig** asked if CC:DA would be interested in preparing a revision of that document in the context of RDA? During the ensuing discussion, there were different opinions on this. While many thought it was important, most thought it shouldn't be pursued until RDA is out, but the Chair could start exploring ALCTS administrative and publication support. **Myers** asked: Will RDA answer the questions raised about when to create a new record? **Attig**: Probably not. **Weiss** expressed his opposition to publishing the document before RDA is published. **Attig** noted that it cannot be mentioned in RDA in that case.

Maxwell contended that *Differences ...* is an important document. **Attig** noted that there are reasons why it is separate from RDA. **Myers** stated that one of the merits of an online environment is that these things can be changed on the fly. He doesn't think we can draft a document until RDA is further along. **Glennan** agreed that it is too early to start work on it, but that the Chair could start exploring what kind of support from ALCTS could be expected.

What wasn't discussed by the JSC: public responses to chapters 3, 6, or 7. Some problems with 1, 2, 4 and 5 haven't been resolved. Lots of work is yet to be done: the JSC needs to work on resolving problems in Section 1, look at responses to chapters 6 & 7, complete the appendices and examples, review the general introduction, and prepare the complete draft for review in July.

Issues: How much change to the current rules should we make? What is instruction and what is implementation? This discussion has been started by the JSC, which is more inclined to make specific changes in the text of RDA if the changes fit the principles (and implementation could be delayed by some organizations). Basically, we are deciding which should be the instruction and which should be the

option. We are trying to strike a balance between making RDA forward-thinking while recognizing that too much change can be problematic.

Marjorie Bloss and Beacher Wiggins will talk about implementation at the update tomorrow. When RDA is implemented in 2009, it will most certainly be implemented in MARC 21. The JSC and MARBI are in discussions. Discussion Paper No. 2008-04 is to be discussed Sunday afternoon at MARBI. Implementation in MARC 21 will probably reflect Implementation Scenario 2. This will be discussed tomorrow with final decisions to be made at Annual 2008. There are also discussions about alternatives to MARC21. This is a complex issue. They are encouraging the MARC community to begin that discussion as it is affected by RDA.

1025. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

Please see report. Handout distributed. The full report is online; these are highlights of interest to this committee.

LC Booth is #1946. Deanna Marcum will be speaking today and tomorrow about the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control's recommendations. The final report of the Working Group has been published. Three internal groups will be advising Deanna Marcum: the directors reporting to Marcum; a strategic planning group within library services; and Thomas Mann. Tillett discussed LC's strategic plan, staff changes, the expansion of the cataloging services at the overseas offices, the BEAT project, and continuing CDS staffing problems (hopes to hire more staff soon). Spanish language and French language interfaces now are available for Cataloger's Desktop. Class Web continues to grow and expand.

CPSO is attempting to bring more non-Latin scripts into cataloging products. It is looking at how to add non-Latin characters into authority records; they will be treated as variant forms for now. At a later time, it will figure out how to make non-Latin headings preferred forms. The initial implementation will probably begin in June or earlier. There is a white paper (URL: http://www.loc.gov/catdir/cpso/nonlatin_whitepaper.html) on this. Tillett welcomed comments and suggestions. **Scharff** asked if there is any coding in the 4XX to identify which headings are in non-Roman scripts? **Tillett** said there was none. **Schiff** noted that as part of the testing of the next version of Connexion, we have been adding vernacular headings and the results have been good so far. **Maxwell** wondered whether the addition of these headings would slow down the regular NACO loading. **Tillett** replied that this would not be a problem, as they are limiting it to 30,000 headings per day. LC is using Voyager now for JACKPHY languages. There is a new application, *Transliterator*—an automatic translator for some scripts—which we hope to make available to anyone using Voyager. LC is working with Ex Libris to include this in Voyager. There is a new policy for spacing for CJK: for Chinese and Japanese characters, the spaces are dropped; for Korean, the spaces are retained.

Statistics for cataloging and authority work are up from previous years. Some prices at CDS are down because staffing levels are lower.

1026. Report of the ALA representative to NISO: Hepfer

Reminder: CC:DA members should send to the Chair any comments on the two ballots that are out: 1) Knowledge Base Working Groups and 2) Standard for Institutional Identifiers. The Chair will forward those to Hepfer.

Hepfer is the new representative to NISO and has not been to CC:DA before. She would therefore appreciate advice on how to improve the report to CC:DA. She spoke with Charles Wilt about how to improve communication within ALCTS; as it stands, information does not get distributed beyond ALCTS, even though many of the standards are applicable to much of ALA. Currently, NISO distributes

the NISO Newline and various announcements to ALCTS leaders. She welcomes ideas on getting information out to a wider audience.

Attig noted that there are standards groups all over ALA, but the most relevant is probably LITA, which is very much interested in standards and has specific groups that are charged with keeping track of those. He thought this relationship was already established.

Hepfer said she had spoken to Hillmann about getting messages out on the LITA blog. Hillmann is now making a concerted effort to get things up there, which has elicited an increase in responses. She has been receiving more requests from people for ISO Standards, which are copyrighted documents and cannot be readily shared. Todd Carpenter (Executive Director, NISO) has said that in order to get comments from ALA members, you have to share them, but these are copyrighted standards. Hepfer is happy to share these documents with ALA members, but some assurance is needed that access is being requested for the appropriate reasons. Sending NISO response requests to the public CC:DA list is fine.

Weiss pointed out that when he was the NISO representative, he would go through the directory to find every group that was related to the proposed standard. ALCTS was the only group that was ever really responsive. **Hepfer** suggested setting up a closed discussion list that includes all of the committees that are involved in drafting standards. The **Chair** noted that she is sharing the information with CC:DA and setting deadlines in order to get responses. **Attig** noted that collective responses aren't always forthcoming, so reaching out to willing individuals could be helpful.

Standards in progress since Hepfer became the representative have dealt with preservation products, environmental conditions for exhibiting library and archival materials, title pages for conference publications. ALA voted yes on all three. She did submit a lengthy list of comments about the title pages from CC:DA (which is still being reviewed). She received no feedback on the SUSHI protocol, harvesting initiative – ALA voted yes and it passed. There has been more activity on the ISO standards side lately.

1027. Report from the Chair of the RDA Implementation Task Force: Miksa

Shawne Miksa did not attend the meeting. Committee members who attended the RDA Implementation Task Force meeting tried to give a summary of what took place.

In Fall 2007, Miksa took over the RDA Implementation Task Force when the former chair resigned. The task force meeting this morning focused on Miksa trying to find out what went on before and what should be in the program at Annual 2008. **Harken** reported that Miksa did not attend the Program Committee meeting; the **Chair** stated she will let Mary Charles Lasater know that the program committee needs more information from Miksa. At the task force meeting, Miksa stated she was trying to increase task force membership to include more public library folks. She talked about collecting resources that can be added to an ALCTS website on how to prepare for RDA. **Ratkovich** stated that there is a need to engage different levels of stakeholders: administrators, catalogers, public service people, etc, and that not everyone would need the same level of information. "Road shows" were discussed and what would be needed to involve different groups. Perhaps something at PLA, working with the visual resources folks, working with the Council of Regional Groups, working with OCLC groups to get the word out there? **Scharff** asked, "Who is this program at ALA Annual going to be directed toward?" The **Chair** stated that the program is trying to reach everyone at all levels. **Harken** will communicate this information back to the program committee.

1028. Report of the Task Force on Specialist Cataloguing Manuals: Scharff [CC:DA/TF/SpecCatMan/3]

The report lists the four points of the original charge. This was originally going to be included in RDA; then the JSC decided that it should be a separate document. One of the charges was to look at the

responses and to combine and organize the resources that were included in the two initial lists, and to come up with recommendations for selection criteria. There was an understanding that this would happen in a wiki environment. A few days before the mid-November deadline, the task force received (as a result of the JSC October meeting), a list of additional resources to be integrated into the list so that this second list of resources did not have to be included in the text and footnotes of RDA. The task force was granted additional time to re-work the list. It appeared that the greatest contribution of the task force was to provide some organizational framework, to identify scope and coverage, and to make recommendations. The task force amended the text in its first recommendation to read: *We endorse the list as an auxiliary list to RDA. If the wiki format is chosen, we recommend that the JSC adopt some sort of gate-keeping mechanism, consistent with their ultimate vision.* It also recommended that the JSC step back and consider whether it wants the scope of the document to be as broad as it currently is (including the *Encyclopedia of Islam* for example). The task force has some additional recommendations about formatting, cross-listing, categories, terminology, URLs, updating, citations, etc. for this document.

Regarding the future of the task force, if the decisions reflected in the document are acceptable, then some fine-tuning/proof-reading may be needed for consistency. The task force suggested that the document be separated into two lists: 1) standards and manuals, and 2) other tools/resources for cataloging. If that were adopted, CC:DA would need to charge the task force to make the changes. The task force has begun formulating the two lists, but did not want to invest additional time before knowing the JSC's intentions.

MOTION: Myers moved to forward this report as amended to the JSC; Thurston seconded.

Mangan asked whether it should be one or two lists. If it is two, then one is authoritative and vetted and the other that can contain anything. **Attig** said he was unsure if the JSC had a clear sense of what it had in mind, but noted that a wiki needn't be open-access. The wiki can be controlled. He believes the list should be controlled and edited by the JSC (and maybe some levels of the constituencies). Gate-keeping decisions will need to be made. Though he can't speak for the JSC, he hopes it is looking for a list that could be recommended to the community. **Weiss** noted that this is very different from the original intent. The list is a bibliography. The committee should focus on RDA. If this requires vetting, he is not ready to send it on. **Maxwell** commented that catalogers need a list of official documents to find information on rules not covered in RDA. **Scharff** pointed out that some communities don't have that mechanism: the music community, for example. **Mangan** argued that it needn't be limited to official publications. Not all communities have created separate specialist manuals, but it's a disservice to those communities who have, just to open this list up to everything that's out there. Also, some of this is country-specific. The IFLA list of states, for example, cannot be used in the US. It's beyond the intention that it was to be a list to supplement RDA for cataloging. **Weiss** agreed with Mangan on many points, but noted that the resources in the list are used to supplement AACR2. With RDA moving so far away from AACR2, these manuals may not be so useful. Individual communities should vet their standards, not CC:DA. **Randall** thought this should be part of implementation. The US cataloging community will come up with its own list for its implementation guidelines. The **Chair** said based on information from the JSC, it sounded like there was going to be no gate-keeping at all. **Myers** wondered why people felt vetting was so important? **Glennan** argued that the gate-keeping issue related to the purpose and status of such a list. If it is on the JSC website, does that mean that the JSC specifically endorses the use of these standards for description? How authoritative is this list? How are people to interpret the permission, blessing, or seal of approval for these works? Some on the list are two decades old and many/most are focused on using AACR2.

Scharff noted that CC:DA had options: we can send it along and say, "Here are some categories." Or, not send it at all. **Weiss** recommended sending it to the JSC as well as the RDA Implementation Task Force. We don't have to say we approve it or disapprove; we've just done what we have been asked to do. **Scharff** agreed that the items on the list have not been officially approved by CC:DA. To do that, we would need another proposal that the JSC come up with some mechanism for determining which items in the list are standards and approved. We can certainly add that as a recommendation if CC:DA would like.

Allgood enquired about the title, noting that not all of these are cataloging manuals. The list doesn't reflect the title of the document, as most were not designed to be used with RDA. **Attig** noted that some of them are neutral as to their application to RDA or AACR, but others are obsolete in the context of RDA. **Scharff** said the JSC would supply an appropriate title.

Glennan asked what, in the context of this motion, does yea or nay mean? The motion says "document," which includes internal CC:DA business (such as the future of the task force).

The **Chair** asked if the motion could be amended to: "To forward the recommendations and the list to the JSC." **Myers** accepted that friendly amendment. **Scharff** stated that would eliminate the issue of one list versus two. **Weiss** wants that issue to be clear to the JSC. **Attig** proposed that CC:DA forward the list and he would bring up the recommendations with the JSC. The **Chair** suggested the motion read: "Forward the list to the JSC" with the understanding that Attig will address the recommendations and concerns with the JSC. **Myers** agreed to the amended motion.

AMMENDED MOTION: To forward the task force's list of specialist manuals to the JSC.

The **Chair** called the vote. (8 yeas; 0 nays) and the amended motion carried. The task force will be left in place in case additional work is requested from the JSC.

1029. **Revisions to CC:DA Procedures** [CC:DA/Chair/2007-2008/2]

The revisions to the procedures are necessary because of the decision to establish a non-voting CC:DA Webmaster position at ALA Annual 2007. Charles Wilt made some other recommendation for changes in CC:DA membership designations. Since everyone had read the document, only questions and concerns with the proposed revisions were discussed rather than each individual revision.

Section I.C: **Mangan** was concerned about limiting the Webmaster appointment to two terms. The phrase "may be reappointed for a second term" was changed to "may be reappointed".

Section I.H: **Patton** stated that OCLC no longer uses the "Online Computer Library Center" phrase since the recent re-branding. It's now just "OCLC."

No comments on the officers or documentation sections.

Section X: **Weiss** suggested that some of the detail found in the minutes be minimized. Too much time and energy is spent on transcription. The **Chair** finds it helpful to have some detail, but relies on the interns to make judgments of what is included. **Attig** suggested that the phrase "Substance of committee discussion" gives some leeway and doesn't require the level of detail found in the minutes. **Myers** stated that the substance of discussion does need to be recorded for the Chair and the JSC rep. **Weiss** stated that it is better for the minutes to be shorter and produced in a more timely manner.

Section X.B

Maxwell: Wondering about removing AACR in X.B. How about cataloging decisions?

Mangan: RDA is not even cataloging rules now. What are they called? Cataloging instructions?

Attig: Strike "on AACR2" and leave out new text.

- **Rewording:** "The minutes shall include the substance of Committee discussions (both pro and con), decisions, and the results of voting, including any straw ballots that may have been taken."

Section X.C: **Attig** suggested omitting "Chair of".

Section X.D: There was a good deal of discussion about the meaning of the text being added to this statement. Some felt it was unnecessary and that decisions about this were outside the purview of the committee itself. Others felt that all of the changes were needed and appropriate.

- **Rewording:** “Other decisions shall be communicated in writing to the appropriate body or person(s) by the Chair.”

No further revisions were suggested.

Myers moved to approve the document as amended and forward to the CCS Executive Committee; **Mangan** seconded the motion. The motion carried (8 yeas; 0 nays).

The Chair recessed the meeting until Monday at 8a.m.

Monday, January 14, 2008 — 8:00 a.m. –12:30 p.m.
Sheraton Philadelphia City Center, Philadelphia Ballroom

1030. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, Chair, called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m. She welcomed visitors and committee members to the second general business meeting.

1031. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Chatham provided a brief introduction to the functionality that is being developed for the online RDA product. The RDA Co-Publishers are developing RDA Online with a database developer based in Ottawa, Canada, named CogniLore. In addition, the Co-Publishers retained a database consultant named Nannette Naught, president of a database development management company named IMT, to coordinate the development of functional specifications that will be consistent with cataloging practice. In October, on behalf of the Co-Publishers, ALA Publishing convened a 2-day meeting with CogniLore, IMT staff, three catalogers, and ALA Publishing staff (ALA Online Resources, Publishing Production, and Publishing Marketing) to analyze potential functionalities and develop a cost effective plan for creating and programming the database product based on input from the RDA Editor and the JSC.

Current plans include the following functionalities:

A scrollable browse functionality that will encompass the text, the table of contents, and the index. Browse history will be available and the Index will include a link list tied to rule numbers.

Display functionalities that will include windows for document types. The document types will be chapter, glossary, appendix, workflow, and a “landing page” that will provide topical references for interoperability features. An auto-synch feature that will synchronize the current location with its TOC position.

Link functionalities that will include cross references within RDA to the glossary, to other collections or products within the environment, and to outside content.

Notes and bookmark functionalities that will allow for bookmarks, annotations, and sharing within both internal and external environments -- all of which can be made persistent across views and updates.

Export functionalities for print options that will be formatted as high resolution, composed PDFs for submission to a printer.

Print functionalities that will allow for user-initiated PDFs of individual documents, user-initiated virtual or online documents (such as workflows, classroom assignments, and topical reference landing pages), user-initiated custom views, and the entire text if so desired.

Profile-related functionalities that will provide for such features as: persistent settings for designated views and individual preferences, extensibility options for multiple views under one login, portability (whereby a cataloger will be able to move individual profiles to other settings or institutions), and shareability within and outside the subscription. This pertains to bookmarks, notes, views, and workflows.

Search functionalities that will include: advanced search, controlled vocabulary search, key word search, and a TOC/Browse option (which is to say a search within the browse listing only). There will also be the capacity to save searches and retain search histories.

Topical reference functionalities that will provide interoperability with OCLC, ILS vendors and other cataloging tools by way of “landing pages” that contain RDA content links keyed to cataloging record fields (this will simulate the “RDA buttons” that were introduced in the first prototype).

Update functionalities that will display change histories, provide clear indication of the most recently updated material when the changed document is displayed, and update-based content filtering, or searching, of the most recently updated material.

View functionalities that will include Full view, Custom views that can be filtered on metadata fields for inclusion or exclusion of content, including Required (mandatory/if applicable), Exceptions – alternatives / optional omissions / optional additions, Description type, Content type, Media type, Issuance type, Work type, Composite examples, and the option to view or hide examples.

Workflow functionalities that will allow the creation of new workflows (such as for the Step by Step process demonstrated in the first prototype, or for situational/environment specific processes such as, for example, those that are relevant to public libraries or classroom assignments), the modification of existing workflows, the ability to browse workflows, and the ability to share workflows. Integration with vocabularies and application profiles. AACR2-related “on ramp” or “crosswalk” functionality that will provide either AACR2 rule numbers or the text itself for reference -- searchable by key word and browsable by TOC (with the potential to scroll, search, browse, and link). An AACR2 to RDA Index.

Additional base functionalities will include the following: Inclusion of images in documents, such as title pages, compatibility with major browsers, enter key as submit button, keyboard shortcuts, right click menus, system/product support functionalities (such as dynamic help and sales support).

Chatham stated they have been working with a variety of catalogers and other librarians on the analysis and design of this product. (These are: Ed Jones, Karen Miller, Cheryl Tarsala, as well as an advisory group composed of the following: Mary-Charles Lasater, Andrea Kappler, Diane Dates Casey, Jones, Tarsala, Joseph Keegle, Deborah Fritz, Magda El-Sherbini.) They will provide a prototype for review by others. At this point, they need to nail down the functionality to get it available by June or July (possibly for Annual; definitely for IFLA). At IFLA there will be a formal, international launch of the product.

He said that the Co-Publishers are increasingly confident that the product will facilitate the application of RDA and address users’ anxieties through its practicality and functionality. They are getting good feedback that the product will facilitate the transition.

Attig inquired about which functionalities will be issued in the first release. **Chatham** responded that at this stage, they are planning to proceed with functionalities he listed today. Any additional functionalities that come out of suggestions might need to wait until version 2.

Ratkovich asked about the timeline for the print product. **Chatham** indicated that many questions about the print product have yet to be answered; specifically, redesigning the online product into a linear format and synchronization. He noted that the text is really long and printing it out from the online version would be formidable. They are working on “print derivatives,” but are not sure what these will be yet. He believes the online product will be less expensive than print. The Co-Publishers will continue to work with segments of the market that have higher “perceived need” for print.

Hall brought up affordability and infrastructure limitations as barriers that some libraries would face with the online product. **Maxwell** noted that this is the first time anyone had learned that the print product would not be immediately available. **Ratkovich** was also concerned about the print and online versions not being published simultaneously, pointing to the needs of school and small public libraries. **Schmierer** echoed Maxwell’s concern, noting that “if you want people to start using it, give it to them how they want it.” **De Groat** said that a basic print version would be useful for small special libraries that only catalog occasionally and asked if one could turn off all the options and just view the basic required rules with little additional functionality. **Chatham** believed so, pointing to the option of choosing and isolating a single workflow. He said it might also be possible to sign on for short periods without a full subscription for one time access.

Weiss asked if there would be links from Cataloger’s Desktop directly into the content or to the landing page. **Chatham** replied that they are constructing a database with a tool set that will provide “engagement opportunities” to enhance RDA, such as Cataloger’s Desktop. A bridge will be provided, at the very least. He had spoken with Tillett and Beacher Wiggins about various relationship possibilities with LC.

Winzer said she had heard that the JSC is trying to edit for a more understandable explanation of the material. **Weiss** stated that the drafts were poorly written. **Tillett** responded that editing issues were being discussed by the JSC, but that there was concern about the time-frame. She noted that Tom Delsey’s writing style is what it is and that it is hard to communicate complex concepts in simplified language without bringing in ambiguity.

Myers noted that he and others have a range of cataloging information-seeking behaviors that influence their preference of resource format. If the online product is not what people need, they’ll be “screaming for a print version.” **Chatham** said that this was why they would include AACR2 crosswalks in the product, to assist transition. **Myers** responded that CC:DA members did not all agree that this was for the best. **Welbourne** voiced her disagreement with the crosswalk to AACR2 rules.

1032. Report on PCC’s Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets: Fletcher

Recommendation #3 of the ALCTS Task Force on Non-English Access charged CC:DA and CC:AAM to work with the PCC to review and update the core level supplement on “Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets.” The PCC Standing Committee on Standards (PCC SCS) agreed to review the core level supplement and get back to CC:DA regarding the status of the review and what help it might need from CC:DA.

Fletcher stated the document is short and will be internally updated, as necessary. There will also be a wide review of PCC guidelines on supporting different characters in cataloging records. The PCC SCS realizes there are various scattered documents on this topic and not all of them include all Non-Roman character sets. It will identify and review the various documents to see what’s missing, which ones conflict, etc. The **Chair** asked if there was a set time frame for this. **Fletcher** replied that in a month, the PCC SCS would begin to gather the needed documents; beyond that, he was not quite sure. PCC SCS Chair **Joan Schuitema** said that within the next four weeks, the committee will go through all of the

documentation to identify what's missing and conflicts. After that, it will see if an internal task force is needed and how these relate to other issues.

1033. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2008/1 (preliminary)]

Allgood presented highlights from MARBI's Saturday and Sunday meetings:

Proposal No. 2008-01: *Representation of the Dewey Decimal Classification (DDC) System in MARC 21 formats.* There were nine sub-elements of this paper addressing various needs within MARC for the DDC community. All nine were approved, some with minor revisions.

Proposal No. 2008-02: *Definition of field 542 for information related to copyright status in the MARC 21 bibliographic format.* Proposal approved with fairly substantive revisions.

Proposal No. 2008-03: *Definition of first indicator value in field 041 (Language code) of the MARC 21 bibliographic format.* Proposal was approved with minor revisions.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP01: *Identifying headings that are appropriate as added entries, but are not used as bibliographic main entries.* This discussion paper will come back as a proposal, which will include other headings that fall into this category, e.g., uniform headings of fairy tales such as Cinderella.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP02: *Making field 440 (Series Statement/Added Entry--Title) obsolete in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.* This discussion paper will come back as a proposal or a series of proposals.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP03: *Definition of subfield \$3 for recording information associated with series added entry fields (800-830) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.* MARBI would like this discussion paper to come back as a proposal or a series of proposals, broader than this paper which specifically addresses the serials community only. Both the map and sound recording communities expressed interest. MARBI would also like to see this proposal address more than just the 8XX fields.

Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP04: *Encoding RDA, Resource Description and Access data in MARC 21.* As this was only a discussion paper, MARBI offered broad guidance and direction to the JSC for developing a proposal or series of proposals that MARBI will receive at ALA Annual. MARBI offered a principled approach, the guiding principle being, "Granularity is good." As a general principle MARBI wants to accommodate each of the RDA data elements necessary to encode RDA records in MARC. The RDA elements that currently have logical locations in MARC should be encoded there, but existing MARC elements will not be redefined or tweaked to accommodate RDA. Instead, where necessary, MARBI will define new fields, subfields, and values to encode all necessary RDA elements. By providing for the encoding of all necessary RDA elements, MARBI believes that individual user communities and libraries will be able to determine the best possible RDA-based catalog and record displays for their users. Many ILS systems fail to recognize the difference between data encoding and data display, but that is an implementation issue and not necessarily a MARBI issue.

Attig reiterated that when a coded data element corresponded with an RDA element, MARBI felt the existing element should be used.

Maxwell stated that we need a totally new data structure and asked who would develop this. **Attig** responded that the JSC made this point in their discussion paper. RDA poses the need for a new structure. The MARC community in general is the forum in which this is taking place, but there are no specific plans. Attig stressed that it's "time to get serious about this process." **Hillmann** noted that the library community has no recent experience in developing a new structure, so we must look outside of our own community. DCMI has expertise with the Web platform. It is starting a project the results of which will be made available in March. **Myers** said that communities perceive the need for a new data structure as

the “elephant in the room”, but don’t know how to proceed. The landscape is not settled on which to develop a new structure.

1034. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee, Part 2: Attig

Before moving on to the continuing discussion of RDA, the Chair asked Tillett if she would like to comment on the Library of Congress’s message on the future of RDA. **Tillett** stated there appears to be differing interpretations of the messages being presented by LC leadership regarding the recommendations of the LC Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control. Before leaving for ALA, LC staff members were told to focus on the upcoming decision-making process. Until the feedback is received, LC staff members were informed that current operations would not change. Apparently, Marcum stated something to the contrary at the LC exhibit booth. **Tillett** reminded CC:DA that LC took part in the Committee of Principles (CoP) declaration about the RDA implementation plan and in the CoP’s response to the working group’s recommendation that work on RDA be suspended. She believes that suspension of work on RDA is counterproductive and can’t wait for it to be done.

Thurston was told that some of the recommendations in the final report are things that the WG realizes are already getting done. The group member she spoke with was much more positive about RDA than what is reflected in the report.

Continuation of the discussion of the RDA draft

Comments on Chapter 8: General guidelines on recording attributes of persons, families, and corporate bodies

Myers asked what principle drives the differences between spacing in corporate and personal names. **Attig** replied that continuity was the principle.

Maxwell reiterated his concern about the language of cataloging agency/language of original work issue. **De Groat** noted that the language instructions at 8.2.5 and 8.2.6 contradict each other.

Comments on Chapter 9: Identifying persons

Randall observed that in choosing the preferred name, guidelines are in two places: 9.2.0.3 and 9.2.1.

Maxwell was pleased the instructions were not split between contemporary and non-contemporary authors. **Attig** replied that this was an intentional decision, but the JSC needs to look at the results to make sure it’s not a problem.

Regarding Appendix F, **Weiss** expressed concern that language vs. ethnicity of a person weren’t being specified. 9.2 works better because it’s organized by situation rather than the result we want users to come to.

Maxwell asked that patronymic be defined in 9.2.15.

Myers asked what principle underlies the removal of the title *Saint* from Popes and Kings (9.1.1.2.1; 9.7.0.4.1; 9.5.0.6.1). He noted that the term “other” in the recording of gender at 9.8.0.3.1 would be deemed offensive by some and doesn’t help us code people who’ve changed their gender. What does the gender that someone identifies with mean? What about people writing under pseudonyms? **Attig** replied that the element is there to allow you to record the obvious ones. **Schiff** informed the group that the GLBT Round Table has this issue on their agenda and will likely form a task force. **Tillett** commented that it’s optional and follows a FRAD element. Gender is a required element in France and we’re continuing this international conceptual model. **Maxwell** cited academic reasons for encoding this element. **Myers** reiterated his earlier point about George Sand: if we code her as a man, the data point

won't serve users searching for female authors. **Weiss** said that gender is only one area where there's a difference between personal and bibliographic identity.

Weiss asked if the different name types in 9.3 should be construed as element subtypes of variant names or as examples. "If we are identifying variant names displaying in these categories, why not the preferred name in the same categories? If we are indicating the variant name is a name in religion, why not for the preferred name? It seems odd that we would have more data about the variant than for the preferred."

For 9.2.4.1 and 9.2.4.2, **Myers** said he couldn't determine where Mark Twain would fit, indicating that the rules themselves are unclear. **Attig** believed 9.2.4.1 should cover the case at 9.2.4.2. **Maxwell** disagreed that 9.2.4.2 is an exception to 9.2.4.1.

Maxwell pointed out that the name Lewis Carroll sometimes appears on math works, but Charles Dodgson would be given as the heading, according to our instructions. **Attig** responded that how we apply different names for identities in naming works is something we must look at more carefully. The JSC considered this issue and decided that when an author uses a different name, he/she has created a different identity. **Schiff** advised the group to look at the rule in AACR2 [22.2B3 (second paragraph)]—removed from RDA—concerning an author who writes under a pseudonym and later publishes under a real name which requires us to make a count to decide which is predominant. It was very difficult to find an example for inclusion in RDA that worked in reality, so it was left out. We should consider if there's a need for it, however.

Myers noted that 9.2.6 is lifted verbatim from AACR2: exceptions are first, which should be modified. According to 9.4.1.3.3 and 9.4.2.3.2, if death and birth dates are not known, we could get the construction unknown-not known? This is an editorial oversight.

Glennan commented that in 9.4.3.3.2 slashes are used to separate centuries rather than dashes. **Attig** replied that nothing in the instructions specifies use of punctuation, and **Schiff** noted that this instruction is right out of AACR2.

Randall asked what, in 9.2.18.1.2 and 9.2.19.2, distinguishes Mother Hen from Aunt Jemima? **Schiff** responded that one is a term of address and one isn't. **Attig** noted that this distinction carries forward from AACR2.

Regarding 9.2.6.6 Scandinavian names, **Hostage** said he believed the current culture defaults to compound name. He suggested we consult language experts.

Weiss said that, since 9.4 covers all dates associated with a person, why not treat places in the same way? He suggested creating element sub-types.

Glennan questioned the intellectual distinction between field of activity vs. profession/occupation [9.16.0.3 and 9.17.0.3]. **Weiss** commented that this is one of a number of places where distinction between two attributes is blurry. **Maxwell** thought this revealed a problem with the attributes' definitions.

Myers argued that in 9.5.0.8.2, data that's being referred to will only be extractable if it's recorded in the statement of responsibility. But if use of the statement is optional, this would impact our ability to provide data elements specified if the information is not available in the records.

Maxwell questioned the removal of *title* for distinguishing identical names (i.e. Ph.D.) (see the cover letter, page 11, second bullet point, as well as 9.1.1.2). **Schmierer** responded that Ph.D. is a useless addition, as so many authors have them. **Jean Altschur** noted that it can help clarify when a person is from a different discipline.

Comments on Chapter 10: Identifying families

Myers noted that the instructions list elements in one order, but the examples have a different organization. **Attig** said that instructions for choosing which element you will include in an access point needn't be in a particular order.

Regarding 9.2 and 10.2, **Weiss** noticed that adding additions for differentiation purposes is noted in one chapter but not the other. **Attig** replied that that discrepancy was unintentional.

Maxwell commented that with personal names there's a strong presumption that they're qualified when needed, but with family names, the assumption is that they'll be qualified even when conflict doesn't exist. **Smart** argued that we should always qualify to assist in future name construction, particularly given the growth of shared databases. **Randall** agreed, saying that conflict is inherent in a name without additions. **Schiff** noted that in 10.1, type of family is a required addition to both the preferred name and its variants.

Myers pointed out that the instructions at 10.1.1.1.2–10.1.1.1.5 say to make additions in the order listed, but the examples do not follow this order. In an online environment, order needs to be made explicit because you'll be able to customize the view. **Attig** agreed that it might be better to specify order.

Hostage noted that only the type of family is required for every family name, the other three additions are used only if necessary.

Weiss commented that families are relatively new to the non-archival community, so good examples are important to help them become familiarized. **Maxwell** agreed that a qualifier is useful even when not required.

Myers asked that the distinction between family and clan, and royal house and dynasty be defined. **Weiss** added that we need to be clear whether this is a preferred list or categories with definitions. **Attig** responded that, if we really want this to be a rigorous set of categories, with definitions and controlled vocabulary, then we need to do some work.

Comments on Chapter 11: Identifying corporate bodies

Weiss said that he had hoped for a more principled approach to bringing AACR2 rules into RDA.

Maxwell believed that it isn't necessary to retain the distinction between governmental and non-governmental bodies. **Weiss** agreed.

Maxwell expressed concern at the inability to use institution as a qualifier for conferences. The instructions for choosing qualifiers are more prescriptive than AACR2; he prefers more cataloger's judgment.

Hillmann urged that consideration be taken for the cost of having things cataloger determined. If choice is not prescriptive, a machine will not be able to assist in disambiguation; a human will always have to be involved. In a scenario where data is in a record to allow for disambiguation, a machine could tell us where we need the disambiguation. It needn't be fixed ... it could be displayed to users in various ways.

Randall replied that users won't always be accessing data in an online environment. In non-online output there needs to be a constant form. **Weiss** noted that if records exist in different databases, each database could disambiguate them in different ways. Is the goal consistency across databases, for human readable citations; or simply disambiguation for the sake of uniqueness?

Schmierer observed that, at 11.6.0.3, we have lost various possibilities for identifying types of corporate bodies. RDA is too prescriptive here and should be broadened. **Glennan** noted that the qualifiers that follow in 11.7.0.4.1 allow for more types. **Maxwell** said he assumed that words were not to be used in a qualifier but in some other part of encoding.

Weiss considered 11.2.2 to be unclear: one corporate body with different preferred names across time, or different corporate bodies (as in AACR2). He prefers the first option. **Hillmann** noted that **Weiss**'s question is about relationships. Is it the same entity with a new name or a more fundamental change in the entity? **Myers** said this was analogous to concerns around pseudonyms for individuals, following the same principle that the name of an identity is applied to resources that are associated with it.

Maxwell asked if, in 11.2.1, there's a difference intended between the phrases "different forms", "variant forms", "variant names". **Schiff** responded that some different forms represent changes of name, while others represent variants.

Weiss was pleased with the parallel structure of chapters 10 and 11.

Glennan commented that the footnote on p. 11-24 on ancient and international bodies says, specifically, to use English. At 11.3.3.1 an alternative linguistic form of name should also include translation. 11.9.0.3 Recording address of a corporate body: this is not repeatable, but corporate bodies can change their addresses. If we're going to go through the trouble of recording the information, we should associate dates with places. **Attig** replied that RDA says nothing about repeatability, so if there's a need for more information it can be added. This will be an encoding question.

Myers said that, at 11.2.0.6–11.2.0.9, he missed the clear indication that these instructions address omissions. **Attig** noted that the instructions begin "omit ...", but maybe they need to be identified on the caption level. **Weiss** disagreed.

Myers noted that 11.2.0.9 is verbatim from AACR2, but is confusing out of that context; the contrasting instruction is at 11.1.1.8. He will work on a solution. 11.2.3.1 is also confusing. He wants more contrast to bring out direct v. indirect entry.

Lawrence repeated her contention that footnotes are inappropriate (e.g., p. 11-26).

Lilker observed that 11.2.7.2.1 says to record a head of state in the language preferred by the agency, while the instruction on the next page (11.2.7.3.1) says to record in the official language of the jurisdiction. Conceivably, you could have headings for both in the same record. **Schiff** noted that this is a carryover from AACR2. **Attig** asked the group which was preferred. Several people said they preferred language of jurisdiction. **Maxwell** suggested that we should combine the two instructions.

Comments on Chapter 16: Identifying places

Mangan said that the fact that place names are also used to represent jurisdictional names has always been a problem; we've never been able to make a distinction between a corporate body that administers a geographic area and the geographic area itself. She wants the distinction to be made in the preferred heading. **Maxwell** agreed. **Attig** said the JSC put limitations on the scope of this chapter because it was not actually covering geographic names as such in this draft. **Weiss** noted that place is more generic than governmental body, so it is relevant to talk about now. **Mangan** agreed, as it's in the section on group 3 entities. **Attig** replied that names covered in chapter 16 would only be used in conjunction with access points or other instructions, so if you're using this heading with a corporate heading it would be clear that it's a jurisdiction. **Weiss** stated that this distinction needs to be coded.

Myers commented that places associated with an event or conference don't quite fit in FRBR: it's a Group 3 entity that's related to a Group 2 entity. **Attig**: "I don't think you are talking about the entity itself, but the relationship that may or may not fit into one of the categories for which we have instructions." **Maxwell** replied that in Chapter 23 we could record the subject of many other things besides a work, including group 2 entities. We shouldn't restrict ourselves.

Mangan expressed concern about the emphasis on *published* gazetteers, as most catalogers depend on online gazetteers as well as national place-naming agencies.

Weiss noted that there are very few attributes for place. **Mangan** agreed with **Weiss**' concern. Places change names and return to the same (e.g. Georgia Republic), so date should be an attribute. **Weiss** specified that he was referring to basic attributes like populated place, water feature, etc. which are not in this draft. **Attig** said that, in 16.4 and 16.5, the JSC was committed to following FRBR/FRAD models and the problem is that the status of place in those models is under discussion and some of these attributes not accepted. **Maxwell** commented that this argument is analogous to the conflict about corporate body vs. geographic area.

Glennan asked what the distinction between *different* and *significantly different* 16.3.0.3.1 meant? This might be the only place where it comes up. **Attig** expressed surprise that this is the only instance. "I don't think we want to define what is significantly different and we need to use cataloger's judgment." **Maxwell** reiterated that machines can't make these judgments. **Weiss** noted that we ask people to use judgment with place, but not person. He argued for consistency.

Comments on Section 9: Recording relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies

Thurston asked if there would be examples available in an appendix about relationship designators. **Attig** replied that it is under development.

Maxwell wondered why, in 29.3, attributes of persons are required elements for recording relationships. **Attig** stated that an access point is not an element. These other elements may be included for the access point, because they are part of the name that we're making the relationship to. **Maxwell** argued that the instruction is about recording the relationship, not about recording the name. **Allgood** agreed. **Weiss** noted that naming this section *Required elements* is misleading; it's really required pieces of the elements representing the relationship. **Attig** agreed that this is unclear. **Maxwell** continued: what is required is that there needs to be a link which is either the preferred name or the identifier. **Myers** proposed revising the text to say "the elements that comprise the preferred access point". **Weiss** argued that we should talk about required relationships, not the technique to achieve the end. **Attig** replied that the problem is that this doesn't deal with what relationships are required, but what elements are required to identify the relationship.

Weiss said that in 29.4.1, the phrase "represented by a preferred access point" should be struck.

Comments on Appendices

Weiss asked how the choice is made to include something in the appendices rather than the main text. **Attig** replied that the appendices include egregious examples of things that are very specific. "The appendices are a compromise." **Weiss** argued that frequency of use should not determine where something goes physically; logical structure should determine placement and the online nature of the product will make this issue irrelevant. **Schmierer** noted that some of this information has not been reviewed for a long time, so keeping it in the appendices makes it easier to review this spurious information.

Glennan expressed concern that some parts of the appendices are required, while others are optional. This is a structural problem. **Attig** noted that the instructions do indicate when an appendix instruction is necessary. **Maxwell** defended the use of the appendices for valuable non-cataloging-related items.

Comments on Cover letter

Winzer said that, regarding 6.24, the law community has not come to complete consensus about eliminating "Laws, etc." "Treaties, etc.", and "Protocols, etc." They fulfill a different purpose, so the law community would like to keep them. She said dropping the etc. would be possible if the meaning for each were clearly defined.

Attig asked if work and expression identifiers should be required. **Glennan** replied that an expression record identifier might not work because an expression can encompass so many things. **Maxwell** agreed.

Scharff noted that there is a disconnect between ISWC and RDA. ISWC is more oriented toward sound recordings. **Weiss** argued that because Chapter 6 encompasses both works and expressions, it reduces emphasis on expressions. **Scharff** said that the ISWC does not adopt hierarchical structure in identifying works and parts of works. Machines might be able to cope with this, but not easily. **Hillmann** noted that the ISWC orientation is toward royalties, not toward identification. We shouldn't adopt their identifiers, but if there's congruence between our description and their identifier, that's okay; it's okay to have multiple identifiers. **Weiss** replied that RDA should require identifiers, but we should exclude them from our implementation. This would be a way to push communities to create more identifiers. **Hillmann** noted that we have to distinguish between identifiers that exist for people and for machines. We are going to have to use both, but it's the machine identifiers that will "make our life worth living."

Schiff said that the examples committee was struggling to find the interpretation of what constitutes a denominational body. **Knop** responded that ATLA might want a uniform title approach to this issue.

Weiss argued against the decision not to allow preferred access points for manifestations.

Regarding the AACR2 instructions on p. 8, **Glennan** wondered where in RDA the instructions for compilations that lack a collective title had gone. **Scharff** agreed that the rules for constructing a title-less compilation's access point are unclear. **Attig** agreed.

Glennan said that the text on p. 9 leads her to conclude that introductory phrases are included in the title, but she's told this is *not* the decision. **Schmierer** commented that CC:DA's previous discussion on this matter focused on what an observer sees as the title. **Randall** argued that machines won't know the context of our discussions. **Attig** agreed that we need clarification about whether we're ignoring part of the title or recognizing that it's there, but choosing not to record it in the access point.

Weiss said he thought the list of gender terms was incomplete. **Attig** suggested that it could be an open list.

Randall disagreed with the JSC's conclusion that C.E. and B.C.E. will still be a problem because they reflect the Christian calendar. Common Era is an old term. **Scharff** noted that his state had proposed legislation to require B.C./A.D. use in official documents. **Myers** argued that the prevalent calendar is the Christian calendar and its use is pragmatic.

1035. Report from the Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication: Smart

[CC:DA/TF/Communication/4]

The task force has been fairly busy working on its charges.

Charge A: Reviewing relevant prior work. This was mostly completed before ALA Annual 2007. The task force began compiling a contact or recipient list (not comprehensive or formal mailing list) for external communications. It has a basic list of contacts and is looking for suggestions for additions. It won't be a paper-based list; names to be added to spreadsheet or database instead. The list will be reviewed on an annual basis.

Charge C: Assess the nature of internal communications. This was mostly completed before ALA Annual 2007. The task force reviewed emerging technologies that could be of use and polled CC:DA members and liaisons. Everyone seems to be satisfied with how things are working. It developed some guidelines for evaluating technology for internal communications.

Charge D: Determine the functional requirements for software. It created a list of general functional requirements. Any feedback would be appreciated.

Charge F: Migrating and maintaining CC:DA's web site. Successful migration will depend on active cooperation from ALCTS and/or ALA and the options that are available. The task force wants it known that the members are available to assist the new Webmaster if needed. The charge should be extended to include any Web-based communication, not just Web sites.

1036. Report of the CC:DA webmaster [CC:DA/Webmaster/2007/1]

The **Chair** gave this report. She said that Patricia Hatch and Christine Taylor from the ALCTS office would be discussing the Web migration situation; it is unclear when any migration can happen because ALA is not ready yet. Hatch is looking to improve the new Web site, and is poised to move forward. Radical changes are not happening to the way we do business. We will need some help with the migration. CC:DA must decide if a task force is needed or should the Internal and External Communications Task Force have its charge extended. **Attig** argued that it is too early in the process to decide. ALCTS has to wait for ALA to resolve some problems; LITA's move experienced some problems. CC:DA is next in line and will be one of the biggest challenges for ALA's web services. There are, however, some central ALCTS things that are in the queue before us. **Weiss** asked if the questions in the document needed to be addressed. The **Chair** stated the questions are not for CC:DA, but for ALA.

1037. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings

The **Chair** reported two items of note from the Friday CCS Executive Committee meeting. First, an ALCTS liaison came to get feedback on adopting the name Interest Group for all current Interest and Discussion Groups, as well as standardizing their term to 3 years. The other item is the ALCTS database to track the strategic plan. It is now up and running, and committee chairs are responsible for entering data into the database (but the chairs can delegate). The Chair will report to the CCS Executive Committee tomorrow about results from this conference, and the revision of CC:DA's procedures.

Tillett advised CC:DA that the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles will come out in March. The **Chair** stated that the task force must be prepared to move on that for ALA Annual.

1038. Announcement of next meeting

The next meeting will be held in Anaheim, California at ALA Annual. The following times were requested:

- Friday, June 27th from 1:30 -5:30 p.m. for RDA discussion (if a draft is available)
- Saturday, June 28th from 1:30-5:30 p.m.
- Monday, June 30th from 8:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.

Theroux asked if it would make more sense, in future meetings, for the JSC report to be given before the Committee discusses the RDA drafts. **Attig** stated that it may not be relevant for 2008 ALA Annual as the next draft is not expected until July, but for future meetings, that should be considered.

The Chair adjourned the meeting at 12:08 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Alexandra Crosier, Intern
Daniel N. Joudrey, Intern