

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 2009 Annual ALA conference
in Chicago, Illinois, July 13, 2009**

Members present:

John Myers, Chair
Kathy Glennan
Sylvia Hall-Ellis
Robert Maxwell
Kevin Randall
Lori Robare
Paul Weiss
Kathy Winzer
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, Intern
Peter Rolla, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

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

ALA Liaisons present:

Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/CC:CCM
Jennifer Baxmeyer, ALCTS/CRS
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Steven J. Miller, ALCTS/NRMIG
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/PARS
Manon Th  roux, ALA/ACRL
Shelby Harken, ALA/LITA
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA

Non-ALA Liaisons present :

John Hostage, AALL
Judy Knop, ALTA
Elizabeth Lilker, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Jasmin Nof, AJL
Thomas Duszak, CLA
John Hostage, IFLA

Chamya Kincy, MedLA
Mark Scharff, MusLA
Greta De Groat, OLAC (represented by Martha Yee)
Peter Fletcher, PCC
Dorothy McGarry, SLA

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 the actual voting members rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.
- IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

AACR2 = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision

AALL = American Association of Law Libraries

AASL = American Association of School Librarians

ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate

ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries

ALA = American Library Association

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America

ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections

ATLA = American Theological Libraries Association

CC:AAM = ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials

CC:CCM = ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children’s Materials Committee

CC:DA = ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

CCS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section

CDS = LC Cataloging Distribution Service

CETM = ALCTS/CCS/Continuing Education Training Materials Committee

CETRC = ALCTS/CCS/Education, Training, and Recruitment for Cataloging Committee

CIP = Cataloging in Publication

CLA = Catholic Library Association

CoP = Committee of Principals for AACR

DC = Dublin Core
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
DCRM(S) = *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)*
FRAD = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Authority Data*
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
FRSAR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records*
HTML = Hypertext Mark-up Language
ICP = *International Cataloguing Principles*
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ILS = Integrated library system
IME-ICC = IFLA Meetings of Experts on an International Cataloguing Code
ISBD = *International Standard Bibliographic Description*
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LCCN = Library of Congress Control Number
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
MAGERT = Map and Geography Round Table
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MusLA = Music Library Association
NAL = National Agricultural Library
NASIG = North American Serials Interest Group
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM = National Library of Medicine
NRMIG = Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PARS = ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PLA = Public Library Association
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SKOS = Simple Knowledge Organization System
XML = Extensible Markup Language

1076. Welcome and opening remarks

John Myers, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 8:10 am, and welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors.

1077. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to sign in.

1078. Adoption of agenda

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. The **Chair** noted that Shawne Miksa would not be attending, so the Chair will cover Report from the Chair of the RDA Implementation Task Force. The **Chair** also noted that under the last agenda item the Committee will discuss the future activities of CC:DA, looking forward to RDA implementation and associated events.

Hall-Ellis moved to adopt the agenda; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously.

1079. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2009 Midwinter Meeting, January 24 and 26, 2009

Several corrections to the minutes had been received via e-mail. These include corrections to the attendance list (the given names of Suzuki, Robare, and Kincy had originally been misspelled but were corrected); the abbreviations list was corrected and updated to regularize the format of section and committee names; under the JSC Representative's report on p. 6, **Randall** clarified some comments made by him regarding the application of the IME-ICC ICP element set to the formulation of the RDA element set and on p. 7 corrections were made to the spelling of Qur'an; under the RDA Implementation Task Force Report, **Patton**'s name had been left off as a presenter at the RDA pre-conference; under the ISBD 0 Task Force report, a correction was made to **Hostage**'s comments on syntax for content form and content media type and also a correction to the spelling of Playaway; under the same report a comment regarding ISBD not addressing manuscript materials should have been attributed to **McGarry**. Under the ALA publishing report **Tillett** referenced the Cataloger's Desktop and Class Web products, and in one instance that should be amended to just Class Web. There were also several grammatical corrections to the minutes.

Motion to approve the minutes as corrected by **Robare**; seconded by **Maxwell**. Motion carried unanimously.

1080. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, January-June 2008

ALA procedures require confirmation of electronic votes that occur between Annual and Midwinter. There were two motions voted on electronically that are described in the written Chair's report. Motion by **Winzer** to confirm both of the electronic votes; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously.

The **Chair** reviewed highlights from the written report. Other actions taken by and on behalf of the Committee in the preceding six months include the migration of the CC:DA e-mail discussion list from [ccda] to [rules]. This move was taken to allow all subscribers, both members of the Committee and non-members, archival access to the list. This change was approved at the ALA 2008 Annual Conference and was completed in February, 2009. Committee members have read-write privileges while non-committee member subscribers have read-only privileges.

The Task Force for Review of ISBD Area 0 submitted a revised report based on feedback at the ALA 2009 Midwinter Meeting. The response was approved at that meeting and the report then submitted to

IFLA. The Task Force was subsequently discharged.

The charge renewal documents for CC:DA were submitted to CCS Policy and Planning. The two most prominent issues are the high workload of the Committee and ongoing scheduling conflicts with its meetings. Regarding the former issue, CCS is working with some ideas and is open to further suggestions to lighten the workload or spread it out. The scheduling conflict issue remains, and in fact at this conference several potentially relevant programs conflict with the usual CC:DA meeting times.

There have been a significant number of ISO/NISO reviews in the past months, several of which engendered discussion and informal feedback from CC:DA.

1081. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Chatham provided information on the current status of the RDA online product. The project is moving forward according to schedule, with the database developers working hard to meet their deadlines. Thus far, no major impediments have come up. ALA Publishing will be meeting with the company on Wednesday morning via a conference call to determine where the company is in the process and if there is anything that requires attention.

Some incidental observations were noted about the RDA program "Taking RDA for a Test Drive", specifically, that it was too technical. The presentation should have talked more about the concept of the product. The product is structured around three functionality "tabs" – RDA, Toolkit, and Resources – and it would have been more helpful if the presentation had concentrated on how those three tabs relate to each other and what functionality is under each. The presentation however, focused too much on the technical background of the product which, while interesting and relevant to some audiences, was not what program attendees were seeking.

A meeting was set up with the Library of Congress and ILS vendors, to apprise the vendors of the plans for the testing program. ALA Publishing has been trying to work with the vendors at various stages, but the conversations have been hampered by a lack of final details regarding the interface and the content. ALA Publishing now has more information to give to the vendors. The entity relationship diagram is complete, and the content is completed and being coded. They have more information about the database development of the product and can share more of those details. The vendors are still not sure where they fit into the process at this time, or what is going to happen with MARC and RDA. Also, there seem to be two levels of expectations about RDA. On the one hand, "street-level" catalogers are concerned about the nuts and bolts and how they will create records with it. A different level wants to create a new content standard for the digital age, and wants RDA to be about more than just creating records. The ultimate application of RDA is Tom Delsey's implementation scenario 1 of linked records. Nannette Naught the RDA program manager was attending the Linked Records panel which discussed this scenario.

Chatham remarked that he had discussed pricing at the last meeting, with the caveat that ALA Publishing does not have all costs figured out yet. Any adjustments along the way will have cost impacts and ALA Publishing has to do all that work before concretely saying what the overall project cost will be. They are having ongoing discussions with the Library of Congress and other groups that are moving along well and are working to find ways to address the needs of these organizations. The work of creating schemas and vocabularies adds another element of development with cost-affecting issues that may or may not be final and are essentially where they were before. ALA Publishing is trying to create the lowest possible price, and is still talking about having just the RDA tab available with just the rules and search or browse

capability but with none of the additional product functionality or toolkits. One of the wrinkles in this plan is what to do about updates. For this more limited offering the objective is to get close to what today's price of the print product of AACR2 would be. It was priced at \$85 five years ago, so today it would probably be more than \$100, so the RDA tab alone might be priced at around \$125-\$150. For the full product the price tier will go up, depending on the number of concurrent users. **Chatham** stressed that he is aware of CC:DA's concerns about the price of RDA. ALA Publishing hopes to have a reliable if not a concrete estimate of pricing in the early fall, perhaps by September. He does know that libraries have budget concerns but there are a number of costs to which ALA Publishing has to be sensitive. He then stressed that publishing is one of ALA's three sources of revenue and represents 50% of the association's revenue. ALA is still looking at a late November release for RDA.

The **Chair** asked about whether any thought has been given to making the product available to trainers or to those responsible for creating training materials, whether or not they are taking part in the testing process. This question had come up the previous day in the RDA Implementation Task Force discussion, and the **Chair** wanted to make sure ALA Publishing is aware it is an emerging concern. **Attig** remarked that there had been talk of making a free preview of RDA available for a limited time; he suggested that this preview could be used by trainers. **Chatham** responded that ALA Publishing is making the product freely available to the 23 testing institutions, and so they could probably do something similar for trainers. A complicating issue is the fact that the testing process with the national libraries will happen after the product is complete, and not during beta testing. This could mean that changes to the product or to the content may be requested after it is complete. It is unusual for a publisher to be in such a situation. Normally they do offer free trials of products, from one to three months, but with the assumption that the trial will lead to a purchase.

Allgood remarked that since the formal testing will not begin until the final product is available, probably in November, presumably other institutions that are not part of the test may go ahead and purchase the product. **Attig** responded that some might purchase it, but others will wait until the official implementation after the testing is done. **Allgood** asked about the earlier release of a preview version, and **Attig** followed up by remarking that a functional demo had been mentioned frequently in the past, and wondered if it was actually going to be made available soon. **Chatham** responded that they had been waiting for the final content to be done; **Attig** replied that it was complete and also that a demonstration of functionality did not depend on the content being fully complete. **Chatham** then replied that ALA Publishing had been waiting for the constituent review copy of the content and was going to use that for a demo but while waiting they decided to work on other issues like coding. They thought that the screen shots from the CLA presentation would be sufficient as a demonstration. Currently a demo copy is not underway although they do think it would be a good thing.

Weiss asked about the status of translations of RDA, and whether any of the non-English communities have communicated with ALA Publishing, or if they have looked into license agreements. **Chatham** replied that they have heard from Germany and are trying to meet with Germans at ALA Annual. Also, Canada is required to have a bilingual product, although the Canadians assume that the French translation will not happen simultaneously and that they will have to wait for it, a condition that they accept. ALA Publishing has already received requests for translations, even before the product is complete. Ideally they would like the translation to take place in the product itself, although most of the queries they have received want to translate the content and then pour it back into the product. One factor is the translation of tags, labels, etc., within the product, that need to be translated so there are not any misunderstandings with regards to the relationships. Another complication is the fact that this is a web/database product. With a traditional print product, typically ALA Publishing would grant the translation rights to an

institution, person, or company, and then that entity would sell the translated text and pay royalties. Since this will be a web-based product and live on the website, ALA Publishing needs to figure out how best to proceed and what relationship makes the most sense with the translating agency. AACR2 has been translated into more than 30 languages, so obviously there will be a need to translate RDA. Whatever happens, the English language version will precede any translations. It will not be possible to do those simultaneously.

Schmierer noted that RDA consists not only of text but also of other materials, such as external registries, that are connected using specific approaches that require uniqueness and consistency that previous publications have not required. These approaches may not lend themselves to easy, one-to-one equivalencies in other languages. She suggested that before any translations proceed a document should be written that lays out a baseline of what would be necessary to have in a translation. **The Chair** offered a re-statement of Schmierer's comment, that we need specifications not just for the RDA product itself but also for a suite of related materials. **Schmierer** clarified that translations need to follow the specifications laid out in the documents that guided the development of RDA. In RDA there is a great deal of vocabulary with very specific meanings and the terminology has a specific relationship to the workings of the product. Because the product is so interconnected, care must be taken to have accurate translations.

Lilker asked if there was any news on incorporating RDA into Cataloger's Desktop. **Chatham** replied that ALA Publishing is continuing to talk with LC about the relationship between the two products but the relationship needs to be redefined. It is different from before, when one product was print and one was online; now both are online. There is no decision yet.

Chatham revisited the issue of the price of RDA. ALA Publishing wants to keep it as low as possible, but does not yet have in place all of the final costs nor the revenue relationships, like translations. They will make it as economically practical as possible. He is confident the product is better and includes more, valuable features and that once catalogers and technical services administrators see it, they will recognize its value. He does understand the concerns about the price. **Attig** commented that the reality of most cataloging departments is that there is less money to spend on such things.

Randall asked about the current thoughts on the print product. **Chatham** replied that ALA Publishing has always expected to have some print derivative or version. It is difficult however to define what, if at all, the print needs will be, since this is such a different product. The size is also an issue; the manuscript runs something like 3,000 pages, much more than AACR2. ALA Publishing does not know if it is feasible to print all of it, or perhaps just sections. He thinks people should understand and appreciate the online product first, which may reduce the necessity for a print version.

Maxwell commented that print does meet the need to use the product offline, and wonders if there are plans for a stand-alone electronic version, like a CD-ROM or DVD-ROM, that could be used without being connected to the Internet. **Chatham** commented that updates would be a problem, and **Maxwell** acknowledged this, but still would like the option to work offline when not connected to the Internet. **Chatham** said ALA Publishing looked into creating an e-book product, but licensing the software from Adobe would have been too expensive and they decided it was not viable. He said they will continue to look into a stand-alone electronic version but it might not be feasible.

Jizba brought up the issue discussed and agreed upon at the previous Midwinter about the need smaller libraries would have for a reduced, judicially edited version with just the basic principles for creating a

record. It would be a companion product. **Chatham** replied that ALA Publishing has considered a print derivative. **Jizba** then remarked that a 1,500 page document is not desirable and not what the committee had been considering.

Hall-Ellis brought up the issue of library education, and how educators will orient and teach RDA to new professionals. ALA Publishing has never had adjustments in its pricing for this environment, and schools have to pay per unit as if they were all individuals. She asked if there cannot be some limited or group access for library schools. They cannot afford to pay \$150 for every student, but they do need to incorporate RDA into the curriculum. The pricing structure ALA Publishing is talking about dissipates the ability to train students in the way that employers want. **Chatham** replied that ALA Publishing recognizes that educators represent a different customer category and an important sector. Also, the schools probably will not be able to teach the entire content of RDA in a 10-week course. **Hall-Ellis** remarked that some library schools are making a definite effort to offer not just one course but a whole sequence of courses on cataloging and need to have access to RDA, and therefore she hopes this conversation is continued.

Randall estimated that 25-30% of AACR2 users would not be able to use the electronic version of RDA, and therefore he does not want what the majority prefers to override this significant minority.

1082. Report from the MARBI Representative

Allgood summarized the two MARBI meetings held Saturday and Sunday, highlighting the papers and proposals discussed:

Proposal number 2009-07, Definition of field 883 (Source of Description note). The proposal was approved with amendments and revisions, following extensive discussion yielding a repeatable 883 field, containing subfields a, 5, 6, and 8. Part of the discussion focused on broader need for this field by other cataloging communities beyond continuing resources. As those communities' needs are identified, revisions to the field may be necessary.

Proposal 2009-08, Changes to field 257 (Country of Producing Entity) for use with non-archival materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This proposal was approved with amendments and editorial revisions.

Discussion paper number 2009-DP05, Making 008/39 (Cataloging source) obsolete in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. OCLC and others reported that the information this byte is intended to encode is found more reliably in other parts of the MARC record, specifically the 040 subfield c and the absence or presence of the 042 field. The discussion paper will return as a proposal at the next Midwinter.

Discussion paper number 2009-DP04, Adding codes for online access and direct access in the 008 field for Form of item in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This discussion paper will also return as a proposal at Midwinter. The focus of the proposal will be on option 1 in the paper and will be clarified as a proposal specifically for bibliographic descriptions following a separate-record approach.

Proposal number 2009-09, Adding new codes to Music 008/18-19 (Form of composition) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This was approved with editorial revisions for both the tag 008 bytes 18/19 and for tag 047.

Proposal number 2009-10, Adding subfield \$3 to field 534 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This proposal was approved.

Several proposals and discussion papers addressed issues regarding RDA and its implementation: Proposal number 2009-06/1, Accommodating Relationship Designators for RDA Appendix J and K in MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This proposal was approved with revisions.

Proposal number 2009-06/2, Transcribing Series and Subseries ISSNs for RDA. This proposal was approved.

Proposal number 2009-06/3, New coded values for RDA media carriers in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The proposal was approved.

Discussion Paper number 2009-DP06/01, Encoding URIs for controlled values in MARC 21 records. This paper will return as a proposal at Midwinter presenting two options: the subfield 1 option presented in the paper, and a possible 88X linking field option to encode URIs similar to 880 linking pairs in current records. This paper was one of several discussed at this conference in which MARBI is confronted with the limitations of the MARC format; i.e., the fact that in several instances, MARC21 relies on the sequencing of subfields, and in some cases fields, to indicate the significance or relationship of that element. This has been noticed in the past but MARBI is confronting it more and more now.

Attig remarked that the specific question with regard to this paper is whether we can support this technique in both classic MARC and MARCXML. We are faced with the prospect of things we can only implement in MARCXML and not traditional MARC. It is a question that will keep coming up, and it was asked that this question be addressed in a more general form. **Allgood** replied that many discussion papers bring up the question of whether we need to keep MARCXML and classic MARC in sync or not.

Discussion Papers 2009-DP06/02, Enhancing Field 033 and Field 518 for Place and Date of Capture in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format, and 2009-DP06/03, New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Format for works and expressions, will return as proposals at Midwinter.

Attig noted that the MARC Standards Office has created a web page tracking and providing early documentation on the changes that relate to RDA. It is on the home page of the MARC Standards website under a button labeled "News". It provides a good way to keep track of what has been decided and what is still pending, and the web page also has draft documentation for the new RDA fields.

Randall asked about a recently approved tag that was changed before being published. **Glennan** summarized the issue, which had to do with a discussion paper about work and expression records. The question came up whether the same tags should be used in both bibliographic and authority records or whether different tags should be used. In a proposal that MARBI had approved at Midwinter several 62X fields were approved for the authority format. However, using similar tags in the bibliographic record would put the fields in the wrong block of MARC tags. Because these changes had not yet been published, and no one had started to write documentation or implement the changes, MARBI decided that it was still okay to change these to 3XX tags and therefore keep the two formats in sync.

1083. Report of the ALA Representative to the JSC

Attig reported that the ALA response to the full draft of RDA, as well as additional proposals, was submitted. He thanked everyone who made comments, as well as several people in particular for their work on these reports, specifically: Glennan and Scharff for putting together comments on the music proposals; and Randall with the relationship designators in appendix J. The ALA response was a full and complete response to the draft, and it was appreciated. The JSC received about 1600 specific comments as well as a number of more general comments. They dealt with about 600 high priority comments that had been identified by members of the JSC as issues that needed to be resolved for the final version of the text.

The JSC met in Chicago for almost two weeks and completed all of the decision making. **Attig** described the process and documented the decisions in his blog. The JSC report that he submitted last month was based on this blog, with some additional information from preliminary but official documents from the JSC Secretary. Subsequent to the meeting a number of adjustments were made, and then the editor prepared the editorial text, in the form of marked-up PDF files. The JSC then split up this text and proofread it. This mark-up extended to 2000-3000 pages. Finally it was turned over to the developers exactly on schedule; the developers will update the base XML files for the online product. At present, there is no further work to do regarding RDA content and text.

Currently the vendors are working on the RDA software. The developers, Nannette Naught and her company, IMT, are updating the content of the XML files, which will come together late in August. IMT is doing internal beta testing on the functionality of the software. After August, with the final content, it will begin beta testing with external users in a very controlled environment. At the same time or shortly after, the JSC will do a final review of the text to make sure that all the corrections that have been submitted were correctly made. This will not be to make further changes nor to rethink decisions, but simply to correct typos and errors in conversion. Assuming things stay on track, the product will be released before the end of the year, hopefully in late November. This basically means that subscriptions for the 2010 calendar year will be available.

A number of background documents have recently been posted on the JSC web site, which has a new URL: www.rda-jsc.org (the old URL will still work and will re-direct users to the new site). The mappings that describe the relationships between the FRBR/FRAD models and the MARC format have been updated. In addition, a document is available that lists the changes between AACR and RDA, or at least the changes that the JSC was conscious of making. Also, there is a list of issues that were deferred until after the initial release.

Winzer thanked **Attig** for writing his blog.

Attig added that another group of people to be thanked were the various contributors of examples. The examples will be one of the strengths of RDA. They are extensive and have been completely revised and reevaluated. Adam Schiff put in a tremendous amount of time, as did the people working with him.

1084. Report from the Library of Congress Representative

Tillett presented her report from the Library of Congress. The LC's full report is available on the web, at <http://www.loc.gov/ala/an-2009-udpate.html>. Her report draws from that to focus on items of particular interest to CC:DA.

For issues that fall more into the cataloging realm, she first mentioned that LC is continuing to work on

its integrated library system, specifically regarding denials of service. LC has noticed that there have been only a few denials on peak days. From the copyright office comes news that a notice has gone out to amend the regulation about mandatory deposit of online works. The Office is starting with demands for electronic serials. Of interest to catalogers, this process will include metadata that, in theory, will be able to be repurposed for subsequent cataloging.

The reorganization at LC, which merged acquisitions and cataloging functions, has been completed, although the physical moves of people will probably take another six months. About 600 people are involved. Also, the six overseas offices are doing more and more cataloging and acquisitions. As a reminder, the e-mail address for what was formerly called CPSO is now policy@loc.gov.

LC is taking part in several international efforts, including the virtual international authority file or VIAF. This is a project that has been going on for some time, started by OCLC's Research Office. Up to a dozen national libraries are taking part in this project, and at least 8 more have applied. Currently the VIAF is on the beta version, which contains 10.4 million personal name entries, accessible at the URL: www.viaf.org. **Allgood** asked if the beta version contains all the personal names from all the libraries and **Tillett** responded that it does. The project has been exploring adding authority files from the archival community as well.

Hall-Ellis asked how interactive the site is, and if updates to the LC/NACO authority file automatically update the VIAF. **Tillett** responded yes, and also encouraged people to use the comment line for feedback. Comments on the site have already led to improvements to many authority records from contributing sources. **Attig** asked if there is a capability to export authority records from it. **Tillett** again responded yes. Right now it is possible to see MARC21 and UNIMARC versions of records, so you should be able to export records and import them into local systems. The project is also exploring other codes like XML, MODS, and DC. **Maxwell** commented that it would be nice if NACO catalogers could bring records into the NACO authority file, to use as templates for names not already in the NACO file. **Tillett** mentioned that although the VIAF started with personal names, it has also begun a pilot study for geographic names and hopes to add corporate names and uniform titles. The VIAF, however, will not have subject headings, as these are too difficult to map to each other.

The worldwide regional meetings on cataloging principles have been completed, and in February ICP, *International Cataloguing Principles* was posted online. The published text will be available this month from Saur, and it has been translated into 20 languages. There will be some programs about this at IFLA in August in Milan. The plan, approved by all participants, is for the principles to be reviewed every five years and updated as needed. Also, a placeholder was left for subjects, awaiting the conceptual model of the *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data* (FRSAD). Once that model is out, the ICP will be updated.

LC is working to make its documentation more accessible. The Cataloging Service Bulletin back issues have all been scanned and made available at no cost. The entire 31 years of CSB are available. The publication will continue for at least another year during the transition to RDA but once RDA is implemented LC may revisit it. There may be other venues for sharing rule interpretations than via CSB. Also, LC is gearing up for the next generation of Cataloger's Desktop, which they are calling Desktop 3.0. This represents a major modernization. LC has been doing some preliminary demonstrations and is working with the contractor to update the tool.

In regards to the testing of RDA, the participants have been formally announced. More than 90

applications to be part of the test were received. LC tried to achieve a wide range and a diverse mix in the participants in order to represent all the constituents who applied. The test is expected to begin after the public release of the final version of RDA. Even though LC has selected formal participants in the test, it will be publicly sharing all the documentation and training materials, including the methodology and access to tools. Those not officially part of the test will be welcome to follow along, and will be encouraged to share their findings.

Following up on recommendations made in “On the Record,” the report from the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, LC is working to eliminate redundancies. One project, involving two vendors, Cambridge University Press and Wiley, is in place and involves software that converts their ONIX data to cataloging data. This is working well and LC is very encouraged by the improvement of data coming from publishers. Data can be captured immediately and thereby reduce both the time re-keying data and typos. The vendors are also grabbing cover art and including tables of contents and summaries, attributed to publishers, with a note indicating that it was machine-generated information.

Beginning in August, NACO participants can begin supplying geographic coordinates in the 034 field. LC is working with OCLC to look into populating LC authority records for geographic names with coordinates. **Mangan** asked if this will ever be extended to corporate names that represent geographic areas like universities and airports. **Tillett** replied that it is not in the immediate plans, but it is something in which she is interested. Adam **Schiff** asked when LC will begin to add the 034 for geographic subjects. **Tillett** did not know but said that LC will announce it.

There is now an official site for LCSH in machine-readable SKOS format. LC has received positive feedback about this from people working in the area of linked data. The site id.loc.gov also has LCSH authority records available for searching and display. A visualization tab that accompanies the authority records converts the broader and narrower terms to a visual tag-cloud display. This site also has a link to the Rameau subject headings in French.

The **Chair** thanked Tillett for making her report available ahead of time.

1085. Report from the Chair of the RDA Implementation Task Force

The RDA Implementation Task Force chair, Shawne Miksa, was unable to attend, so the **Chair** provided a report on behalf of the task force. Its final meeting was held on Sunday, July 12. The task force will be discharged and reconstituted into two new task forces, the RDA Planning and Training Task Force and the RDA Update Programming Task Force. The former will address training materials and work to foster communication with respect to the implementation efforts of RDA, and will be chaired by Luis Mendes. The latter will address programming for conferences and will be chaired by June Abbas. The CC:DA chair will remain an ex-officio member of the Planning and Training Task Force and we hope that CC:DA will have informal representation on the Update Programming Task Force. Chamyia Kincy has volunteered, and hopefully that will avoid further conflicts in schedules such as those that occurred at this conference.

The Task Force discussed the two RDA programs held at this conference, the RDA pre-conference, “RDA, FRBR, FRAD: Making the Connection,” on Friday and the RDA program “Look Before you Leap, Taking RDA for a Test Drive” on Saturday. The initial feedback on the pre-conference indicates that it was well-received. There were 126 registrants. The most beneficial presentations displayed the FRBR and FRAD models and the RDA content standard concretely, as well as presentations that

connected those standards and models with how they will help us serve patrons better. The program on Saturday was less successful, but the members of the Update Programming Task Force are aware of the feedback from both programs and will take it into consideration when shaping the next round of programming. In regards to future programming, the Task Force is looking at providing an update forum at Midwinter 2010. It is not yet sure what form a forum will take since the previous update forums have looked at the progress of the content development and that phase has now closed. At Annual 2010 the Task Force anticipates preparing an additional pre-conference. It also has preliminary plans for two programs at Annual. It is hoping for a vendor panel to cover how vendors might incorporate RDA into their products and also a testing panel to provide a look at the testing process. The formal testing period will have just closed, so the Task Force is hoping to have anecdotal reports on the formal test. **Schmierer** commented that discovery tools are becoming more common and should be included on the vendor panel to discuss how these tools will handle RDA.

1086. Report of the CC:DA webmaster

The **Chair** read the report because webmaster Patricia Hatch was unable to attend. The efforts to migrate the CC:DA website from Penn State to ALA continues at a slow pace due to circumstances beyond CC:DA's control. The vestigial page on the ALA web site has been updated to remove time-sensitive material so that it appears less out of date. It also directs people to the Penn State web site, which is more current and active. There is also a link there to ALA Connect.

Glennan asked what we envision our use of ALA Connect to be. She has tried it and has not been excited by it, but perhaps because few people are using it. The **Chair** replied that **Hatch** is building some CC:DA content on it but is also frustrated with ALA Connect. It is a work in progress and we will be watching. **Attig** remarked that it could be a useful outreach tool, with some basic documents included on it, but at this point it is hard to see it as a working tool for the committee. The **Chair** suggested making a Facebook page for the Committee.

1087. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting

The **Chair** gave a report on the CCS Executive Committee meetings. He was only able to attend the Sunday morning meeting. There is a survey for the ANO, ALCTS Newsletter Online, which will be up until September, so ALCTS is asking people for feedback. Also, an ALCTS New Members Interest Group has been formed for those who have been members for fewer than five years. There will also be some changes with respect to training and programming, involving revisions to the CETM and CETRC subcommittees. **Robare** clarified that at the Division level there will be some changes on how continuing education happens, which will have repercussions on the section level and involve CETM and CETRC. The specific changes are still uncertain at this point.

The **Chair** then reported that concern arose through the reauthorization process for CC:DA with respect to the Committee's workload and specifically that of the Chair. Perceptions of the Chair's workload present a challenge for recruitment. CCS Exec is exploring the possibility of incorporating a vice-chair into the Committee's structure. Specific details have not been worked out, such as whether CCS Exec would increase the number of members to accommodate a new position or designate an existing voting member slot as a vice-chair position. A vice-chair would provide continuity in turning over the Chair's responsibilities and would also provide some assistance to the Chair. CCS Exec is also looking into lightening the load on the ALA Representative to the JSC, perhaps by creating an intern position in direct

support. Hopefully these changes can be put in place during this quiet period between the content development phase and the implementation and review phases of RDA.

Lastly, the current strategic plan cycle is drawing to a close and it is time to reinitiate the strategic plan process. CCS Exec is anticipating a process that is more dynamic, given the current pace of change, and that will result in a three-year rather than a five-year plan.

There were no reports from the floor; the **Chair** asked for new business.

Attig raised the issue of an invitation to review FRSAD, the *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data*. A report from the working group is available for comment, but the comment period is very short and responses are due by the end of July. Since this concept crosses the boundary between descriptive and subject cataloging, the question was who should review the report for ALA, CC:DA or SAC. Mary Woodley and the **Chair** had determined previously that it should be referred to SAC to take the lead but that CC:DA would take on a consultative role in light of its experience dealing with these models. However, the leadership of SAC seems to be in flux at the moment and reports indicate that when this issue was brought up at SAC it was presented as an information item and not as an action item. Therefore **Attig** suggested that CC:DA needs to organize ALA's response and invite SAC members to contribute. The **Chair** agreed, but commented that lines of communication while at Annual are more difficult. He suggested that CC:DA form a task force to present ALA's response and then he will work with SAC to incorporate some of their members. **Hall-Ellis** moved to authorize a task force to review FRSAD; **Maxwell** seconded. The **Chair** asked for discussion, and **Attig** suggested that the task force be modeled on previous similar task forces. The **Chair** called for a vote, and the motion passed unanimously. The **Chair** then asked if anyone wanted to take the lead as chair. **Robare** volunteered to be chair, and **Weiss** volunteered to work with her. The **Chair** asked for more volunteers, noting that while the chair of the task force needed to be a member of CC:DA, other members could be drawn from ALA or ALCTS. **Robare** decided that five members from CC:DA would be a good number, and **Jizba**, **Schmierer**, **Allgood**, and **Harken** volunteered.

The **Chair** mentioned that it was time to start looking forward towards the Committee's work once RDA is implemented. He turned the discussion over to **Attig**, who remarked that at this point it can only be a preliminary discussion; that we cannot start a revision process until we get the text. It is not too early for constituencies to start organizing to develop proposals, if there are rules that they know they do not want left in the current state. However, the JSC has not yet begun this discussion nor has the Committee of Principals had its own discussions about the governance of the entire process. We are assuming that the JSC will continue in some form and that the current constituencies will be represented, but they may not be the only constituencies involved in future revisions. The JSC has neither been given its charge nor the parameters of the revision process from the CoP and so we can only speculate. **Attig** said that his sense is that these discussions will happen at the meetings of the JSC and CoP next March or April and at that point they will set the rules for constituencies to follow. It is doubtful that the JSC will consider any revision proposals at those meetings since it will still be too early. After that point the table will be open and there will have to be exercises in prioritization. **Attig** commented that revisions that emerge from various testing efforts, i.e., requests that come from trying things out and finding they do not work, will probably be given priority. In addition, there is a long list of issues deferred by the JSC. Constituencies can look through this list for ideas of new proposals and make decisions about what they think is most important. The JSC will have discussions about what it considers most important and will work with the constituency representatives to come up with priorities. There will be a lot of discussions about where to start. It looks as if there will be a large agenda of revisions that will need to be worked through. CC:DA

will probably get busy again, and part of that will be deciding what it wants to sponsor as revision proposals. We cannot yet organize too much or start looking through the lists, partly because we need to go back to our constituencies and get their views, but it is not too early to start asking the questions.

Attig suggests that CC:DA needs to do some administrative organization to coordinate all this, and had the idea of appointing a small leadership group that would be in contact with all the constituencies so we know what we are likely to get and when and could give a picture of what the entire workflow would be.

Schiff suggested that before Midwinter in Boston, CC:DA might look at the items that were deferred and decide what the priority issues are. **Attig** remarked that the document is available on the JSC website, and that it would be a good idea to start looking at it now to identify priority items on the list. **Winzer** asked whether, since many items on the list of deferred issues came from specific constituencies, representatives could go back to the constituencies and ask if the recommendations are still important. **Attig** suggested that representatives of constituencies could do that before the discussion in Boston.

Weiss asked **Attig** about the placeholder pieces in RDA and if the process of the development of those will be significantly different. **Attig** confirmed that **Weiss** meant the placeholder chapters for subject relationships and entities, and said that the JSC has not discussed that yet. He believes that the JSC will want to discuss the process before it actually opens the table to that development and that it is probably something for the long-term.

Yee asked what will happen to what used to be called "Manuals to accompany AACR2" for certain communities, like the Archival Moving Image Material Cataloging Manual. She does not know what her community is planning to do once RDA is finalized, but wondered if the JSC has thoughts of handling these manuals differently. **Attig** replied that it is essentially the business of the groups that produce the manuals. The online product might be relevant to this and might be able to integrate external materials. It is worth exploring, but it is basically up to the groups to decide what to do with the content of their manuals.

The **Chair** closed this discussion by remarking that the committee's members should start taking a look at the list of deferred items and start to have conversations on the email discussion list before Midwinter, to move forward with a loose plan for the deferred items.

The **Chair** talked about the membership of the committee. Two long-standing members, **Maxwell** and **Weiss**, are leaving after this meeting. The Chair noted that "to review their accomplishments is to glimpse the impressive scope of this committee's work over the past decade in addressing the preliminaries of RDA, RDA review itself, and changes in the wider world of cataloging standards." The committee received a recitation of Weiss and Maxwell's contributions with acclamation.

The **Chair** announced that Martha Yee and Bob Wolverton will become voting members of the Committee. He also offered congratulations to members Shelby Harken, who was elected the new chair-elect of CCS, and Jennifer Baxmeyer, who will become the new member-at-large of the CCS Executive Committee. The Chair also reminded everyone that he will be rotating off the Committee and out of the chair at the close of Annual 2010, and encouraged anyone interested in becoming the chair to contact him or Harken.

The **Chair** announced the next meetings at Midwinter, which should take place at their normal times: Saturday, January 16, from 1:30-5:30 and Monday, January 18, from 8:00-12:00. Midwinter will take

place at the new Boston Convention and Exhibition Center, although the Committee's meetings usually take place in a conference hotel.

There was no further business, and the **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 10:58 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, Intern
Peter Rolla, Intern