

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
2011 ALA Annual Meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana
June 25 and 27, 2011

Members present:

Lori P. Robare, Chair
Patricia M. Dragon
Sylvia D. Hall-Ellis (Saturday 6/25 only)
Kevin M. Randall
Peter J. Rolla
Kathy Winzer
Bob Wolverton
Martha Yee

Jennifer D. Miller, Intern
Gayle Porter, Intern
Melanie Polutta, CC:DA Webmaster

Ex-officio representatives present:

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

ALA Liaisons present:

Susan L. Cheney, ALA/LITA
Robert C. W. Hall, Jr., ALA/PLA
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CCS/CC:CCM
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGIRT
Robert L. Maxwell, ALCTS/CCS/SAC (Monday 6/27 only)
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA/MARBI
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, ALCTS/CRS (Saturday 6/25 only)
Nathan B. Putnam, ALCTS/MIG
Randy Roeder, ALCTS/PARS
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA

Non-ALA Liaisons present:

Thomas Duszak, CLA (Saturday 6/25 only)
 Kathy Glennan, PCC
 John Hostage, AALL & IFLA
 Diane Hillmann, DCMI (Monday 6/27 only)
 Chamy P. Kincy, MedLA
 Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA
 Dorothy McGarry, SLA
 Kelley McGrath, OLAC (Monday 6/27 only)
 Mark Scharff, MusLA

Notes:

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

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

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

Saturday, June 25, 2011, 1:30–5:30 p.m.
Hilton Riverside, New Orleans, Louisiana

1137. Welcome and opening remarks

Lori Robare, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1138. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

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

1139. Adoption of agenda

[CC:DA/A/63]

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. Motion to adopt the agenda by **Rolla**; seconded by **Winzer**. The motion carried unanimously.

1140. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2011 Midwinter Meeting, January 8, 2011
[CC:DA/M/1120-1136]

The **Chair** noted corrections to the minutes already received: a formatting error resulting in some words run together; correction to the phrase “Socialist Republic of Slovenia” under Revision proposals from AALL; and clarification of wording under the report of the Task Force on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Bodies. A correction to Richard Hasenyager’s name was received. **Hall-Ellis** moved to approve the minutes as corrected; seconded by **Rolla**. The motion carried unanimously.

1141. Report from the Chair

Chair’s report on CC:DA motions and other actions, December 21, 2010-June 16, 2011:
[CC:DA/Chair/2010-2011/2]

ALA procedures require confirmation of electronic votes that occur between Midwinter and Annual. Three motions voted on by electronic ballot are described in the Chair’s report. Motion by **Randall** to approve all three votes; seconded by **Wolverton**. Motion carried unanimously.

The **Chair** noted that the committee will make extensive use of the CC:DA wiki in the coming months for gathering comments on ALA proposals and constituency proposals. In light of the need to conduct a significant amount of business during the summer months, **Myers** commented that it is helpful to alert the Chair in advance if one anticipates being away during a particular vote so that the Chair does not hold up the announcement of the vote results.

The **Chair** commented that CC:DA authorized formation of a Task Force to Investigate Changes Affecting RDA in the *Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition*, in October 2010 but delayed formation of the Task Force pending resolution of an LC proposal regarding Appendix A. Since that proposal will be discussed at this conference, CC:DA will want to revisit the need for the Task Force.

The **Chair** reported that there had been some discussion on the RDA-L list in May about naming parts of the Bible, started by a question about the Apocrypha (whether to treat the Catholic deutero-canonical Biblical books as apocryphal in authorized access points). Judy Knop, ATLA liaison, will lead an effort to develop a revision proposal to address this issue, working with CLA and other interested parties. The intent is to have a revision proposal ready for discussion at Midwinter.

1142. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet
[LC Report, June 2011]

Tillett presented a concise version of the full LC report for the Committee, and encouraged meeting attendees to view the full report online for news items of interest throughout the LC organization. Exhibit booth presentations at this conference include a presentation by Judy Kuhagen, Dave Reser, and Ana Cristan on the RDA Transition FAQ (attachment to the LC report). Suggestions for questions to add to the FAQ may be sent to LChelp4rda@loc.gov.

Tillett noted that personnel losses in PSD include Paul G. Weiss, senior subject policy specialist, who retired after 37 years. PSD is unable to fill positions; one result is that the weekly lists are now becoming monthly lists.

Tillett highlighted the recently released *Transformation of the Bibliographic Framework* document which announced LC's intention to try to move beyond MARC and decide with the worldwide community which directions we should go for the future environment. This will be a fully collaborative, inclusive effort, involving the metadata community, standards experts inside and outside libraries, and systems designers. A series of invitational meetings will take place in 2012 and 2013. A draft action plan may be released by the end of September. A discussion list, BIBFRAME and web site have been established; URLs are in the report.

Tillett also discussed the U.S. decision about RDA implementation on the part of U.S. national libraries. Senior managers agreed that the implementation would not occur before January 1, 2013, and that certain conditions must be met before implementation. Some of these were already in process, others are new as a result of the test. As part of addressing these conditions, LC committed to having testers at LC resume work as RDA catalogers, probably starting in November. Having these 30 or so RDA catalogers will help PSD fulfill conditions regarding implementation of RDA and help with training, revision proposals, and documentation. The full report and executive summary are available on the Test web site; this will be archived and a new web site will be created for RDA implementation.

Tillett noted that the LCPS will be reviewed in coordination with the PCC. Some definitely will be changed; many things in the LCPS were there specifically to test, to see the impact of going to the nth degree on some issues. Others may be left as is, but all will be reviewed.

VIAF now has 18 participants with another four in the test stage. Formal invitations to join will be sent in August to Bibnet, a consortium in Belgium, the Russian State Library, and ABES in France. More information is available on the VIAF web site. The LC report also contains much information about subject cataloging developments; Janis Young will report about these at the SAC meeting.

Tillett commented on ABA production statistics, which are a little behind fiscal year 2010 at the halfway point due to RDA test activities, but not as far as she expected they might be.

Attig inquired about the National Library Catalog (formerly XML Data Store, p. 14). **Tillett** described it as one place to go to access what LC has in all of its various silos, including the OPAC and all of the other databases – “one-stop shopping.” The integrated library system was

originally intended to be the way to pull all of these together, but additional individual databases proliferated.

1143. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

Attig gave a brief update about JSC activities since Midwinter. The JSC has held almost-monthly conference calls; announcements are expected soon on several topics. The JSC is trying to document a “fast track” decision-making procedure as an alternative to the formal proposal process for things that don’t merit that rigorous treatment. Some are simply corrections to the text that required no discussion; these are documented in Representative documents. This may include additions and changes to examples, and probably to relationship designators as well.

The JSC has decided to charge a new Examples Group to assist in development and maintenance of the examples. This includes two components: working on examples in the text of RDA, including reviewing new proposals and making recommendations on examples; also starting on an official set of complete examples. An announcement about the working group will be made soon, and **Attig** invited indications of interest in serving. **Attig** clarified that “examples” refers to discreet examples in grey boxes, not parenthetical illustrative wording in the text.

Attig described the JSC’s review of the content of RDA elements and vocabularies, which identified a number of structural issues to be addressed (highlighted in Gordon Dunsire’s talks at this conference). In addition, definitions are needed for each term, as currently most vocabularies do not have them. The JSC would like help with this. Definitions will be added to the Registry and the RDA Glossary so that the two are in sync. As part of the review of vocabularies, **Attig** created a spreadsheet in which one column is a list of definitions that need to be changed or are missing. **Attig** will post a version of the spreadsheet on the CC:DA wiki, structured so that an individual or group can indicate that they are volunteering to work on a particular vocabulary. Other constituencies will also contribute, but **Attig** would like to see ALA make a major contribution. The JSC wants to do this as a sort of fast track procedure but wants to give the opportunity to comment as well. It should be possible to re-use definitions and not write them from scratch, but these have to clear copyright so part of the process will be to document the sources used to compile definitions and what was used from those sources.

Attig announced that the JSC plans to meet the first week in November in Glasgow. Previously announced deadlines still hold: new proposals must be submitted by August 11, and responses to proposals from other constituencies will be due September 28. Most of the work ahead for CC:DA is on the agenda at this meeting. Regarding the implementation decision from U.S. libraries, **Attig** explained that the JSC has not yet had a chance to discuss the full report and has talked only briefly about the recommendations and executive summary. He suggested that the meeting time might best be used to discuss the documents that are actionable.

The **Chair** noted that the deadlines mentioned are for the JSC representative to submit proposals. Any ALA proposals must come to CC:DA by August 1 to allow time for discussion and voting; deadlines will be set later for the second process, comments on proposals from other

constituencies. **Attig** will try to prioritize and sequence proposals and put together a program of work.

The first document discussed was a JSC representative proposal. **Attig** prepared this based on something that came up at a workshop, which suggested to him that the definition of Affiliation in FRAD that is used in RDA is limited in some ways. It is essentially defined as the related institution or entity. The content is expected to be the name of a group, but sometimes there is a need to say something else. The specific example was Leonard Bernstein, who was affiliated with the New York Philharmonic at two different points in his career, once as assistant conductor and once as music director. **Attig** believes this is a very important aspect of defining the affiliation and suggests adding an additional element for Position Held, renaming the current element as Affiliated Body, and adding Date of Affiliation. **Attig** sees a need for this but it also raises issues the JSC needs to discuss in general terms: the relationship of RDA to the FR models; to what extent the JSC is willing to go beyond them; linked data; and data about data.

Winzer supported the idea and said that she has found the same kinds of problems with faculty affiliations with a university (including dates, as some leave and later return) and also lawyers at a law firm, and it would be nice to be able to parse this out and not just put it in a 670. **Rolla** agreed that expanding this element would be useful. His institution did informal testing of RDA and catalogers found the Affiliation and Profession elements very helpful; they liked being able to take what has been done as text and treat them as data elements. On the larger question, **Rolla** noted that now we are having real-world experience, which is a reason to move beyond the models, as it is not just theoretical anymore.

Attig anticipates that if the JSC wants to go in this direction, it will communicate to the FRBR Working Group an observation that based on practice, we would suggest things that are possible future changes to the models. The JSC is trying to be sensitive to the relationship with these other standards and keep them informed about what's happening. We have to decide how close we want to keep the relationship at the present time.

Myers reflected that back in the days of pre-AACR and card production, these very elements had been a routine addition to name headings for faculty associated with his institution (position, rank, dates of affiliation, etc.). This inherited practice proves challenging as he tries to exercise authority control in an online environment using AACR2, but it affirms that these are historically valid data elements of interest to many institutions.

On the question of going beyond the models, **Paul Weiss** from the audience commented that in earlier days with AACR2 and ISBD, if both sides had always refused to change from the other, we wouldn't have gotten anywhere. The model itself is a living document and will change.

Attig asked if there are other things that might fall under this category. **Winzer** replied: dates of degrees. **Attig** responded that that is not affiliation, and **Winzer** noted that it is a piece of information that is important and is used to disambiguate people with similar names who are lawyers.

Discussion ensued about whether to incorporate this idea into the proposal. **Winzer** was willing to revisit the date issue in the future, but others agreed that it was useful information. The **Chair** asked whether we would need type of degree as well. **Attig** speculated that we might create a new Affiliation element with the name of institution, date of degree, and type of degree, but he was not sure where position within the body would fit. **Attig** affirmed the need to talk further about the potential for a separate element and what it would entail, so discussion will continue on the wiki.

Hasenyager inquired about using a different term than position that would be broader and not as concrete – perhaps “level.” **Attig** responded that it was possible, but we would need to make sure that the term is not so generic that it is not a well-defined data element. It may turn out that the best approach is to use an additional element.

In closing on this topic, **Attig** noted that he would incorporate comments he had received from Adam Schiff, that discussion would continue online, and that this is just the tip of the iceberg in wanting to break elements into a more granular approach.

Attig turned to discussion of two proposals and one discussion paper from LC. The first proposal deals with Appendix A. The general issue is how much effort to expend on maintaining this information within RDA and making it as international and comprehensive as feasible. There was a point at which the JSC was thinking of going elsewhere for this information and not maintaining it as part of the text; LC has presented reasons why this is not a good idea at this time. LC suggests retaining the text that is there and maintaining it as needed, and adding specifications for additional languages, along with some different options for handling these additions in the text editing context.

Attig inquired first whether CC:DA is in agreement with LC on the general recommendation to include this type of information in appendix A of RDA. There was no objection.

Attig noted that the proposal would extend the scope of general guidelines for capitalization beyond corporate bodies to other entities; following unusual capitalization practice for personal names is a change. **Myers** commented that this may be a continuation of the practice that allowed Mark Twain to be Mark Twain; we have gotten away from a culture of monolithic capitalization practice and need to be current and flexible. **Winzer** provided a caveat that people’s names are often represented by publishers and wondered whether a cataloger would know that “k. d. lang” is always “k. d. lang” or just that particular publisher’s presentation.

Weiss returned to the question of retaining Appendix A and commented that he thought it should be deleted; there are other documents to which we could refer, and we should let people use cataloger’s judgment. **Attig** noted that this has consistently been the position of ALA but it did not prevail in the JSC decision making process, and now the issue is being raised again in a different context. **Attig** asked, having decided that we do want to be consistent about capitalization (the issue with which ALA has problems), are there ways to achieve this without including instructions in our documentation? **Myers** noted the potential for dueling cataloger’s judgment when editing in a shared record environment; for example, some catalogers might give

“e. e. cummings” in all lower case, but others might change it thinking that all proper names should be in upper case.

Attig suggested that since ALA has a history on this position, it seems appropriate to include in our response the general statement that we don't feel that capitalization is worth the effort that's going into it in RDA, but we know that the JSC has decided otherwise, simply to get that on the record.

The second specific question in the proposal was about terms associated with names of persons – including field of activity as a qualifier. **Attig** asked about this being limited to names of persons, and whether terms associated with corporate bodies is covered somewhere else in Appendix A. That will be verified.

The third specific question is the addition of missing languages and how much effort to expend in maintaining alphabetical order. **Attig** noted that it will be very difficult to maintain the structure of RDA with persistent instruction numbers; it is hoped that there will be something persistent in the structure under the numbers so that translations can be done easily. The question here, for this section, is which do we consider most important?

Myers expressed a personal inclination for preserving the alphabetical format, but noted that LC presents a preference for preserving rule number order, and commented that in light of presentations on identities and the semantic web, as well as experience with many URL changes, he would hold his personal preference in abeyance in favor of persistent numbering.

Randall asked for more information on the issues regarding re-numbering, noting that we re-number other rules to keep things in sequence when changes are made. He feels it is important to keep additions in alphabetical sequence and asked about the mechanics behind the issue, noting that one of the main points about RDA being in an online environment was to have something easily updatable.

Attig explained that within the Toolkit, this is not a problem; it will maintain its own internal integrity. The problem is all of the things that refer to it, all of the documentation that tells you what to do for a place such as Latvia, when suddenly references to the instruction number are wrong because we've changed what that number means. This will be a problem with many things; if Time is added to the list of entities, even chapter numbering may not be persistent. Ideally there will be a technical solution that will make something permanent so the number doesn't have to be.

Randall asked whether a certain segment in the text has its own name or numbering in the system. **Weiss** suggested getting rid of the numbering, for example picking A.27 as other languages, then A.27.Latvian.1 and A.27.Latvian.2, etc. Rule numbers wouldn't matter, because we would just refer to it as the number within a language. Each translation of RDA would be alphabetized but there would be a common language for talking to each other.

Attig commented that alphabetization is definitely language-specific. He plans to articulate in the ALA response that we would prefer not to have to worry about this, and we hope there will be a solution so that it won't matter, but we have to say, if we must make a choice, this is what we would prefer. **Nanette Naught** from the audience offered to explain what has been done technically. In the Toolkit content system, every paragraph has a persistent ID. It's not yet possible to link to it, unless you know what the ID is. A demonstration was given at the "RDA 201" preconference. Weiss's suggestion is actually what the IDs look like; things are nested in the Toolkit, with a master ID, and within that, each language's ID. This is not exposed now, but hopefully will be in the future. **Attig** suggested continuing discussion on the wiki and may offer suggestions for how to phrase the ALA position.

Attig introduced the second LC proposal regarding Date of Manufacture, which might be characterized as a correction of an oversight. The JSC had previously redefined Production so that it covered all unpublished material and the other related elements covered only published material. There are "ghosts" of unpublished material in some of the other areas, and this is simply removing them. This could perhaps have been a fast track correction, but it is a proposal and seems very straightforward.

Attig introduced the LC discussion paper on Selections as used in RDA chapter 6, a fairly complicated set of issues. There are two general recommendations on p. 6 followed by ten specific revisions. Recommendation 1 asks whether Selections is always a work-level element, and Recommendation 2 asks what we should call it. **Attig** noted that there seems to be some ambiguity about whether Selections can be applied to parts of an expression as opposed to parts of a work. **Attig** sees some cases outside the library where he would want to be able to do it either way and make that distinction; some things are translations of a collection or compilation, some are selections from a translation. He expressed uncertainty about whether we really need to do this in our bibliographic environment; essentially we're talking about the sequence of elements in the access point.

Tillett commented that Recommendation 1 was actually trying to get more consistency across the board as to what you would prefer in terms of treating Selections as a work attribute but also constructing access points because right now there are differences. **Attig** responded that we need to look at the details on the wiki, and look particularly at the consistency issue in terms of constructing access points: is there a problem with trying to apply this now?

Recommendation 2 asks whether the term Selections should be changed to something else, Extracts, Excerpts, or other. **Dragon** inquired whether this would leave Selections to be used under any circumstances; **Tillett** responded no. **Dragon** then asked whether it is advisable to have a clean break with past practice, when people are liable to have a mixture of records created under different codes. **Myers** echoed the concern about legacy records and losing a significant collocation function in the catalog.

Attig said the issue is, are we really talking about the same things? The argument here is that we're not and that it's misleading to give them the same label and treat them as if they are the same. **Judy Kuhagen** from the audience agreed, and also responded about making a clean break.

She reminded the Committee that the AACR2 practice of using just “Selections” changes in RDA to “Works. Selections.” There will be a difference; the question will be which kind of difference.

Glennan echoed concerns about how patrons will approach legacy records done one way and new records another way. To address Kuhagen’s comment about “Selections” and “Works. Selections,” **Glennan** stated that we could potentially do a machine conversion; there is a mapping we could use. With both of these recommendations, our existing headings would be harder to convert in an automated way, but it would be important to find a way to convert them so that we end up with a single practice, to give a reasonable result to our end users.

Winzer asked whether there is a specific meaning in music for Extracts. **Scharff** noted that it would at least parallel what is done in subject practice, and from a training standpoint it could be helpful to correlate the practices, but that users might interpret Extracts to involve re-working or arrangement of music. Excerpts gives less of a sense that you have changed something by taking it out of its original context. **Glennan** commented that in some communities Extracts may have a different or slightly additional meaning: Selections implies some sort of grouping selected as a whole (all of movement one, all of chapter seven) but Extracts could be construed as very small unrelated snippets.

Attig expressed the view that all of these terms have connotations and that the problem with both Excerpts and Extracts is that they apply rather well to compilations of selections, but not very well to selected works. For two of the novels of an author who wrote a dozen, calling it Extracts or Excerpts creates cognitive dissonance. The same could be said of Selections, but the problem is that we’re trying to apply the same term to two cases that don’t belong together. **Attig** suggested that perhaps “Works, Incomplete” might be better than Selections; then for the other category either Excerpts or Extracts does match what people expect.

Rolla questioned the value of the uniform title Selections, noting that arguing about what to call the uniform title seems like we are still tied to the AACR2 model, and not going beyond it. **Weiss** noted that a previous JSC Working Group almost recommended getting rid of Selections, and asked who benefits from Selections? Reference librarians don’t get it and patrons don’t search for it. **Attig** stated that it’s simply a warning that it’s incomplete.

Attig noted that we are talking about a set of alternative rules: a way of formulating a single authorized access point, as an alternative to the instruction to record authorized access points for each selection. Two novels issued together is a toss-up, but for 50 poems, the general instruction is harder to do, and for 500 pictures from a collection harder still. We would like to do precise identification of what we’ve got, but for pragmatic reasons, it seemed best to provide an alternative. **Myers** commented that that if he were to see “Whitman, Walt. 50 poems,” or “Dickens, Charles. 3 novels,” that would actually convey real information. This would be a completely different direction than what we’ve done, but it might be something we could explore: to open up the rules to articulate contents in shorthand adequately.

Attig reinforced that what we're really talking about is naming the work, it's not one single work but a cataloger-constructed name, and suggested that we continue the discussion online.

Randall reiterated that there is a definite interest in making sure we have the option to say that the works aren't complete.

The **Chair** announced the break, and asked visitors to sign attendance sheets.

1144. Revision proposal from AALL: Hostage

[[CC:DA/AALL/2010/1/Rev.: Places in Certain Federations](#)]

Hostage introduced the revised proposal, based in part on suggestions from Attig about treating the United States, Great Britain, Canada, and Australia as alternatives to the general instruction. The group also omitted Malaysia and the former Yugoslavia, included some instructions for islands and island areas, and moved some rules for names that include jurisdictions.

Mangan asked for clarification of the word "near" at the bottom of page 2, where it says "Add to the name of an island or island group..." She felt that "near" was ambiguous and needed to be defined, or catalogers would be confused about whether to qualify or not, using the example that Puerto Rico is close to the U.S. but should not be qualified. **Hostage** replied that there is some judgment involved and it probably needs to be ambiguous; this language reflects current practice from the LCRI's.

Myers stated that Mangan raised a valid question about quantifying "near" but that it is a very fuzzy area. He suggested that a survey might be conducted of existing headings to see if a range can be identified for when to qualify or not, and that catalogers should use past practice in the "middle area." He also wanted to advance the AALL proposal.

Mangan proposed using a phrase such as "if it is considered part of the country" in deciding whether an entity should be qualified or not. **Hostage** stated that certain places that are part of France that are located in the western hemisphere are not qualified by France under current practices. **Mangan** asserted that they aren't considered part of the country. **Myers** pointed out that the instruction includes the phrase "associated with the country" five words past "near."

Hostage referred to Adam Schiff's comments regarding treatment of places in the British Isles, which is carried over from AACR2. Ireland is an independent country and thus cannot be qualified by a larger entity. **Attig** stressed that the topic of discussion was the instructions in 16.2.2.8.3 which are an alternative approach for places in the British Isles. He had suggested breaking them out that way as alternatives to allow each country to decide how it wants to treat its own places. He suggested that we observe the anomaly of treating Ireland as part of the British Isles though it's an independent country and not part of any grouping, and invite the British to propose how they want to deal with it. **Hostage** agreed with Attig's suggestion.

Attig suggested that the category should not be the British Isles but the United Kingdom. **Myers** stated the opposite, that Ireland is not part of the United Kingdom, but is part of the British Isles, which describes a geographic area rather than a jurisdiction. **Attig** said that the

alternative treatment is for parts of the United Kingdom. The appropriate way to treat Ireland is under the general instruction, and we could suggest that to the British again diplomatically; Ireland has been treated anomalously for some time.

Attig mentioned Schiff's additional comments and suggested looking at examples. There are examples under the general instruction for places that are covered by alternatives, including places in the United States. The examples under the general instruction don't necessarily reflect the way we would like to treat places in the United States; current practice will be reflected by the alternative. Furthermore, the instruction on adding qualifiers to distinguish places with the same name comes after the general instructions. He cautioned against using as examples of places in the United States places that are not unique.

Schiff's comment, according to **Hostage**, was that because we are treating these places as alternatives, we should include some examples in the general rule for places that would be qualified by U. S., but the problem is that some of the places in the revision proposal are not unique and could not be used until after the instructions about distinguishing places with the same name. **Hostage** questioned whether making alternative rules is the best approach if we actually don't want people to apply the general rule, and suggested making a rule to treat those countries that way.

Hostage pointed out a typographical error at 16.2.2.8.4.1; the word "province" will be deleted.

Attig asked about the effect of not having specific instructions for the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia, and whether that changes current practice. **Hostage** said that for the most part there is no change, especially if we continue to follow the LCPS which says that if the larger place changes its name, the latest name is used as a qualifier. He said there should be no rule change for local places within those republics (in the former USSR and former Yugoslavia). The only question might be how to treat names of republics in those countries, whether you should qualify Croatia by Yugoslavia for that time period, or qualify Latvia by Soviet Union. This situation could be handled in different ways:

1. Treat them by the general rule, which would mean qualifying them during the times when they were parts of those countries, which means a lot of authority work and which we probably want to avoid;
2. Use a LCPS that instructs treating them a certain way;
3. Add a note in the authority file, as we have already done for the Czech Republic, which had that name a few years before Czechoslovakia split up.;
4. Create a new rule in RDA that specifies how such names should be treated.

Attig said he was less concerned about whether the results of applying these rules are the same, but rather are the component republics essentially the same jurisdiction before and after they were a part of the federation, or is this a distinct governmental structure that really needs to be kept separate? **Hostage** replied that it was not easy to answer; this was really more of a political science question.

Randall questioned the placement of instructions on islands and island groups coming between instructions on punctuation in 16.2.2.4, and suggested they be moved elsewhere. **Hostage** said he struggled with the placement but really the whole chapter needs to be rethought. The problem with islands is that sometimes a larger place exists and sometimes not; this seemed like the best placement, but he was open to suggestions.

Scharff used Latvia as an example and asked if it made a difference whether we distinguish between Latvia the current country and Latvia that existed under the Soviet Union. He thought it would look odd to have some governmental units added to Latvia whose names clearly indicated that they were governmental units under Soviet rule. **Hostage** noted that that already happens; Latvia is not qualified by “Soviet Union” for that time period. **Mangan** pointed out that many headings weren’t qualified by “Soviet Union” because that was part of their name, for example, Georgian S.S.R. **Hostage** noted the mismatch of practices for former Soviet republics; some had names like Azerbaijan S.S.R. and some did not, such as Latvia and Estonia. He doubted the need to discuss that for this proposal.

Attig stated that we need to continue this discussion online. He pointed out that chapter 16 will be rewritten; the scope will change radically when subject entities and relationships are added, however the current content in chapter 16 will probably retain more or less the same form. He suggested that the group return to more discussion on this proposal after Monday’s discussion on subjects.

Hostage asked about the status of the proposal and if there were any serious objections to it. The **Chair** noted hearing concerns about the use of the word “near” for island groups. **Attig** also noted the question about the sequence of rules in 16.2.2.4, but did not feel these were major problems. He also noted that the rationale for the original proposal was not carried forward, so it will need to be re-constructed.

1145. Report of the TF on RDA Instructions for Heads of State and Heads of Government: Winzer

Winzer pointed out a typographical error: “Israel Rash” should be “Israel Rosh.” She suggested striking the sentence “Additional examples throughout RDA for Catholic Church. Pope would also need to be changed” on page 5.

Attig acknowledged that this was a difficult set of issues to write into a proposal, and it wasn’t a complete solution, but he was impressed with the results. **Winzer** admitted that Task Force members struggled with the proposal. She thought it would be helpful to pull things out as separate elements and parts; to have a rule that simply says, “Put together the jurisdiction, the title, the dates of incumbency, and name” and be done with it, but that’s not what we have. **Dragon** asked what would be done if a jurisdiction has more than one official language. **Hostage** said that it’s a general problem for bodies under a jurisdiction, and that catalogers should follow the rule for determining what to use. **Winzer** added that the rule instructs catalogers to use 11.2.2.5.2 if there’s more than one official language.

Hearing no further discussion, the **Chair** invited a motion to approve the proposal and authorize the JSC representative to forward it to the JSC. Moved by **Randall**; seconded by **Rolla Myers** noted a small error under the heading: “Advantages of the Proposed Change” in the second line: “not only for heads of government but all for” should be “for all.” The motion carried unanimously. The **Chair** dismissed the task force with thanks.

1146. Report of the TF on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies: Randall

Randall acknowledged the challenging nature of the rules for subordinate bodies. The Task Force made a combined list of instructions for types of governmental and non-governmental subordinate bodies. The resulting list is much shorter and eliminates much redundancy because many instructions for governmental and non-governmental subordinate bodies were almost identical.

Randall said that the Task Force is trying to determine if they could eliminate Type 6 for non-governmental names (a name that includes the entire name of a higher or related body as a condition for recording it subordinately). When experimenting with getting rid of Type 6, it became evident that past practices for recording names have been strange. The issue is not just whether the name of the parent body is included in the name of the subordinate body, but how that name happens to be presented on the resource from which the cataloger is working and how the whole name is recorded according to the rules for that name. Consistency within a resource is an issue as well. **Randall** gave an example of the current heading “Duke University. School of Law,” with references from “Duke Law School” and “Duke University. Law School.” **Randall** compared this with the heading “Harvard Law School” which has a cross reference from “Harvard University. Law School.” The Task Force was unsure what kind of principles should determine subordination regarding how names are recorded; **Randall** asked for suggestions.

Attig said that some of the issues **Randall** raised are related to the decision about the preferred form of name, based on representation; depending on decisions for the latter, there will not be consistency across a group of similar corporate bodies, but based on the decision about what the preferred name is, Type 6 will or will not apply. **Randall** agreed. **Attig** noted that subordinate entry is primarily a way of grouping things, and grouping things alphabetically in lists is important but perhaps less so as we place more importance on identifying things. We may have gone too far in trying to use subordination as a way to keep things together. On the other hand, that is likely to lead to some differences with government bodies where hierarchy and subordination is perhaps even more important. **Randall** noted that Type 6 does not apply to government bodies.

Yee noted that a principle to keep in mind in the practice of subordination is what Lubetzky called a “distinctive name,” which involved trying to identify things that were not distinctive from things that were distinctive enough to stand on their own without needing to be subordinated to a higher body. She said that main categories were a test operational item for that basic principle, and suggested that it might be better to return to the original principle of letting catalogers decide whether a name is a distinctive, and if not, subordinate it. **Attig** said that the

“distinctive name” idea may apply more to other types than to Type 6. That is what is behind a lot of the detail.

Myers liked Yee’s comments and suggested stating the more general rule to subordinate when needed to distinguish the heading, and in making that decision, apply certain factors without stating hard and fast rules. **Attig** commented that this proposal may need more time than afforded by the August 11 deadline. One option is to subordinate everything: to record a name as it is; if it is presented as a series of bodies and sub-bodies, then record the whole thing. If it is presented as a name, use that as the heading.

Randall asked whether we would want to do that in our current metadata environment. **Attig** stressed that he liked it as one of the options to explore, but wasn’t sure it would work. He admitted that it could be a nightmare for maintenance work, as every time a body changed its name, all of its subordinate bodies changed names, something we have tried to avoid. **Randall** cited some examples of African nation names and said that such an option could result in very frequent title changes for serials. **Attig** agreed that there may be reasons to reject that option, but he would like to report that it was considered.

Rolla commented that **Randall**’s most recent question is similar to the transition from earlier cataloging rules wherein everything had been subordinated, so the fact that it would be a different practice is not a reason to avoid making the change. **Rolla** also questioned the value of having Type 6, and suggested using, for example, “Duke University School of Law” if that’s how it’s presented; he questioned the value of putting a period and a space \$b between those two entities, and also in the middle of the string “Harvard School of Law.”

Attig pointed out that in the last example, “Harvard School of Law” which is for “Harvard University School of Law,” we need to remember the issue is not just preferred name, but also variant names. It is not worth a lot of effort for people to agonize over which ones should be preferred or variant as long as we have consistency and as simple practice as possible.

Myers understood what **Rolla** said but he is also cognizant that in some respects these are not pedantic differences; they actually reflect how a university or an organization may structure their respective components. For example, Union College is part of Union University which comprises a number of other professional schools, and it’s more of a confederacy than a proper corporate structure; the schools are fairly independent. **Myers** offered as a possibility that the Harvard University system may constitute itself as a collection of quasi-independent bodies as opposed to a place like “Duke University School of Law” where the “School of Law” is actually organized under the context of a large corporate body that is “Duke University.”

Attig said that was probably right, but that a lot of weight was being put on that one period. **Attig** also questioned whether consumers who use our data will perceive what we catalogers try to put into it. **Rolla** was not arguing that there were not hierarchies in corporate bodies but the lack of utility of that period. **Weiss** said that one use of the period is in authority control, for example, if a parent body changes name, there’s a distinct piece where it does so. The period does have some significance.

Myers suggested that the working document for this proposal be posted onto the wiki so members could comment on it. **Randall** wondered if that would be allowed because the document has copyrighted information, but was assured that it was. **Attig** suggested that the Task Force share what they have on the Task Force wiki page (in Working Documents, a separate category from finished proposals) and the rest of the committee post comments to it.

1147. Report From the TF on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Rolla

Rolla stated that the Task Force has just started its initial review of the elements in chapter 3 regarding quantity and units of measure, and will propose revisions to make the elements more machine-actionable. **Attig** added that the Task Force listed the elements in chapter 3 that they wanted to review and started to compile the structure of the statements resulting from the instructions in those sections. They looked at examples and worked from simple to more complicated examples, where catalogers measure different things, record all kinds of statements, and look at pieces of data. The Task Force reviewed 3.5 Dimensions fairly extensively, started on Extent and the other elements, compiled some raw materials, and started to discuss various pieces of information and how to put them together to make statements in RDA.

Rolla stated that the Task Force cut several elements that do not fall under its charge because they were strictly textual labels and information. It also compiled examples of the sections that it will review. The Task Force has divided up labor: some members will work on proposing instructions; others will work on larger linked data and semantic web issues. The biggest challenge will be to use complicated examples to formulate rules. The Task Force views this approach as a good initial step towards the goal of using RDA to move into the linked data world which has been the focus of much news and discussion.

Attig said the Task Force will meet Monday afternoon in person for the first time when they will decide on their next steps. The Task Force plans to use Google Docs as a communication tool, which has commenting and chat features; the latter allows remote discussion and viewable typing amongst participants and even several threads of discussion. The Task Force met for two hours awhile ago using the chat feature.

Rolla said that Diane Hillmann suggested using Google Docs, and it has worked out quite well. He recommended it as a consideration for other task forces, especially in the initial stage. The Task Force decided against using the wiki right away because they wanted a public space where they could discuss ideas amongst themselves.

1148. Report from the RDA Programming Task Force: Abbas

Abbas described the RDA training sessions that were held during this ALA conference, including a very successful two-day preconference, *RDA 201*, with 135 attendees. It was more advanced than last year's preconference, focusing on helping people understand the differences between AACR2 and RDA and implementing RDA in daily cataloging work. **Abbas** noted that all of the presenters were emerging experts in RDA application and the preconference was

hands-on; many attendees brought their own laptops, accessed the Toolkit, and worked through the exercises. Preconference materials are available on the RDA 201 Connect space and may be made publicly available. The conference sessions may be turned into webinars.

A well-attended Saturday program, "On Beyond Zebra: Looking Beyond MARC," discussed linked data and tried to help people understand the non-record view of how we can implement RDA, among other topics.

Abbas listed other conference sessions focused on RDA to be held on Sunday:

1. A discussion panel where vendors will discuss their implementation plans for RDA;
2. An update forum featuring John Riemer from the PCC and Robert Bremer from OCLC;
3. A brainstorming session on training for LIS educators and RDA trainers to discuss what needs to be included in training materials.

Abbas announced that the Task Force had asked CCS Executive to review the constitution of the two RDA task forces. CCS determined that according to the charge, the Programming Task Force should remain in force until one year after RDA implementation, which now means until 2014. Task Force membership will change due to term limits. **Abbas** asked CC:DA for feedback on what the Task Force should focus on for the coming year.

Attig asked whether there are any programming plans for the next annual ALA meeting. **Abbas** replied that the Task Force had not known how long it would exist so has not yet made plans; it will have a planning meeting on Sunday afternoon and a meeting on Monday with the ALCTS Program Committee. CCS Executive gave Abbas a list of ideas to consider. The Task Force tentatively plans to have an update forum during Midwinter and perhaps offer a preconference during the next annual conference, plus other programs.

Attig recommended that the Task Force target a new audience next time in order to reach more people with the same basic information. The strategy used this time will be the appropriate level for a certain amount of time, and the same approach can be repeated to reach more people.

Myers commented on the level of success that the Task Force has had at the ALA level and suggested that the training programs be presented at the state level. **Abbas** replied that several Task Force members have been training at the state level, but more needs to be done.

Abbas commented that CCS Executive suggested a program focused on authorities and FRAD. **Attig** urged that the Task Force work with the PCC on this topic, since many people do authority work within a NACO context. During an organizational meeting with the PCC, Attig and others realized that there are some things that only the PCC can do, namely make decisions about the national authority file. Paul Frank and Judith Cannan at LC are contacts.

Abbas has received a proposal from David Miller for a program about what is being done with RDA internationally, and the Task Force may offer that as a program next year if it is approved by the Program Committee. The **Chair** complimented the Task Force effort on the programs offered at this conference.

1149. Report from the RDA Training Task Force: Robare for Harcourt

The **Chair** stated that the focus of the Task Force has been to arrange RDA webinars. Approximately 48,900 persons registered for five RDA webinars held since Midwinter 2011; about one thousand additional persons registered for individual sessions. In sum, a total of about 69,798 persons received RDA training via the webinars. The **Chair** announced that the Task Force written report was posted on the website, and listed the webinars planned for fall 2011:

1. August 31, instead of “FRAD,” “US RDA Test: Reflections on the Test,” presented by Barbara Bushman and Regina Reynolds;
2. September 28, “RDA and Cartographic materials,” presented by Paige Andrew;
3. October 19, “Scores;” October 26, “Sound Recordings,” both presented by Kathy Glennan;
4. November 2, “Cataloging Law Materials,” presented by John Hostage.

Randall pointed out that a group of people at Northwestern University viewed a webinar, so the actual numbers of people who received training via webinars was most likely higher. In response to a question about the FRAD webinar originally scheduled for August 31, the **Chair** replied that it may be rescheduled. ALCTS webinars will be available free of charge for a certain period of time, possibly 6 months after the original broadcast. There has not been a very public announcement about this, and it would be useful to publicize it more.

Attig commented again on the PCC group that has begun to get organized. Since the PCC secretariat is at LC, the PCC and LC are jointly developing materials to train LC catalogers so they can be repurposed to use as general training. The PCC group is unclear about what the scope of the training should be, and for various reasons feels the need to cover everything, not just specific PCC information, so they are potential partners for developing training for whatever is needed. **Attig** stressed the need to keep in touch with the PCC group and figure out ways of working together in order to maximize the efforts of both groups.

Weiss stressed the need to train people who don’t know AACR2 as well as people who do know it. The **Chair** requested that questions and suggestions about RDA training be forwarded to Mary Woodley and Kate Harcourt, or to any Task Force member.

The **Chair** announced that the next CC:DA meeting will be held Monday, June 27, at 8:00 a.m., and adjourned the meeting at 5:17 p.m.

Monday, June 27, 2011 — 8:00–12:00 p.m.

Hilton Riverside, Grand Salon C

1150. Welcome and opening remarks

The **Chair** called the meeting to order at 8:05 a.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors. She routed the roster for members to initial and correct, if necessary, and an attendance sheet for visitors. The **Chair** also alerted members and visitors to copies of the agenda, the LC Report and the RDA FAQs, and announced that the CC:DA portion of the meeting would end at 10:00 a.m. and that CC:DA would meet with SAC after the break.

1151. Report from the MARBI Representative: Myers

Myers reported on highlights from and actions taken during the MARBI meetings on Saturday and Sunday related to the following proposals:

Proposal 2011-02: RDA Production, Publication, Distribution and Manufacture Statements in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: This was closely tied with Discussion Paper 2011-03 for “Date of Copyright Notice.” After discussion, MARBI settled on an arrangement using field 264 for these statements, with copyright date rolled into it, breaking out by indicator value the respective production, publication, distribution, copyright, and manufacture statements. This obviated the need for Proposal 2011-03.

Proposal 2011-04: Adapting Field 377 (Associated Language) for Language of Expression in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats: The proposal supports RDA requirements and expansion to include applicability to families and expressions. Option 2 added subfield \$b to provide for language terms in addition to language code. Discussion indicated a preference to replace subfield \$b with subfield \$l, to align with the use of subfield \$l in controlled access points. Option 2 was approved with the amendment of subfield \$l.

Proposal 2011-05: Broadening field 373 (Affiliation) for Associated institutions in the MARC 21 Authority Format: There was a desire to expand coverage of this field; after deliberation, the consensus was that this was a documentary change required by MARBI, so there were some minor changes to the documentation language and the element names.

Proposal 2011-06: RDA Fuller Form of Personal Name Attribute in the MARC 21 Authority Format: After some discussion, the proposal was slightly modified to change the base field from subfield \$a to subfield \$q and that was approved as amended.

Proposal 2011-07: Additional Corporate Body Attributes for RDA in the MARC 21 Authority Format: Two questions that arose regarding the establishment of a new field 368 were:

1. Is the proposal appropriately granular? The consensus was yes.
2. Which was preferred, option 1 or 2? Option 1 differentiated from the types of other corporate body attributes by using indicator values; Option 2 allowed that differentiation by using subfields. Option 2 was approved.

Proposal 2011-08: Treatment of Controlled Lists of Terms for Carrier Characteristics in RDA in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: This was a fairly complicated proposal with several possible elements:

1. Make the 300 subfield \$b repeatable, which was soundly rejected;
2. Add subfield \$i to field 500 to specify the nature of contents of the field (in this case, pertaining to recording of Carrier characteristics, but possibly extensible to other uses); that was rejected, as it is out of normal practice and was redundant in many cases;
3. Attributes regarding print characteristics; these were incorporated into additions to field 340 and were carrier characteristics for a number of media formats: sound, projection, video, and digital. There were two options for addressing those characteristics: group them into one large field with many subfields; or break them into four distinct fields; the latter option was chosen. There was some discussion about the addition of subfields 0, 6, and 8, which are a variety of linking mechanisms between the content of the carrier instances of the field and to external information.

The following additions were approved:

1. New subfields to field 340; 2. New fields 344-347; 3. Subfields \$0, \$6 & \$8.

Proposal 2011-09: Identifying the Source of Thematic Index Numbers in Field 383 in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Formats: This was to address the increased granularity afforded in RDA for this information. There were minor editorial changes received from the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing and some additional editorial changes regarding subfield \$b. All were incorporated into the final proposal which was approved as amended.

Proposal 2011-10: Geographic Codes in the MARC 21 Classification Format: The proposal was approved as amended with the addition of subfield \$0 for linking data.

Proposal 2011-11: Addition of 1st Indicator Value 7 (Other edition specified in \$2) in DDC Number Fields in the MARC 21 Bibliographic, Authority and Community Information Formats: This was to address the wider diversity of Dewey additions than originally encompassed for this field. The proposal was approved as written.

Proposal 2011-12. Defining Subfield \$q for an Assigning Agency in Field 084 (Other Classification Number) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format: This was brought by the German National Library to address slight differences in classification practices and choices between major classification projects and efforts in Germany, although it has wider applicability, and it involves using subfield \$q in fields 082 and 083. The proposal was approved as written.

Discussion Paper 2011-DP05: Additional Means of Identifying Medium of Performance in the MARC21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats: This was brought by MLA and emerged from evolving understanding of the formulation of genre headings for music. Numerous existing subject headings used to express genres are composed of a form term with medium of performance information. This medium of performance is considered out of scope for genre headings, and a new place is needed to record it. The Discussion Paper raised the questions of which fields and formats to use, and what mechanisms should be used in the fields to convey the

information. Issues revolve around grouping, indexing, and display of the data. **Myers** would like feedback in order to accommodate the proposal. The paper offered three solutions:

1. Use of field 048 (currently in the bibliographic format) in the authority format;
2. Use of field 382 (a fairly new field), both in the bibliographic and authority formats;
3. Use of 6xx field in the bibliographic formats—with no analog in the authority format.

Discussion narrowed the potential solutions to these latter two; field 048 was rejected. The discussion paper largely met with favor provided that the medium of performance and number of players were tightly coupled. Extra thought was given to treatment of individual instruments for voices vs. ensembles and some of the musically more technical aspects of the medium of performance were reviewed; there were some questions about the doubling of instruments where one player swaps out.

Attig asked if that information was online. **Myers** stated that the discussion would continue on the MARC discussion list and the Bibliographic Control Committee (BCC) website to facilitate the development of a proposal in time for consideration at Midwinter. **Attig** stressed the need to pay attention to this issue and its results for two reasons:

1. The medium of performance is also an RDA element. These two things are currently treated in somewhat different ways, both in terms of structure and of content, for which terms to use. He expects an ongoing question as to whether those two uses in naming works and expressions and in providing medium access to old bibliographic and authority records require things to be treated as different elements or whether we can make it work in a more unified way. Also, the PCC wants to add these to authority records and use them as medium access to works and expressions; this is the start of discussion about enabling a subject relationship between these various attributes and a work or an expression.
2. We are used to recording certain information in 650 fields that soon we will not be able to record in either 650 or 655 fields; therefore there is some urgency to provide a place for this information, but there are also other general issues. **Attig** implied that we need to find some other ways to record the information.

Glennan stated that one such difference between RDA's Medium of Performance and how information is currently recorded is pluralization of the term if there's more than one instrument or voice. From a thesaurus retrieval view, as Myers pointed out, it is best to use a singular term and a number if there are, for example, two trumpets. RDA currently tells us to use the plural, because this is considered eye-readable data. We have not consistently used "trumpets (2)" in the past. Catalogers would prefer to record that kind of information once in a record and not create two fields, one with "trumpet (2)" and one with "trumpets (2)" due to using two different sources for the vocabulary.

Myers stated that that closed the formal business of the meeting, but there were some other reports. First was a report from the RDA MARC Working Group on identifying identity types in MARC records. The basis for this was a discussion paper addressing the ability to identify a record explicitly as encapsulating a work, an expression, a manifestation, or an item. The discussion resolved into a strict entity type definition or loose entity type definition. The former would allow for record validation against the element specific to a given entity level, but this

would be a problem, as not all the required elements are available in the authority format for this use. Many legacy records and practices included in the bibliographic format have elements from more than one entity level. The desirable outcome was to validate but there seemed to be no workable solution given the state of existing records and of existing mindsets, how the record is pulled together, and the general lack of ability to establish parallel structures for each entity type in both bibliographic and authority formats.

Myers added that the loose entity type definition would avoid that problem but at the cost of formally affecting a mechanism of limited utility. This would not be useful in future differentiation of records; without a validation mechanism there would be ample opportunities for fields to creep in that did not necessarily belong at an appropriate entity level. Given the rapid evolution of standards and practices it was undesirable to lop the formats into this configuration until a better approach emerges later. The Working Group decided to return to this when it has time to think about the implications for the bibliographic and authority formats more generally. He implied this issue would be discussed later, and admitted some disappointment in the inability to advance on these issues.

Myers continued with other reports. LC is relying heavily on online updates; MARC 21 updates are not being printed anymore except for the concise version. There have been numerous requests for better printing from the web; this was deemed implemented first for those sections that are affected by online updates. Update 12 was issued and Update 13 will be available soon. The Concise Format for Bibliographic and Authority and Holdings Formats (due in October) will incorporate updates 12 and 13. Work continues on the id.loc.gov site with a richer format for lists. The platform is being migrated; there should be no visible changes to users in terms of presentation of print information but it will offer better linking functionality and include names.

Myers commented on LC's launch of the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative (www.loc.gov/transition). During the MARBI business meeting, there was a brief discussion on the relationships between the two groups represented at MARBI meetings: the ALA Committee known as MARBI and the MARC Advisory Group, which reports to the Library of Congress in its efforts to maintain the MARC formats. MARBI's meetings and role has largely been subsumed under the MARC Advisory Group. As the efforts and development of the Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative proceed, it was thought that the roles and actions of the two groups would be distinguished and perhaps disambiguated. Moving forward, the MARC Advisory Group would focus on the import on and the crosswalks between MARC and the "what comes next" standard. Given MARBI's more general charge, it might have a role in developing the "what comes next" standard and in the conversations leading up to its creation. MARBI might need to be reconfigured to address this wider engagement with machine-readable initiatives and with corresponding allocation of agenda time to allow the two sides of these efforts to proceed. MARBI has had three meeting slots during the ALA annual conference; lately the Monday slot has not been used, but it has potential to help with the committee's work. MARBI's role in this effort could include the presentation to the committee of white papers not specific to MARC or presentations on non-MARC systems and specific components of systems such as RDF. In addition, many interesting presentations for these kinds of mechanisms occur at

ALA conferences but are scheduled in conflict with MARBI meetings. Changing this structure could also help.

Maxwell asked if the proposal about qualifiers for personal names was approved for authorized access points only. **Myers** replied: yes, and added that there were discussions during the meeting about the name of the field, its applicability to name forms in the 400 fields, and its utility for machine processing for incorporation to re-establish name heading forms. These issues were largely set aside to make it apply specifically to preferred name forms found in field 100. There was a lot of discussion about the see-from forms but it ultimately was viewed as too complicated to align the expansion in this field with the appropriate 4xx fields to which they might belong.

Maxwell stated that this was another example of RDA not fitting into MARC well. **Myers** agreed.

1152. Revision Proposals from MusLA: Scharff

Scharff introduced the proposal regarding the status of the container and noted that **Randall** had offered some good feedback via the CC:DA wiki. **McGrath** said that the OLAC community was less current on these issues than MusLA, but agreed with the proposal as written.

Scharff stated that the main issue and the “aha” moment for him was in realizing that:

1. The instruction focused on preferring a source of information that identifies the resource as a whole;
2. There are many ways a resource can be identified as a whole, within one place, but not all of those ways involve a collective title.

Scharff shared MusLA’s perspective that when offered a collective title that identifies the resource as a whole, we should prefer the collective title for the sake of our users. **Hostage** understood the wording “a source identifying the resource as a whole” to distinguish this from a case where you have just a list of titles. He thought that the wording already conveyed the meaning the group had intended. **Scharff** said that a common sense viewpoint would agree, but he and other MusLA members realized it didn’t have to be read that way. For example, one can have a CD where on the disc surface there are three titles that identify the resource as a whole, but it is preferable to use the collective title on the container because users are more likely to know that title. **Scharff** summarized Randall’s comments from the wiki, which propose adding to the end of the instruction a sentence to clarify the fact that identifying a collective title is not something that one needs to do all the time, but does need for a resource embodying multiple works.

Maxwell asked about the possible situation of a book with three poem titles on the title page but a collective title on the spine; would the instructions prefer the spine title in such a case?

Scharff tentatively agreed. **Maxwell** asked if that was what we wanted. **Scharff** asked how common that was, and **Myers** said it was common enough that he considered the same question, and concluded that this is the solution to that problem. **Maxwell** stated that this is not a big

departure for media, but it is for books. **Scharff** stressed that the focal point of discussion was a title issued that way, not a binder's title.

Randall suggested adding a word such as "prominent" to indicate that it should be something that was not in a minor place, to allow cataloger's judgment indicating that someone would reasonably think this was the title. **Scharff** thought it might be problematic to use the word "prominent" because RDA doesn't define it. He noted that catalogers of sound recordings and DVDs look everywhere for a collective title, and explained that in certain situations RDA directs catalogers to devise a title when they lack a collective title, but he did not know how that would apply to this situation.

Myers stated that the addition of "prominent" is not quite in the spirit of this proposal because the proposal reads: "has a collective title on the container or in the accompanying textual material," whereas RDA 2.2.2.3 for moving images (page 3) reads "If the resource does not contain a title frame or title screen, use as the preferred source of information, as applicable: a label bearing a title...excluding accompanying textual material."

McGrath stated that in 2.2.2.4, only after one lacks a title on the title frame can one refer to the accompanying material or to the container. She added that we want this rule to resolve a discrepancy between the order of preferred sources and the desire for a collective title in favor of a collective title, even if the collective title appears much further down in the order of preferred sources. **Scharff** stated that the proposal adds a caveat to 2.2.2.4 that still excludes the accompanying material and the container unless they provide a collective title that is not found elsewhere.

Maxwell suggested adding the caveat: "Prefer the source, assuming it really is a source that the user would reasonably consider to be the title for the whole." **Scharff** asked for opinions about whether that would be overly flexible in terms of instruction. **Myers** thought that it was overly flexible. **Maxwell** emphasized that this is why we have cataloger's judgment. **Myers** agreed, but added that in a specialized music or media library, the impressions on users would be very different from those in a public library. **Maxwell** noted a possible situation in a public library where the dust jackets are kept on books and no one would ever see the spine title.

Rolla spoke from his perspective as a book cataloger that it is less common for a book to have a collection of works on the title page and then a collective title in paragraph 5 of the introduction. He added that the proposal is worded such that cataloger's judgment would allow us when cataloging a book to recognize that the last paragraph of the introduction is probably not where one finds a common title, whereas maybe a spine is.

Yee said it was very common for audiovisual items to lack collective titles or barely have them. The user is therefore served by analytics by which catalogers provide access to the works contained. Patrons are not likely to use the collective title much, but OCLC requires a title in the 245 field that won't be impossible to read or be too long, so you would want a collective title if you can possibly get one, rather than a list with everything on it.

Attig said he was trying to figure out how these rules are organized. He added that our discussion is on the basis of the description, not the “sources of information” rule, though much of its focus is selecting sources of information. The example that fits this rule best is a resource that consists of three novels, each with its own title page, and no collective title page. The current instruction says if you can find a source that applies to everything, like the spine, or the cover, you can use that. If you can’t, then you have to treat all the individual title pages for the novels collectively. This rule is written for when you don’t have a title page; it doesn’t really refer to choosing another source. **Attig** doubted that this rule bears on the question of selecting something other than the title page in order to get a collective title. **Scharff** asked **Attig** if he suggested we work on something else; **Attig** replied perhaps the work on Proposal 2 covers it and there may be no need to revise this rule. He was uncertain about whether this is the place where it instructs one to choose a source other than the title page.

Scharff stated he didn’t know how it solves the notion of Maxwell’s title page with three titles that don’t identify the resource as a whole, according to the instruction. **Scharff** stressed that you can’t argue that the title page doesn’t represent the resource as a whole, because those three titles are for the embodied works. Without a rule that defines when you have different things that describe or identify the resource as a whole, he doesn’t know how to resolve the situation of a resource that presents that identification as a collective title.

Myers presented a music scenario similar to that of three titles on a title page versus three title pages for each work: two pieces of music issued together; one manifestation on an LP, and the other on a compact disc. Because the LP has two sides, would they be treated as two separate title pages, leading to use of the collective title on the sleeve? With the compact disc, because the information is all on one side, we would need to treat it as a non-collective title situation, and we would end up with different results based on the manifestation. We want to avoid that.

Attig agreed to return to the discussion of Randall’s wording which clarifies the issue of when there are separate works. There are no caveats to when it would be applied, so it would apply beyond music sound recordings and other AV materials. **Attig** asked if this is a problem. **Randall** asked if it should be kept vague and left to cataloger’s judgment which would be informed by specialist community resources, policy statements, and cataloging guides. **Attig** asked if **Randall** meant vaguer than what is on the table. The problem is that the instruction doesn’t “allow”; it specifies. **Scharff** agreed, and added that if we feel that Maxwell’s concerns need to be accommodated, we need to devise something that addresses this.

Randall asked how “prefer” was defined and if it meant absolutely to use this. **Attig** said yes. When the **Chair** asked Maxwell for his opinion, he said he was simply asking the question, not objecting to it. The **Chair** suggested a straw poll on Proposal 1 to find out whether there was general support for it, adding that there seemed to be no concerns within the music and audio-visual community but that questions had been raised about the broader impact. No serious concerns about Proposal 1 were expressed. **Attig** suggested continuing the discussion on the wiki and asked for any further comments. **Scharff** noted that he agreed with **Randall**’s suggested changes in wording in the wiki, but was unsure of **Randall**’s notion about whether they could cut some redundancy by stating this principle once, and that it would carry through all the way. He

was not sure it was true for RDA, because RDA does not function as a linear document, and so suggested a discussion on it.

The **Chair** suggested moving on to Proposal 2 on artistic and technical credits. **Attig** proposed structuring the discussion by first discussing what is being proposed and then discussing the question of extending it.

Scharff stated that RDA 7.2.4 deals with artistic and technical credits, and as currently written, it is intended to apply only to moving image materials. It is defined as “a listing of persons, families, or corporate bodies making contributions to the artistic and/or technical production of a motion picture or video recording other than as performers, narrators, or presenters.” The proposal was written to extend this same kind of information to sound recordings. The subcommittee members compiled a compelling list of music producers who have had great impact on the production of sound recordings and would be of interest to users as an access point. The proposal is simply to add the phrase “or sound recording” to the rule.

Scharff noted that the MusLA subcommittee recognized that there would be a question of whether this concept should be extensible to other kinds of material; OLAC provided feedback on particular types of video games and computer programs, and perhaps the rare book community might identify people such as engravers or typesetters. The group recognized that it could be extensible, but lacked sufficient knowledge about the various types of materials and when to include these people. The rule as written excludes people from consideration in this area, so you either need to write exclusions for every category of material to which you try to apply it, or devise more principled ways of making clear that this rule doesn't cover the author of your book.

Maxwell suggested generalizing to everything by removing “moving picture” and replacing it with “resource.” He gave the example of fine press books and printers. **Maxwell** read the suggested revision: “An artistic and/or technical credit is a listing of persons, families, or corporate bodies making contributions to the artistic and/or technical production of a resource other than as performers, narrators, or presenters.”

The **Chair** liked the general idea, and asked if book illustrators would be considered as artistic contributors; where is the cut-off point and the exclusion? Does an illustrator belong? **Attig** stated that most of us use information from statements of responsibility, and suggested that the generalized form of the instruction be added to the wiki, and that it should be an instruction, not a definition, because that includes both the positive and negative effects. Then people could comment from the perspective of the format of material they work with as to whether this adequately covers what they want to do.

Myers agreed that generalizing seemed to be a great idea. He understood the Chair's point about illustrators and was reminded of conversations on one of the lists regarding statements of responsibility for graphic novels which can vary quite widely with different roles for the illustrations, the caption, the signatures, etc. He suggested that catalogers from the graphic novel cataloging community be asked for input on this issue.

McGrath said she was not sure this is an instruction that can be written to leave out cataloger's judgment even with the rule as currently written for moving images, which is not a very clear statement. One of the video examples produced by the JSC put the screenwriters in the 508 field, in the artistic and technical credits, whereas common practice in the U.S. is to put screenwriters in the statement of responsibility. Although there are general practices followed in North American libraries, the practice has never been spelled out; it is just based on practice and judgment.

Rolla asked why the exclusion is there, and could the wording be changed to "contributors who are not otherwise mentioned?" **McGrath** said she didn't think that part of the rule was under question. She said the concern was limiting by format, which seemed to be at odds with RDA's supposed goal to make a more principled instruction. **Rolla** agreed, and added that if the rule to eliminate exclusions is re-written to be applicable to any resource, perhaps we could get rid of those lists. **McGrath** disagreed and said that that probably wasn't a good idea. She contrasted the statement of responsibility rules in AACR2 and RDA, and pointed out that AACR2 chapter 7 gave positive suggestions of specific roles, but the parallel instructions in RDA exclude certain types of performers and narrators, and then there was a separate part of the rule that included people who performed those roles. She said it was semantic to include it in the instruction because of the problem in RDA of keeping track of what rules you've looked at and what is affected.

Attig stated that one issue to be considered in extending this rule is whether the list of performers and narrators needs to be updated to cover other kinds of material. Since there is only a month to do this, he suggested getting a general sense of whether we would be willing to submit a proposal that deals only with adding sound recordings, or whether we would submit only if we work out a very general proposal.

Myers sensed that if the group submits the proposal for music and then tries to generalize it as a separate proposal we would be covering the same ground, and suggested that the group take the necessary time to write a clean proposal all at once. **Attig** suggested the group try very hard to finish the proposal by August 1, and then assess at that point whether we have gone far enough or whether to defer submitting a proposal. He would like to hear from various people who feel that they are part of what is being generalized. He would like to add a more diverse set of examples, such as credits for sound recordings and examples from other types of material. He asked people to look on the wiki at what would it mean to generalize the text.

Scharff stated that one source of ambiguity in music is the term "artistic," which some people see as "art," but which in performance is seen in a somewhat different way. He asked in people's deliberations to consider what that word means for the kind of resource they are discussing. **Attig** stated that there were several sets of terms that defined the scope of this: "artistic" is certainly one, and another is "production"—for some kinds of materials, that term defines what we are discussing. He stressed that the term "production" has many different meanings and many contexts. The **Chair** suggested the discussion continue on the wiki and

emphasized that this will be a high priority, because we are discussing extending the work that has been done so far.

1153. Report from the PCC liaison: Glennan

[CC:DA/PCC/2011/1]

Glennan summarized activities of the three Standing Committees from her written report and described the three task groups that have been created to deal with RDA-related issues. For all three task groups, reports are due September 1 and will be reviewed by the PCC Policy Committee; complete information is on the PCC web page. Brief summaries of the charges:

The PCC RDA-Decisions-Needed Task Group is charged to determine if issues need to be added to the list of policy and practice decisions; assign priority for each item; recommend next steps; and identify any phasing needed. **Attig** noted that the document listing all of the issues that need to be decided is on the PCC web site and that it is still appropriate to comment, but the sooner the better. **Glennan**, a member of this task group, confirmed that work hasn't started and encouraged comments. The list is broken down by area and program (general, BIBCO, NACO) and already includes some LC recommendations and preferred decisions from the PCC Operations Committee meeting in May, but the document has expanded.

The PCC Task Group on AACR2 and RDA Acceptable Headings is charged to discern types of headings currently existing within the authority file (LC/NAF) that fall into one of the following three categories: headings constructed under AACR2 and valid under RDA, therefore usable as-is; headings constructed under AACR2, in need of change to be used as valid RDA headings; grey areas, where the need for change is uncertain. The task group will identify specs for writing a report that could be used to collect all the records for each type of heading, and make recommendations relevant to each category.

The PCC Task Group on Hybrid Bibliographic Records is charged to investigate the issue of hybrid records, particularly in regard to performing maintenance on an existing record, changing existing records in areas other than headings (e.g., adding field 336-338), and changes made to a bibliographic record that should trigger a change of Leader/18 (Descriptive cataloging form). The task group will make recommendations for best practices.

1154. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2011/2]

Polutta highlighted items from her written report. The website at alcts.ala.org/ccda is being maintained as a mirror site to the PSU web site. Having the mirror site eases some concerns about having only one person have access to the server; Polutta and the ALCTS office have access and can make changes as needed.

Polutta noted that she hopes to improve the navigation structure. There is an organizational structure under the current site, but it is not very visible, and she hopes to make it clearer to navigate among the various sections. She has created mock-ups of some possibilities; URLs are

in the report. **Polutta** emphasized that the mock-ups simply attempt to explain the basic structure of how it might work and might be easier to navigate, not how the finished product would look. She welcomed feedback and noted that she is new to the committee and does not know exactly how people use these documents and the website. She approached this reorganization with the perspective that committee members might need certain information and new members might need different kinds of information; these are the two underlying approaches.

One of the three mock-ups uses WordPress, open source blog software. **Polutta** noted that although it is used as blog software, it is also viable as content management software. The web site doesn't have to look like a blog; many features associated with a blog can be turned off, and posts can be categorized and tagged. One advantage to WordPress is that the user does not have to know HTML. It is easy to learn, which could be helpful for the next webmaster. **Polutta** is not necessarily recommending this approach, but stating some advantages. **Polutta** also encouraged members to send corrected copies of any reports after the conference for posting. The **Chair** noted that there should be time for more structured feedback on interfaces after revision proposals are completed.

1155. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Linker

Linker introduced two staff: managing editor James Hennelly, a cataloger who has digital product experience with Britannica and participated in the US RDA Test, and Alison Elms, who handles many technical support questions and is the license negotiator. **Linker** mentioned that at the Exhibits booth, there is an RDA quiz with a chance to win an external hard drive.

Linker discussed access to the Toolkit in light of the announcement about the timeline for RDA implementation. The double-user offer has been extended twelve months from when it was set to expire. Current subscribers received the double-user offer when they subscribed and will receive it again when renewing. New subscribers before August 31, 2011 will get double users for the first year and again when they renew. Anyone who subscribes between this August and next will get double users for the first year. A free trial is still available for anyone who's never had one. ALA Publishing also gives access during training sessions and "post-event" access to the Toolkit after training sessions, so that attendees can have access when they go home. There is no plan to change any pricing.

Linker noted that there is a webinar scheduled for July 12. This was meant to be a U.S.-centric webinar, an effort to reach those who couldn't come to the conference, but instead it will focus on specifics of the US RDA Test Committee's recommendations. The US RDA Test Committee had shared some findings early on, and other users had also shared ideas, so ALA Publishing was working on some requests before this report came out, and some of these will be demonstrated in the webinar.

Linker described changes in the Toolkit since Midwinter and plans for additional changes. The full table of contents has been added as a printable PDF; this was a request from users to help visualize the structure. **Linker** noted that in responding to requests, it is important to try to discern whether it is the language of RDA, or the organization of the Toolkit, or the change from

AACR2, or a combination that makes it difficult to engage, but that certainly changes can be made to the Toolkit to help. Another addition is a “back of the book” style index in the Toolkit. Previously if a user searched “gmd,” there would be no result, which is not a good outcome; now a user would get a hit on the index, which helps explain the concept of why you should not search for “gmd” but rather other terms. There is a fix for the problem of searching for “Ph.D” with and without the period. This issue was a surprise because the search engine is supposed to ignore punctuation, but words separated by a period are treated differently in the search engine syntax. The fix is to apply an internal thesaurus: search for column A, and always get results from column B.

Linker commented that the biggest impact on the Toolkit will be the recommendation for a re-write of certain chapters, and that there is still more to learn about what is meant and how the process will happen. The recommendation goes to the Committee of Principals and they will decide how to deal with it; probably they will give this work to the JSC and that process will take at least three months. **Linker** suggested that after talking with members of the committee, perhaps “re-wording” might be more accurate than “re-writing,” as the intention seems to be not to change cataloging practice, just to change the wording and be clear about what is intended. Technically the process will be similar to that used for translations, with the original language in column A, and new language in column B. Work was already in progress on the mechanism as an update cycle was expected eventually and the update and revision history would need to be communicated in the Toolkit. One of the recommendations was for the JSC and the Co-Publishers to communicate better about that, and **Linker** stated that there is progress on that point; Linker is preparing an Editing Guide to share with the JSC.

Linker reported that the MARC linking service has been introduced after a pilot with OCLC and the Connexion client. Users can put certain MARC data in a URL and it will pull back all relevant RDA instructions for that field. The mapping has come from several places, but will be reconciled so that there is standard mapping from RDA instructions to MARC fields, and this will be built for other encodings too. There is a robust metadata structure behind the instructions, and ALA Publishing will try to make this more visible. All of the mappings are coded into the instructions: AACR2 to RDA, RDA to MARC, MARC to RDA. Linker said that ALA Publishing want to take a more open approach and will be posting information on the blog. The MARC service will be available to anyone who wants to use it.

Linker noted that the US RDA Test Committee worked as an interesting focus group for ALA Publishing. One reason for the open access period was to get feedback from users and some was received, but once people actually use the Toolkit for a period of time and create records, a different level of feedback is possible. ALA Publishing wants to address concerns and also wants a mechanism for a feedback loop not only from the community but back to the community. They will be instituting virtual user group meetings, which will take a webinar format but will be different from past webinars. The Toolkit is an international product, so it is important to get feedback from those who don't come to ALA conferences. The agenda will be first ALA Publishing talking about newly launched features, then what they are planning, and finally an open-ended discussion in which users talk about their wish lists and concerns.

Linker described recent developments, including displaying the table of contents so that it is not necessary to hit a plus sign to see the contents of chapters. Other developments in progress: enhanced search capability and different ways to sort results; user preferences, such as extending the time-out period; and the ability to drop a user. A major focus has been adjustments to loading an entire chapter at once. The original approach was derived from a way AACR2 was done electronically, with a “next page” between each section; this was too chunked, too small, and it over-corrected and loaded the entire chapter. Now the process will be somewhere in-between; it will break at logical points, but the page will load faster. **Linker** invited questions.

Hillmann suggested an update about integration with the Registry, and **Linker** reported about a meeting with Diane and Jon Phipps on this topic. They are working on two-way communication between the products to ensure that what’s in the RDA text is also in the Registry. **Linker** said that it is important to be more open about what is planned, but he hesitates to raise expectations before new developments are ready to roll out. **Mangan** asked about the crosswalk between AACR2 and RDA. **Linker** explained that it’s there in a way, in the way ALA Publishing intended to put it in: there are links in advanced search from AACR2 rule number to RDA, and these bring back search results. Also if you navigate an AACR2 rule and click the RDA button, it takes you to the relevant concept.

Schmierer asked about progress on translations. **Linker** replied that the French and Germans are working on translations, and they are just about to arrange for the Spanish. Finland also wants to do a translation. The US RDA Test Committee announcement spurred some interest, and Linker will attend the RDA Satellite meeting at IFLA, where translations are on the agenda, so momentum should build. For the Canadians, the French translation is essential; it will be hard for them to adopt RDA until it is available.

1156. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting and adjournment

There were no announcements from CCS Executive. Regarding RDA Appendix A, the LC proposal did not address CC:DA’s concerns about capitalization in light of the new edition of the *Chicago Manual of Style*, so the earlier approved Task Force will be charged and appointed.

There were no announcements and no new business from the floor. The **Chair** thanked departing members Penny Welbourne and Martha Yee for their service and welcomed new intern Jennifer Miller. The **Chair** announced that the new roster would be announced shortly after the meeting.

The CC:DA portion of the meeting was adjourned at 10:00.

1157. Joint meeting with SAC on the treatment of “subject” in the Functional Requirements models and on subject entities in RDA

Robare welcomed attendees and introduced Daniel Joudrey, SAC chair. She asked members and liaisons to introduce themselves.

Attig shared thoughts about the JSC perspective on subject entities and relationships in RDA: what's missing; why the chapters are empty; what they will and won't contain. [Link to Attig's presentation]

Gordon **Dunsire** presented on "Subjects in the FR Family." Topics included the Functional Requirements and Resource Description Framework; semantics and inferencing; treatment of "subject" in each FR model; and reconciling the models. [Link to Dunsire's presentation]

General discussion: LC Discussion paper on Group 3 entity chapters in RDA
[[6JSC/LC Rep/3: Group 3 entities and "subject"](#)]

Attig introduced the discussion and announced that the next JSC meeting is scheduled for November 2011 in Glasgow. JSC members have deadlines leading up to that meeting; proposals need to be submitted by Aug. 11. The plan today is to discuss this paper jointly and work towards a response from ALA. Both CC:DA and SAC will discuss this paper; each group will draft a response and vote on it, and Attig will write a combined response to submit to the JSC by September 28. Each constituency will respond, and all responses will be posted on the JSC website. Because LC has laid this out as a discussion paper it is unlikely that all of the decisions on how to change or fill in these chapters will be made. There will be some sense of the direction forward, and documents will return to these groups for the next steps.

Attig said that LC laid out the discussion paper with a set of numbered topics on pages 3 and 4. Several topics are a priority to discuss because decisions on them need to be made as soon as possible. **Attig** wanted to start with one topic which has a more immediate deadline and which has some lettered recommendations on pages 2 and 3; the last of which the JSC has been asked to respond to before the end of June, so he needs to know today what this group wants to do. On page 10, LC provided a brief model of what the chapters on related entity-relationships might look like and offered to draft those chapters to be part of the document the JSC will read in November. **Attig's** initial reaction was that this entire paper raises so many issues that he is uncomfortable proceeding to draft chapters before these issues have been discussed. On the other hand, these chapters will be so generic that it is unlikely to introduce problems. Those drafts will probably be available by August 11 so that the group response could include the actions to those drafts. **Attig** will forward a positive response if there is no disagreement with the drafts.

Attig stated that some of the bigger issues are those that affect the structure of RDA. He wanted to discuss number 11 in the list--whether we would like to include Time as an entity.

Maxwell disagreed with treating Time as an entity; he considers it an attribute of relationships. **Paul Weiss** said that one of the reasons we want Time is that people disagree on definitions, for example, the start and end year of centuries. He'd like to have controlled vocabulary for

consistency, so that catalogers don't use "20th century" in some cases and "1900 to 1999" or "1900 to 2000" in other cases.

Myers stated that the ground rules for this discussion are that those controlled lists are managed outside RDA. **Attig** agreed that such lists exist; but the issue is how we slot them into categories provided in RDA. **Mangan** stated that it would be good to add the Time entity after we've reviewed it to determine if it's appropriate or not; and if we don't like it we can decide to exclude it.

Weiss said that the Time entity is a concept that currently exists in Library of Congress Subject Headings among other subjects. He also brought up the issue of Event and Time. **Attig** defined an Event as something that takes place in a particular place at a certain time. **Weiss** stated that an event is more than just time and place. **Attig** said that the discussion is leaping ahead of the models, which is a general issue, the extent to which the JSC will be comfortable doing that. He stressed that we will be able to make a better decision if we at least raise the issue and do some background research on it. He added that we need to consider the implications of our plan to add a new chapter that is not in the outline.

Dunsire suggested that without anticipating what the results of a model consolidation might be, FRSAD strongly hinted that group 3 should be removed. FRSAD said that all of these subject groups are types; they are possibly type attributes of thema. He credited **Attig** with pointing out that Place and Time and possibly Event have a non-subject aspect that would be useful to retain. **Dunsire** added that the typology, the categorization of subjects into group 3, and then just adding in the old ones, is something the review group will need to consider seriously, because there are cultural constraints that should not be in a model. There are different ways to slice and dice especially the role of subjects. FRSAD makes this point clear so this is an area that requires re-examination, and **Attig** is correct in stating that this is a further drift from the model.

Attig stated that one could conceptualize what we are doing as defining the types for an RDA application of the model. **Dunsire** agreed, but cautioned not all applications of RDA; that's where some care needs to be taken that you don't exclude other ways of dividing subjects into groups. He added that if RDA is to be an international standard, and other cultures have different ways of forming subjects than our traditional ways, obviously this slicing covers the whole of the subjects and self-referential ones, but there are other ways to include them.

Attig stated that RDA needs to take a generic approach that will support existing subject systems. We can take the FRSAD very generic approach or we can attempt to define some categories into which we want to divide things. It's sort of a pragmatic approach. The extent to which we want to divide things up and how we want to do it will be an area of continuing discussion.

Joudrey expressed concern that the addition of Time, and keeping the structure with Concept, Object, and Event, in chapters 13, 14, 15, would lock us in and does nothing more than to cement that structure before we know what we want to do. He asked if we were absolutely committed to needing chapters 13, 14, 15, 34, 35, 36, and 37, instead of perhaps only chapters 12 and 33; he

was unsure about whether we should commit so readily to those particular structures and chapters.

Weiss stated that one reason we treat things in different ways is that we might say that there are different attributes for Place than for Event, for example. **Attig** said that the LC paper includes some suggestions of potential elements. **Weiss** referred to the distinction between Class and Type in the RDF model, both of which can be called entities in RDA.

Attig suggested the need for further discussion on how to respond to this issue, as reaching consensus on it seemed doubtful. He added that we are saying that Time is an important component of subject analysis, but there remain some uncertainties about whether any typology should now be added into the RDA rules. We've confirmed and want to say two things: that Time is important and shouldn't be left out, but shouldn't we be more general?

Weiss asked if Attig meant that we have redefined Time but we're not sure how we will treat it. **Adam Schiff** said he did not disagree with that, but stressed the need to consider other things like form and genre, which are also things he'd like to control and bring out. He would like to see RDA deal with this as well.

Weiss added language and intended audience, and noted that there are many other things. **Attig** agreed, and said he included some information about form and genre because it's unclear whether the models now help with these two areas. One can argue that they can be treated as subjects but there are some limitations on what's in the models already on what sort of relationships can be made.

Myers asked if each of the committees would be expected to approach these issues separately and address them in their own communication vehicles to be resolved by Attig or will it be a joint communication vehicle.

Attig said that the people involved will need to decide how to proceed. He added that the groups will probably prefer at least initially to consider this separately. We will have two sets of comments that will need to be merged into one response. We need to allow enough time so that both groups can see both sets of comments before they vote and make a decision. If we need to have a discussion with each other, we will do that. Internal deadlines will be set for the CC:DA discussion. Since the SAC Subcommittee does not have the deadlines that CC:DA has in the next month or so, it would be helpful if they could finish their comments by the time CC:DA is ready to discuss it. This will help us learn what it will take to form a joint response.

Weiss suggested that the other big topic for discussion is whether or not to treat Conferences as Events (a concept he fully supports). **Attig** suggested that the issue be opened for discussion and added that it's not exclusively a descriptive cataloging issue but that's where the rules are now. **Schiff** said that the question it raises is can an Event be a creator, and can any other type of subject be a creator? **Maxwell** said that Event cannot be a creator, and added that it is in Group 3 which cannot be a creator. He thinks that the conference is the creator. **Myers** pointed out that we've now allowed fictional characters to be creators. **Hillman** thinks we should rethink the

long-time concept of the conference as creator, particularly now since we have many relationships to use to describe the relationship between conference and conference proceedings. She said that we should name that instead of doing what we have always done.

Weiss thanked Tillett for her work on the discussion paper. The **Chair** thanked the presenters and reminded attendees that the document is on the [CC:DA](#) wiki, and it is structured to allow people to comment on different parts. **Attig** stated that there will be sections for each of the numbered issues, which will help to structure the subcommittee work. **Weiss** commented that for RDA development, there were ways for people not on CC:DA (or SAC) to comment, so another space should be provided for that.

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 12:01 p.m.

Approved [as corrected] [date]

Respectfully submitted,
Gayle Porter, Intern