

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services  
(A division of the American Library Association)  
Cataloging and Metadata Management Section  
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**MINUTES**

**Minutes of the meeting held at the  
2015 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Chicago, Illinois  
January 31 and February 2, 2015**

**Members present:**

Robert Rendall, Chair  
Dominique Bourassa  
Mary Anne Dyer  
Elyssa Gould  
Steve Kelley  
Sandra Macke  
Gayle Porter  
Tina Shrader  
Larisa Walsh [Monday only]

Richard Guajardo, CC:DA Webmaster  
Arthur Liu, Intern  
Laurie Neuerburg, Intern

**Ex-officio representatives present:**

Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee  
Dave Reser, Library of Congress  
Jay Weitz, OCLC

**ALA Liaisons present:**

Tassanee Chitcharoen, ALA/GODORT  
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM  
Matthew Haugen, ALA/ACRL/RBMS  
Jessica Hayden, ALA/ALCTS/MIG [Saturday only]  
Yoko Kudo, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM  
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee  
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MAC  
Adolfo Tarango, ALCTS/CRS  
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA  
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT [Saturday only]

**Non-ALA Liaisons:**

Robert Bratton, AALL  
Thomas Duszak, CLA [Saturday only]

Allison Hausladen, ARLIS/NA  
 Diane Hillmann, DCMI  
 Judy Knop, ATLA [Saturday only]  
 Dorothy McGarry, SLA  
 Kelley McGrath, OLAC  
 John Myers, MAC  
 Cory Nimer, SAA  
 Lori Robare, PCC  
 Tracey Snyder, MusLA  
 Amanda K. Sprochi, MedLA  
 Jay Weitz, IFLA

**Notes:**

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have been rearranged in order to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the process of transcription is laborious. Only in some cases are exact quotes included.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of the actual voting members rather than of representatives/liaisons of particular agencies or groups. 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/liaisons 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 nonvoting 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., 2005 revision

**AALL** = American Association of Law Libraries

**AASL** = American Association of School Librarians

**ABA** = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate

**ACRL** = Association of College and Research Libraries

**ALA** = American Library Association

**ALCTS** = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

**ARLIS/NA** = Art Libraries Society of North America

**ARSC** = Association for Recorded Sound Collections

**ATLA** = American Theological Libraries Association

**CaMMS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

**CC:AAM** = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials  
**CC:CCM** = ALCTS/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee  
**CC:DA** = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access  
**CDS** = LC Cataloging Distribution Service  
**CETM** = ALCTS/CaMMS/Continuing Education Training Materials Committee  
**CETRC** = ALCTS/CaMMS/Education, Training, and Recruitment for Cataloging Committee  
**CIP** = Cataloging in Publication  
**CLA** = Catholic Library Association  
**CoP** = Committee of Principals for RDA  
**DC** = Dublin Core  
**DCMI** = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative  
**FRAD** = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Authority Data*  
**FRBR** = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*  
**FRSAD** = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data*  
**GODORT** = ALA/Government Documents Round Table  
**HTML** = Hypertext Mark-up Language  
**ICP** = IFLA's International Cataloging Principles  
**IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions  
**ILS** = Integrated library system  
**ISBD** = *International Standard Bibliographic Description*  
**ISO** = International Organization for Standardization  
**JSC** = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA  
**LC** = Library of Congress  
**LITA** = Library & Information Technology Association  
**MAC** = MARC Advisory Committee  
**MAGERT** = Map and Geography Round Table  
**MARC** = Machine-Readable Cataloging  
**MedLA** = Medical Library Association  
**MIG** = ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group  
**MusLA** = Music Library Association  
**NAL** = National Agricultural Library  
**NASIG** = North American Serials Interest Group  
**NISO** = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)  
**NLM** = National Library of Medicine  
**NRMIG** = Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group  
**OLAC** = Online Audiovisual Catalogers  
**PARS** = ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section  
**PCC** = Program for Cooperative Cataloging  
**PLA** = Public Library Association  
**RBMS** = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section  
**RDA** = *Resource Description and Access*  
**RUSA** = Reference and User Services Association  
**SAC** = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee  
**SKOS** = Simple Knowledge Organization System

**SLA** = Special Libraries Association

**XML** = Extensible Markup Language

**WEMI** = Work/expression/manifestation/item, the FRBR group 1 entities

*Saturday, January 31, 1:00–5:30 p.m.*

*Hilton Chicago, International South*

**1293. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair**

Robert Rendall, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:04 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members.

The **Chair** invited committee members, liaisons, and representatives to initial the roster sheet and make corrections, if necessary. The **Chair** also invited audience members to sign a separate attendance sheet.

**1294. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Chair** [[CC:DA/Roster/2015](#)]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

The **Chair** thanked members of the audience for their interest in CC:DA's work and encouraged them to participate in the committee's discussions.

The **Chair** also formally welcomed members and liaisons who were attending a CC:DA meeting for the first time, and introduced new liaison **Jessica Hayden** from the Metadata Interest Group.

Eight of the nine voting members were present at the meeting. Committee member **Larisa Walsh** was unable to attend until Monday due to travel issues.

**1295. Adoption of agenda: Chair** [[CC:DA/A/71](#)]

The **Chair** asked for comments, changes, or additions to the agenda. There were no objections. The agenda was adopted as posted.

**1296. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2014 ALA Annual Conference, June 28 and 30, 2014: Chair** [[CC:DA/M/1270-1292](#)]

The **Chair** thanked members for comments contributed to the minutes for the last meeting. All comments that were received by December, 2014 were incorporated into the final document. The **Chair** asked for comments, changes, or additions to the minutes. There were no objections. The minutes were adopted as posted.

**1297. Report from the Chair** [[CC:DA/Chair/2014-2015/2](#)]

It was necessary to confirm and record all the votes that had taken place by e-mail since the last meeting. All the votes were listed in the Chair's report, which was posted online.

The **Chair** explained the highlights from this report:

- In July 2014, CC:DA voted to approve three proposals. These were: the proposal on clarifying instructions regarding sequences of plates (RDA 3.4.5.9); the proposal on recording duration (7.22) and note on carrier (3.21); and the ill-fated proposal on using nominative case for titles (6.2). All three passed 8–0.
- In August and September 2014, CC:DA voted to authorize ALA responses on 34 proposals and discussion papers from other constituencies. These were grouped into six motions. All motions passed 8–0 or 7–0.
- In December 2014, after discussion of the RDA Governance Review document issued by the Committee of Principals, CC:DA voted 8–0 to approve the ALA comments on that document.
- CC:DA agreed to allow the Bavarian State Library to archive the CC:DA website permanently. The **Chair** will correspond with the ALCTS office to ensure that permission is formally granted to the Bavarian State Library.

The **Chair** invited a motion to confirm and record the votes listed in the Chair's report. **Kelley** moved to approve the motion, and **Bourassa** seconded. None were opposed. The motion was approved 7–0.

**1298. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Reser** [[Library of Congress Report, ALA 2015 Midwinter Conference](#)]

**Reser** discussed selected initiatives undertaken at LC since the ALA 2014 Annual Meeting in Las Vegas, as outlined in his report posted on the CC:DA website. These were a subset of a much longer document available at the "LC at ALA" Website (<http://www.loc.gov/ala/>). **Reser** invited anyone with questions to visit the LC booth (no. 2014) at the Midwinter Exhibit hall.

**Reser** focused on the following topics:

- **Personnel changes in Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate (ABA).** Two more section heads retired, but the personnel situation has turned a corner. Two other section head positions were filled, as were two division chiefs. Notably, there was no net increase in ABA staff. Catalogers were selected from within LC to fill these open managerial positions, resulting in fewer remaining catalogers. There are currently six postings up for replacing additional unfilled section heads.
- **Significant Library-wide personnel changes.** David Mao, Law Librarian of Congress, was appointed Deputy Librarian of Congress. Robert Newlen, Assistant Law Librarian for Legislative and External Relations, was appointed Chief of Staff. Mark Sweeney is serving as acting Associate Librarian for Congress following the retirement of Roberta I. Shaffer.

- **Federal budget.** The situation is fairly good. Congress passed a budget for fiscal year 2015 which granted LC a slight increase over last year. However, the new budget is still \$50 million less than it was five years ago.
- **Cataloger's Desktop.** A new release brought significant changes to the system. **Reser** invited users to direct feedback to Bruce Johnson at LC ([bjoh@loc.gov](mailto:bjoh@loc.gov)). Comments regarding changes and additions to the ALA-LC Romanization Tables may also be directed to Bruce Johnson.
- **RDA Toolkit and LC-PCC Policy Statements.** The October 2014 release of the *RDA Toolkit* was a fairly small release, but it was the first since the *Toolkit* was migrated to a new content management system. The next set of LC-PCC Policy Statements is expected in February 2015, after Midwinter. No significant changes in the policies themselves are planned. Rather, an effort will be made to record policies that have up to now been included only in documentation for the BIBCO Standard Record (particularly for non-book and rare materials) and the CONSER Standard Record. These will be big changes to the policy statements, but should not affect most catalogers.
- **LChelp4RDA email account retired.** The [LChelp4RDA@loc.gov](mailto:LChelp4RDA@loc.gov) email account has been retired. The number of valid questions to that account had dwindled. Cataloging-related questions can be directed to the [policy@loc.gov](mailto:policy@loc.gov) account instead.
- **Mini-reorganization in Library Services.** The Network Development and MARC Standards Office (NDMSO) will be transferred from the Technology Policy Directorate to ABA effective the week of February 2, 2015. Sally McCallum will remain chief of NDMSO. Two new developers have been hired from outside LC to work on BIBFRAME.

**Reser** invited questions about the report; none were posed.

#### 1299. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Glennan [[CC:DA/JSC Rep/KPG/2015/2](#)]

**Glennan** presented a walkthrough of her report on the November 3–7, 2014 JSC Meeting and on other JSC activities July–December, 2014, as posted on the CC:DA blog. Highlights began with a summary of major topics at the meeting, followed by a rundown of ALA proposals and discussion papers. A few other tangential issues were discussed in addition to those in the report. The discussion finished with a summary of the action items for CC:DA resulting from the JSC meeting.

The major topics at the JSC meeting were the following:

- **JSC Chair.** Gordon Dunsire graciously agreed to serve another two years as JSC Chair.
- **Next JSC Meeting.** The JSC is tentatively planning to meet in the first week of November 2015. Therefore, any proposals or discussion papers from CC:DA will have to be finalized by the end of July 2015, and any ALA responses to proposals and discussion papers from other constituencies will have to be finished by the last week of September 2015.

- **JSC Governance discussion.** The Committee of Principals (CoP) is looking to broaden participation of communities whose adoption of RDA is desired: the cultural heritage community, the linked data community, and international communities. The CoP will meet in the spring to discuss comments received on this topic (including those from CC:DA) and a clearer picture was expected by ALA Annual 2015. **Glennan** expects that the JSC will not continue to be constituted the way it is; it will be broadened in scope, but not in members. Representation may or may not include the ALA specifically. Still, the expertise of ALA members will be incorporated in some way.
- **ALA Publishing.** In lieu of discussing this topic, **Glennan** advised that questions about this topic should be directed to **Jamie Hennelly**, who would be presenting at the Monday CC:DA session.
- **Examples Editor.** The JSC has shifted from having an Examples Working Group to an Examples Editor (Kate James). The Editor has specific ideas for improving examples in RDA, including: updating the downloadable PDF files of complete examples; revising examples for clarity; and increasing the representation of different language groups, genders, etc. The Editor reminds users that the examples do not necessarily reflect actual practice by American libraries. For instance, some of the names used may not match their forms in the LCNAF. Questions or comments about RDA examples may be sent directly to Kate James, though **Glennan** is also happy to serve as a go-between.
- **RDA Toolkit structure and content.** Issues big and small were discussed, including:
  - **Duplication.** There is some duplication of content between scope statements and the Glossary.
  - **Paywall.** Portions of the *RDA Toolkit* are behind a paywall. There is a general expectation among potential users from outside the traditional cataloging arena that such metadata standards should be free. This raises the question of which portions should be behind a paywall and which should be freely available.
  - **Numbering.** There are challenges with maintaining the sequential numbering structure as RDA continues to evolve. New numbers can be inserted easily, but when sections are deleted, it raises the question whether old numbers should be reused.
  - **Element set.** The current element set used in the *Toolkit* is out of date.
  - **Accessibility of translations.** The translated RDA versions are not currently integrated into the *Toolkit*.
  - **Organizational structure.** There is interest in exploring alternate ways of displaying the *Toolkit* to reflect RDA's underlying models better.
  - **FR consolidation.** There are potential significant changes coming in light of the ongoing FR consolidation effort.
- **JSC pragmatic approach.** **Glennan** provided an advance preview of a statement the JSC would be posting on Sunday, February 1 regarding its pragmatic approach in this time of change. A number of factors impacting RDA structure and content are considered in this statement, including: the Committee of Principals review of JSC governance and its encouragement of participation by cultural heritage, linked data, and international communities; the anticipated FR consolidation; the future strategy

of ISBD and pending review of the ISBD consolidated edition; and changes to the *RDA Toolkit* structure relating to a new content management system, the RDA Registry, and non-MARC carriers of RDA data. The JSC working principle during this time will be that extensive changes to RDA with high risk impact factors will not be implemented. Proposals may be accepted in principle, but suspended pending review. Proposals unlikely to be impacted by external factors—which **Glennan** understood to include most FRBR Group 1 entities—will continue to be implemented. The JSC is unwilling to spend resources on changing RDA structure and content where it is likely that those changes will be overwritten in the next year or two. For instance, extensive renumbering of instructions will be avoided for the time being. The JSC advised groups developing proposals—such as CC:DA—to take this working principle into account when prioritizing tasks. This should not hamstring CC:DA in its choice of issues to tackle. Rather, CC:DA should carefully plan the timing of its efforts. As guidance, the JSC anticipates a greater focus on relationships between entities rather than attributes of entities. For instance, it is possible to recast the FRBR manifestation attribute *Publication Statement* as a set of relationships between places; persons, families, and corporate bodies; and Group 1 entities.

The JSC responses to ALA proposals and discussion papers were as follows:

- **6JSC/ALA/27 and 6JSC/ALA28.** These two proposals were accepted as submitted.
- **6JSC/ALA/29.** **Glennan** suggested retiring or reassigning the term *cascading vortex of horror*. It was not solved exactly the way CC:DA had recommended, but the end result was the same. The JSC removed the conditional core status of the Distribution Statement and its sub-elements, the Manufacture Statement and its sub-elements, and Copyright Date.
- **6JSC/ALA/30.** CC:DA had sought to add specific instructions to RDA 6.2 about using the mark of omission when recording preferred titles of works. The JSC disagreed with this approach, but instead decided that Chapter 2 should be expanded and that Chapter 6 should, in turn, refer to 2.3.1.4–2.3.1.6.
- **6JSC/ALA/31.** RDA Chapter 23 will be populated with intentionally broad content regarding the subject relationship element. The JSC is not in a position to tell catalogers how to do their subject analysis. The RDA instructions will refer to vocabularies external to RDA and allow those vocabularies to define detailed instructions, structures, etc. There will be an Appendix M for relationship designators. This will draw in part from relevant descriptive relationship designators that will be moved from Appendix J, as a result of a proposal from the JSC Technical Working Group. The definition of the subject relationship in and of itself is still evolving, but is approaching finalized wording. One notable wording change was a shift from the term *authorized subject system* to *identifiable subject system*. The JSC has revised the definition of *unstructured description* to add “etc.” so that it can now encompass keywords, which is very important from ALA’s perspective.
- **6JSC/ALA/32.** This proposal regarded expanding the scope of *Statement of Responsibility* in RDA 2.4 and removing special instructions in Chapter 7 that seemed to be similar but restricted to particular kinds of resources. CC:DA raised questions whether the instructions related to statements of responsibility versus content. The

- JSC generally accepted CC:DA's proposal and particular changes were being made to Chapter 2. The text of RDA 7.23 and 7.24 will be replaced with references to Chapter 2, so that the rest of Chapter 7 will not need to be renumbered at this time. The changes should not impact existing cataloging practice, although explicit guidance documents may need to be updated.
- **6JSC/ALA/33.** This proposal regarded clarifying instructions for sequences of plates. The JSC supported CC:DA's proposal in principle, but with some significant changes in wording. The footnote in RDA 3.4.5.2 will be incorporated directly into the instruction itself. The new text for *Leaves or Pages of Plates* in 3.4.5.9 will specifically: address plates that are lettered inclusively; plates that are numbered in words; how to record unnumbered leaves or pages of plates. Finally, the JSC approved a modification to the Glossary entry for *plate*.
  - **6JSC/ALA/34.** CC:DA suggested there were no significant differences between RDA 6.24 (*Date of Expression of a Religious Work*) and RDA 6.10 (*Date of Expression*) and sought to remove RDA 6.24. JSC thought this would be too extreme, but agreed to remove 6.24.1.4 for *The Bible and Parts of the Bible*. RDA 6.24.1 will be retained as a placeholder for future exceptional practices for other religious works. More significantly, RDA 6.30.3.2 (*Authorized Access Point Representing an Expression of the Bible*) was adjusted to remove wording relating to multiple language expressions. The outcome of applying this instruction isn't changing; it just needs to be considered for each expression being described.
  - **6JSC/ALA/35.** This proposal suggested new instructions for using nominative case for titles. CC:DA lost its case, for both its original suggestion and an alternative approach. The JSC noted CC:DA's concerns, but felt that it was not appropriate to incorporate these concerns into RDA at this time. JSC thought this was mainly a training and language issue rather than an instruction issue.
  - **6JSC/ALA/36.** This proposal regarded clarifying instructions for 7.22 (*Duration*) and 3.21 (*Note on Carrier*). The proposed changes to RDA 3.21 will not be made. The intention was to bring together instructions about duration and not have some instructions in separate sections based on the type of carrier. JSC did agree to revise 7.22 to replace the distinction between *Playing Time*, *Running Time*, and *Performance Time* with a single instruction about duration. Also, a new sub-instruction on *Details of Duration* will not distinguish between format types.
  - **6JSC/ALA/Discussion/4.** CC:DA had submitted a discussion paper about recording versus transcribing *Production Statements* for unpublished resources. The JSC sympathized, but felt the distinction between published and unpublished resources was misplaced. Rather, the JSC preferred a distinction between self-identifying and non-self-identifying resources. The JSC requested that CC:DA examine this distinction and produce another discussion paper.

**Glennan** invited questions and comments.

- **Tarango** raised a question regarding the reasoning behind the JSC deferring action on **6JSC/BL/21** regarding fictitious families and corporate bodies.
- **Glennan** responded that this was impacted by the anticipated FR consolidation model. Looking at the evolution of the existing models, FRSAD represents the most

- recent thinking and is also the most difficult to integrate into the other two models. In particular, JSC expects the FRSAD entities *thema* and *nomen* to be applied to the other models as part of FR consolidation. The issue of fictitious agents (corporate bodies, persons, and families) will not go away, but it may be premature to work on this issue until the FR consolidation effort is better understood.
- JSC Chair **Gordon Dunsire**, attending as an observer, commented that in FRAD, the *person* entity was broadened to include non-human entities. The concentration was on authority headings rather than on the entities those headings represent. It was anticipated that with FR consolidation, this expansion would be reversed and there would be a return to the *person* entity representing real-world persons. Instead, the concept of labels may be used to encompass fictitious entities. Relationships would be set up to link fictitious labels to real-world entity.
  - **Tarango** asked whether the label concept would also apply to non-human, real-world entities such as elephants or other animals associated with painting or music.
  - **Sprochi** (from the Task Force on Pseudonymous Corporate Bodies) commented that there seemed to be a concentration on establishing names for creators. However, most of the names established were performers rather than creators (e.g. Flipper or Rin Tin Tin).
  - **Dunsire** replied to mention two concepts brought up in discussion among the FR consolidation group. This first was the idea that a creator must possess intent. This was related to whether a natural thing could be a work if it had no creator. The second idea was that some “entities” (e.g. Flipper or Rin Tin Tin) in reality were not single entities but rather multiple animals filling a role. Many complications arise regarding animals, including the concept of intent on the part of animals and the role of human intervention in their names and roles.
  - **Maxwell** commented that authority work and bibliographic description frequently cover human entities who are not creators, so the question of creatorship or intent may be irrelevant. Also, while some animal names (e.g. Flipper) referred to multiple actual animals, this is not the case for all named animals (e.g. Keiko the whale was a single whale).

**Glennan** concluded by summarizing the follow-up actions listed in her report, which identify work for CC:DA arising from the JSC meeting.

1. **Develop proposal to add the “reference to published citation” element** at each WEMI level. This action was referred to RBMS, who will be discussing it later in the CC:DA meeting.
2. **Review the use of “transcribe” and “record” in Chapter 2.** This was an observation we made in our discussion paper: there was less precise use of the terms “transcribe” and “record” depending on how you get there and whether you follow all of the references. The JSC responded with interest, and invited **Glennan** to analyze this issue—not just in Chapter 2 but in all of RDA—and produce a report to recommend how to move forward. **Glennan** invited CC:DA members and anyone in the audience to participate in this effort. It is not possible to obtain an automated report from the RDA content management system of all uses of these terms in Chapter 2, so any analysis would likely require some manual work. To be clear, JSC

- is looking for a recommendation on how to move forward and the scope of the problem as opposed to a formal proposal with specific corrections.
3. **Prepare a proposal to rework the instructions for unpublished resources.** This refers to **6JSC/ALA/Discussion/4**. Instead of the dichotomy between published and unpublished, we would like to have something explaining the difference between self-describing and non-self-describing. Notably, the British Library is also working on this issue. We want to make sure our proposal is not at cross purposes with the British Library.
    - An audience member asked the scope of the proposal. **Glennan** responded that our discussion paper explicitly addressed the production element in Chapter 2. However, we will likely include language to ask JSC to consider the broader implications of our proposal.
  4. **Upcoming JSC Working Groups.** The JSC is planning on appointing several new groups: a Working Group on Aggregates, a Working Group on Relationship Designators, and a Working Group on Fictitious Entities. These have not yet been finalized. **Glennan** will be asked, as the ALA representative, to make recommendations for these groups. **Glennan** invited any CC:DA members and members of the audience to notify her if interested in participating in these groups.

### 1300. Proposal from the TF on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Lapka/Hillmann

**Strawman Proposal (January, 2015)** [[CC:DA/TF/Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3/5](#)]

Not having received much feedback via the CC:DA blog on this proposal, Task Force co-chair **Lapka** decided to use the meeting time to elicit the committee's feedback on specific questions the Task Force members had. He reminded the committee that this proposal is far from a finished work, and potential problems big and small require the committee's attention.

- **High-level measurements element.** This may not be attached to any particular WEMI entity. The purpose is to reduce redundancy and to standardize or organize the way that measurements are dealt with in RDA. The Task Force recognizes that this proposal would result in significant structural changes in RDA, and therefore would not be implemented this year per JSC's pragmatic approach in light of FR consolidation. **Lapka** proceeded to pose the Task Force's questions regarding this proposal to CC:DA.
  - **Question 1: Does CC:DA think this element would be useful?**
    - The **Chair** asked if the alternative to such a measurements element would be a great deal of repetition.
    - **Lapka** confirmed this to be the case. The idea is to have a higher level element with subelements Aspect, Unit, and Quantity which would be applicable to different varieties of measurements. The alternative

would be to define those subelements separately within each variety. This would require more upkeep.

- **Tarango** commented that the proposal makes sense at an intellectual level. The concern is how to explain to catalogers (or machines) to which WEMI level the measurements data pertain. Having a measurements element that transcends WEMI levels may invite confusion. **Lapka** replied that the proposal would not do away with existing WEMI-specific elements.
  - **Myers** expressed support for the proposal. At present we are conflating different types of information. For instance, we record Extent of the Carrier as “1 video cassette” and Extent of the Content as the running time. The proposed measurements element may help us think more clearly about the distinctions between these bits of information. The question is, would the proposed higher element go in RDA Chapter 1, or some other section? **Lapka** explained that the precise details are still unknown and will require working with the JSC Technical Working Group.
- **Question 2: Can we provide instructions for measurements at a higher level?** Many existing instructions in different RDA chapters are quite repetitive. For instance, for most varieties of measurements there exists the concept of approximate measurements. Is there a preference for instructions at higher or lower levels?
- **Glennan** remarked that this has wide ramifications. How linearly is RDA used? At what point does clicking on links and jumping back and forth become an impediment to user-friendliness? The JSC will have to wrestle with this fundamental issue. **Glennan** expressed a personal preference for repetition, but acknowledged that this is open to debate. **Lapka** replied that perhaps it is those common-sense elements that only need to be read once and are easily remembered that make better candidates for linking to a higher level.
  - **Myers** understands the frustration with hunting through chains of links, especially when developing training programs to teach RDA. However, once the initial learning curve is overcome, the linking to higher levels helps illuminate the overall structure of RDA.
  - **Maxwell** remarked that instructions at the highest level could be greatly simplified. Yet some concepts, such as approximate measurements, may require more detailed instructions to remain at the lower levels.
  - **Hausladen** expressed support for instructions at higher levels.
  - **Reser** asked whether the high-level measurements element would be applicable to a specific, closed list of lower-level elements, and whether there would be a controlled vocabulary for measurement terms. **Lapka** confirmed that this would be the case.
  - **Lapka** concluded that there seems to be a general degree of support for higher level instructions.

- **Extent of the Carrier element.**

- **Question 3: Is there an argument for keeping instructions for storage space (3.4.1.11.2) in Extent of the Carrier, instead of under Dimensions?**

This question is fairly targeted toward the cataloging of archival materials.

The TF believes that information currently being described as storage space is unlike anything else included in Extent of the Carrier. Rather, it is more like the information included under Dimensions. The TF acknowledges that DACS does include storage space information in its extent element.

- **Tarango** attempted to clarify the distinction between extent and dimensions. They are both quantities with units. Are dimensions a quantity related to the carrier or container of information, while extent a quantity given in terms of the information itself?
- Another commenter offered that both extent and dimension information are intended to give the user an idea of the resource. Extent may be related to the quantity of information, while dimensions describe how big it is physically.
- **Hillmann** noted that, in order to be machine-manipulable, descriptive data must consist of a quantity and a unit term that draws from a vocabulary. Strings alone are not sufficient.
- **Myers** noted that the usefulness of the data is not due to whether it is extent or dimensions, but rather how well-defined the unit is. A page count or runtime (in minutes) is easily understood. Archival boxes may vary significantly in size.
- **Hillmann** advised that users include both researchers and librarians/archivists. While relying on text strings to describe extent may serve one group, it is limiting. The idea is not to preclude different ways of recording extent and dimension information.
- **Glennan** observed that this is a modeling question. The situation under discussion seems to center on containers (e.g. boxes) used to contain a variety of unlike things. The question isn't whether to record information, but where to record it. **Glennan** is not opposed to moving storage space to Dimensions, if it seems that is the best place for it.
- **Kelley** agreed that storage space makes sense under Dimensions.
- Other commenters raised the question that if storage space is moved to Dimensions, what does that leave archivists to record under Extent? It is possible that Extent under RDA may be one type of element that is simply not relevant to archival materials. In practice, some information recorded in Extent (e.g. linear feet) serve as a stand-in for more precise extent information. **Lapka** acknowledged that additional dialogue with the archives community is needed, but emphasized that the idea is not to preclude archivists from recording any information they deem important.

- **Extent of the Content element.**

- **Question 5: Which of the 7 options should be used to develop a unit vocabulary for Extent of the Content?** For sake of time, the discussion moved ahead to Question 5. Discussion within the TF revealed a wide range of opinions, and these are reflected in the 7 options generated. The options include using existing vocabularies, such as those based on content type or those already established (e.g. for notated music or graphic materials); developing new vocabularies, which may or may not be tied to the RDA-ONIX Framework (ROF).
  - An audience member suggested that for some formats, a closed vocabulary could work. For others, such as 3-dimensional objects, it would be difficult to anticipate all the types of materials that might be cataloged. Could different options be selected by format?
  - **Hillmann** responded that RDA users are not limited to the vocabularies within RDA. There is an expectation that users, especially from specialist communities, will develop their own vocabularies for use with RDA.
  - **Myers** observed that this implies the need to incorporate Option 7 (“allow liberal use of terms from vocabularies external to RDA”) with some other option. He expressed a personal inclination in favor of Option 3 (basing the unit terms on content type as defined in ROF).
  - **Glennan** commented that RDA currently has a general approach of including a list of controlled terms and supplementing that list with an instruction to use external terms if none of the controlled terms is appropriate. There are advantages of following this pattern. It mixes control with flexibility.
  - **Sprochi** offered that a controlled vocabulary is important for machine-actionable use. Still, flexibility is also necessary. The bibliographic universe will always include concepts that lie outside the terms predicted in even the best designed controlled lists.
  - **Myers** commented that when employing a term from a list external to RDA, it is important to specify the source of the term.
  - **Lapka** noted a general consensus for a combination of a closed vocabulary based on ROF (Option 3) with allowance for external vocabularies (Option 7).
  
- **Extent of the Carrier element.**
  - **Question 4: Does CC:DA agree that Extent (of the Carrier) subunits should not be used to record the extent of reproduced manifestations? Would there be unanticipated problems?** There is a great deal of detail and complexity in the current instructions regarding varieties of subunits under Extent of the Carrier. Upon closer examination, it appears many of these subunits are actually describing Content, not Carrier. This is especially notable in the context of reproductions such as microfilm or digitized materials. Would there be any unanticipated problems with simplifying these instructions in this manner?

- **Maxwell** asked whether these instructions would be moved to a different section or simply be deleted. The information recorded relating to the extent of reproduced manifestations is useful. This is especially true in light of the fact that a reproduction may not contain the entirety of the original manifestation.
- **Myers** agreed with the proposal on a conceptual level, but expressed concern regarding the transfer of or reliance on data from related manifestations. Typically, the record for the manifestation being cataloged may only contain a reference to the related manifestation without detailed extent data about it.
- **Glennan** remarked that the FRBR user tasks could be cited as justification for retaining data about reproduced manifestations. For instance, the number pages of an original manifestation remains a useful piece of information to help users identify a facsimile. While emerging standards like BIBFRAME may feature other ways to pull information from related manifestations, most of us are still using MARC. As we transition, it is important to consider how we retain this useful information.
- **Snyder** commented that the pagination of a microfilm resource is a description of the extent of the carrier, rather than subunits of content. **Lapka** replied that subunits could refer to carrier or content. With regard to microfilm specifically, the subunits would be frames of microfilm, not pages. Still, the concern is valid that the subunits of the original manifestation (i.e. pages) constitute useful information.
- **Tarango** commented that useful information about reproduced manifestations must be displayed to the user one way or another. Relying on references to the original is problematic. The original may not be faithfully reproduced, and it may also involve different units or subunits of extent, so the reproduction may need to be described independently. The ratio of microfilm frames to pages of paper will vary by reproduction.
- **Lapka** explained that the TF is not suggesting that useful information not be presented to the user. The proposal is about finding the right place to record each piece of information while remaining agnostic about presentation style. This will require machine action to pull together the information in a useful way.
- **Myers** observed that Questions 3 and 4 are tightly bound. Both deal with alternative manners of expressing extent information. The discussion has emphasized the importance of data about related manifestations.
- **Glennan** commented that this topic is related to the work of the TF on Recording Relationships. Perhaps the focus should be on describing the original accurately and then linking that information to the related manifestation.
- **Shrader** pointed out that reproductions may not faithfully reproduce an original in whole.

- **Myers** pointed out that a resource with commonly conflated content and carrier extent units (e.g. online resources) may in fact be an original and not a reproduction.

The **Chair** thanked the TF for its work and encouraged CC:DA members to review the other questions in the TF's report and provide additional feedback. **Lapka** thanked the committee for its feedback.

### **1301. Discussion papers from the TF to Investigate the Instructions for Recording Relationships in RDA: Putnam**

The TF submitted two discussion papers for Midwinter, both primarily focused on RDA Chapter 27. The first paper deals with recording relationships of manifestations and the second deals with accompanying materials. The TF chose Chapter 27 as a starting point because much of the focus of current bibliographic description is on the manifestation level.

#### **a. Instructions for Recording Structured Descriptions of Related Manifestations** [[CC:DA/TF/Instructions for Recording Relationships/6](#)]

**Putnam** invited comments on the numbered recommendations and discussion points listed in the paper.

- 1) **Prescribing the order of elements.** The TF recommends not prescribing an order.
  - **Snyder** inquired about the TF's reasoning behind the recommendation.
  - **Putnam** explained that since RDA is not prescribing any display mechanisms, it is inappropriate to prescribe the order of elements.
- 2) **Preference for relationship designator "contains" instead of "contained in."**
  - **Glennan** explained that this is a known problem with having relationship designators follow a particular grammatical structure. This is a display issue and is linked to machine manipulability. There is interest in generating a registered vocabulary of relationship designators. This would enable the display of different language phrases to different users.
- 3) **Separate "notes" each preceded by a relationship designator versus a single "note" with a relationship designator.** The TF recommends allowing both options.
  - **Glennan** agreed with the recommendation to allow both options, but pointed out that the CC:DA's proposal must specify to which two examples it is referring.
- 4) **Recording contents as work or expression relationships.**
  - No comments.
- 5) **Clarifying usage of the term "part" when it may refer to clearly separate works, separate works that may not be described as such, and non-work parts.** The TF recommends a Glossary definition.

- **Polutta** commented that there is a need to clarify the difference, if any, between *part* and *component part*. RDA 6.27.2 only uses *part*, but some of the CC:DA blog comments on this proposal use *component part*. Usage of *part* here may also not match its definition in the Glossary. It is important to use consistent terminology.
  - **Glennan** acknowledged that there is a problem with *part* in the Glossary. It contains two distinct definitions for a single term. The JSC disfavors this approach. The JSC may welcome a solution of separating these concepts.
  - The **Chair** asked whether the TF had a proposed solution at this time. **Putnam** replied that it has been under discussion, but no solution was ready yet.
  - **Polutta** replied that the TF did not have specific definitions to offer as of yet, but it was considering creating an expansive definition of *component part* and then applying it to appropriate sections throughout RDA. The TF was interested in feedback from CC:DA as to whether this is worth pursuing.
  - The **Chair**, hearing no objections, offered encouragement to the TF to move forward.
- 6) **The conditionality of recording a title proper with a structured contents note.** The TF argues that a lack of title proper would imply an unstructured description.
- No comments.
- 7) **The conditionality of recording statements of responsibility of parts by different authors.** The TF recommends that the basic instruction be always to record the statements of responsibility, with an alternative to omit when all the parts are by the same author(s). **Polutta** highlighted the issue of machine readability, especially for cases of a compilations of works by the same author. Is there a need to repeat the same name over and over?
- **Maxwell** commented that the statement of responsibility is a structured but uncontrolled element. Machine-readability relies on controlled access points, not statements of responsibility.
  - **Polutta** replied that the TF wanted to explore the possibility of creating access points from structured statements of responsibility.
  - **Myers** commented that statements of responsibility cannot be controllable because they are transcribed from the resource. While other elements like title proper are indexed separately, statements of responsibility are only indexed by keyword. Machine-readability requires controlled access points.
  - The **Chair** observed that omitting the statement of responsibility would lose the fact that there is a statement of responsibility present on the resource. The question of authorship(s) of the part(s) is the function of other elements.
  - **McGrath** commented to support the usefulness of a hypothetical system to link statements of responsibility with authorized access points.
  - **Polutta** replied that such a system would not be possible in MARC. However, could other systems potentially enable statements of

responsibility to function as links? This would of course not be a requirement, but does CC:DA object to allowing for its possibility? The **Chair** invited further comments, but none were offered.

- 8) **Instructions for statements of responsibility for performers and technical credits.** The instructions do not explicitly address multiple statements of responsibility for different roles. Are further instructions needed?
- **Glennan** suggested referring to RDA 2.4 for appropriate instructions. **Putnam** asked whether linking to RDA 2.4 would be sufficient in lieu of adding further instructions. **Glennan** confirmed that RDA 2.4 should offer guidance on all of the options, but suggested the TF check this.
- 9) **Inclusion of expression or work attributes in structured descriptions.** Does it make sense to include expression or work attributes alongside manifestation attributes in structured descriptions?
- **Glennan** commented that this question has implications for the TF on Machine-Actionable Data Elements. (This offered a satisfying reciprocity for that TF’s question about Extent of the Carrier subunits, which had implications for this TF.)
- 10) **Recording elements according to instructions in Chapters 2 and 3.** Should we consider violating this principle, especially for work or expression attributes, and instead instruct catalogers to record information as it appears on the manifestation?
- **Glennan** argued against “breaking the principle.” There must be a better solution than carving out exceptions to broad principles.
- 11) **Preference for recording contents of the manifestation.** The TF recommends as best practice recording the contents information from the manifestation, with allowance for recording contents of the work, expression, or item. **Putnam** noted that this question generated the most comments on the CC:DA blog.
- **Glennan** commented that there should be flexibility to record contents at whichever WEMI level is appropriate. In some cases, contents may be appropriate at the work level. The *Lord of the Rings* trilogy is an example of a work that should have its own contents information.
  - **Sprochi** agreed and described a classic distinction between bibliographic divisions and physical divisions. Publishers may bind or present a work in a way that differs from the author’s intention.
  - **Maxwell** commented that the promise of WEMI is that each piece of information only needs to be recorded once, wherever it is appropriate. The best practice should be to record the contents information at the highest appropriate level.
  - **Putnam** explained that this question arose in response to CD compilation examples. Preferring the information from the manifestation would avoid the need to track down work or expression information not presented explicitly on the manifestation.
  - **Bourassa** commented that a compilation CD represents multiple expressions captured in a single manifestation. In this example, a “contents note” would actually be a series of relationships to different expressions rather than a structured description of the manifestation.

Meanwhile, information about the manifestation would constitute a description of the carrier, not a structured description.

- **Reser** observed that the TF may be expecting the structured description of Chapter 27 to accomplish more than it was intended to do. Chapters 25 and 26 contain other mechanisms for accomplishing these goals.
- **Maxwell** suggested that guidance is needed on contents notes in Chapter 27. This information is useful and the instructions should allow for its recording.
- **Reser** noted that there is an LC-PCC Policy Statement regarding contents notes, but it is in Chapter 25. Perhaps it should be moved?
- **Dunsire** noted that this topic could be the subject of a separate working group.
- **Bourassa** inquired whether there is a clear definition of *structured description*?
- **Putnam** replied that there is not. He observed that the general consensus of CC:DA is not to require contents information at the manifestation level, at least not as a structured description.

**b. Instructions for Describing Accompanying Material in RDA** [[CC:DA/TF/Instructions for Recording Relationships/7](#)]

**Putnam** explained that this discussion paper grew out of the work on Chapter 27. The TF discovered that the topic of accompanying material yielded a number of interesting issues. He invited comments on the information presented in the paper.

- The **Chair** asked for specific comments from the TF on the inspiration for the paper.
- **Polutta** explained that there was a difficulty connecting RDA 1.5.2 and 3.1.4 regarding the same or different carrier types. The former discusses resources with different *parts* while the latter assumes a resource with multiple carrier types. However, there are plenty of resources with accompanying material that is of the same carrier as the primary material (e.g. a book with an accompanying index). RDA Appendix J.4.5 uses the term *accompanied by* without rigorously defining that term. The TF argues there is a need for the instructions to allow the defining of a dominant thing and an accompanying thing.
- **Reser** suggested that the TF may be conflating two different concepts. Part of the issue relates to inheriting AACR2 terminology of “accompanying material.” **Reser** agrees that 3.1.4 has a problem, and noted that the LC-PCC Policy Statement says to disregard the phrase about same carrier types. There are also limitations related to the MARC 300 $\ddagger$ e designation as “accompanying material” as well as the non-repeatability of the MARC 006.
- **Polutta** acknowledged that there is a need to accommodate the 300 $\ddagger$ e in present practice. However, this discussion arose because that does not form a solid principled approach. In the long term, it is important to express the relationships between the parts of a resource. Utilizing access points may be the best way to express these relationships.

- **Reser** asserted that there are two separate issues at hand. **Polutta** suggested splitting the document into two to deal with the physical aspect versus the relationship aspect.
- A member of the audience commented that there may be confusion regarding what is being described. What has traditionally been called “accompanying materials” or “supplements” may be interpreted variously as different manifestations or different expressions. Varying approaches are possible.
- **Polutta** replied that while the physical relationships are at the manifestation level, the assumption is often that deeper relationships go back to the expression or work levels. This is true if the accompanying material consistently accompanies the primary material. In future, post-MARC standards, it may be possible to use access points to link various manifestations. This is the long term, principled approach. Extent would be separately described. Presently, we are still describing one work as predominant and the other as an augmentation of that work. Ultimately, the TF wants to allow for current practice without impeding future work.
- **Bourassa** commented that the examples in the paper are centered on extent, which are not descriptions of manifestations.
- A member of the audience suggested using the terms *complements* or *complemented by* instead of *accompanying*. This may more clearly suggest a primary/secondary relationship.

The **Chair** encouraged the TF to continue working on these papers and to bring forward proposals at the next meeting. **Putnam** and **Polutta** indicated the TF would be prepared with a proposal to address at least parts of the issues at hand.

### 1302. Report from the TF on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K: Maxwell

**Maxwell** explained that the Task Force was charged with improving the relationship designators in Appendix K, which covers relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies. After nearly one year of limited progress because of membership changes, including the chair twice, the Task Force was reconstituted in November. Maxwell is the chair, and other members are Jennifer Baxmeyer, Cory Nimer, Adam Schiff and Larisa Walsh. Back in November 2013, the Task Force submitted a proposal to the JSC that was returned for additional work. Preparation is going on for the next few months to revise the document and resubmit it as a proposal for approval at ALA Annual. It is in good shape now. There are minor issues to iron out, such as incorporating FRAD relationships into the proposal. The current proposal includes secular religious relationships and would treat the secular name of Pope Francis as a variant name relationship, which changes current cataloging practice.

Discussion during the meeting included:

- There are other forms of name change in addition to secular and religious relationships that catalogers may want to record. **Maxwell** agreed that there are

implications to include other forms of name change and asked if they should be included in the proposal. **Glennan** thought that this is a difficult area to work on while the details of the FR consolidation efforts are not known. She asked Dunsire to share more information about the FR consolidation process.

- **Dunsire** stated that there is a forthcoming JSC working group on relationship designators. He went on to say that in a linked data environment, there will be no preferred nomen because a numerical identifier, the URI, will be used for all names. He expressed support to move forward with the proposal. **Glennan** commented that they are breaking new ground by moving away from character strings and that they would like to link all variant names to a URI. **Maxwell** replied that it could be useful. **Glennan** remarked that all sorts of people have different names at different times, so it has broad application.
- It was noted that there are many implicit relationships in the MARC fields in current practice, and it makes sense to allow for the possibility to record these relationships and show why “string x” is associated with “string y.”
- **Maxwell** brought up the case in which one person assumes another’s identity to create a work and to exploit the higher status of the assumed identity. This happened fairly frequently in the ancient world. Work by an unknown person was attributed to a famous person. These are in our current authority file as names beginning with Pseudo-. For example, an anonymous person who published under the name of Saint Augustine has the name Pseudo-Augustinus in our authority file. He asked what relationship designator should be used to describe this relationship. He suggested “impersonator” or “erroneous creator,” and asked for other ideas.
- There should be a different term depending on if it is a sanctioned use of the name or not. One member suggested the term “zombie” as a relationship designator for the sanctioned use of a deceased person’s name.
- There is a problem with “erroneous” for the example of Saint Augustine because it implies somebody made a mistake. A better term might be “imposter.” The example of “Dear Abby” being written now by the original columnist’s daughter was brought up as another idea to consider.
- Other suggestions for terms were “false identity” and “misattributed.” It was thought that “misattributed” implies a mistake by the person who consumed the work. Another suggestion was “appropriated identity.”
- An example was given in which three different people each took on the name of an old blues singer to cash in on his reputation. This has happened with other singers as well. In some cases, the “fake” person who assumes the name ends up being more successful than the original singer. Here, the “fake” person has the intention to deceive.
- **Maxwell** commented that sometimes the assumed identity is done with purpose, but other times it is a mistake.
- **Dunsire** stated that as part of the FR consolidation process, this attribution relationship might be eliminated. The relationship is between two nomens with identical strings. He advised to proceed with caution. **Maxwell** replied that if one person has assumed the name of another person, then there is a relationship between those two persons.

- There was a British Library proposal in 2013 that had similarities. It talked about misattribution and someone who was formerly attributed to a work. There are many different categories. The difference between nomens and relationships between themas should be separated in such a way that catalogers will understand it. **Maxwell** replied that catalogers need these relationship designators and that he tells his cataloging students that it will be coming soon, so it is important to develop a proposal that is likely to be approved.

The **Chair** asked if there were any further questions. There were no further questions or comments. Work on the proposal will continue, and it will be discussed at ALA Annual.

### 1303. Update/invitation to comment on DCRM(C); update on Reference to Published Description proposal: Haugen

**Haugen** invited members to view the final draft of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)* at [dcrmc.pbworks.com](http://dcrmc.pbworks.com). The Editorial Committee invites CC:DA members to comment by March 1st. The *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Music)* is coming along soon. At ALA Annual in 2013, the Bibliographic Standards Committee issued a formal charge to revise DCRM for RDA. The Task Force has met two days during the present conference to work on rules to accompany RDA for rare materials. It is envisioned to look like LC-PCC PS, as linked companion material to RDA.

RBMS has taken on authorship of a proposal to revise published description references in RDA. Particular attention has been given to MARC 510 citation notes and expressing citation data through relationships rather than subject information.

Discussion during the meeting included:

- The **Chair** stated that to clarify, RBMS is inviting CC:DA to collaborate, but RBMS expects to present a report to CC:DA at Annual 2015. **Haugen** agreed.
- It would be useful to RBMS for CC:DA to issue a formal comment on *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)*. This is an important standard for which CC:DA is well-suited to provide feedback. Perhaps a CC:DA Task Force should be formed. The **Chair** replied that a task force would be considered on Monday.

The **Chair** recessed the meeting at 5:02 p.m..

*Monday, February 2, 8:30–11:30 a.m.  
Hilton Chicago, International South*

### 1304. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The **Chair** opened the meeting at 8:33 a.m. He welcomed the members and audience to the meeting in snowy Chicago, and he thanked everyone for coming.

**1305. Report from the PCC liaison: Robare** [[PCC Report for CC:DA at ALA Midwinter, Chicago, February 2, 2015](#)]

**Robare** announced that a new strategic plan for the PCC has generated some enthusiasm. The vision for PCC over the next few years is that the PCC community is an influential source of metadata expertise, experimentation, and training and that the PCC community's data are trusted, integrated, and valued in a global data environment. The continuing value of services and programs developed over time is affirmed. There are strategic directions about how the PCC will invest in continuing education and experimentation that will extend members' understanding of emerging technologies. The first strategic direction will provide education for the PCC community to advance its understanding of linked data. The second strategic direction will align the PCC's activities with others and build partnerships that will maximize impact. The next is to take leadership in authority control to move away from text strings and toward a focus on managing identities and entities. Finally, they will explore branding and funding models that will support the PCC's sustainability. The next steps are to gather input from the PCC community and then the responsible task forces will move ahead.

The Standing Committee on Standards has been developing PCC policy statements. Some that have been finalized are policy statements for RDA microform reproductions cataloging as well as print-on-demand and photocopy reproduction. These will appear in the February update of the *RDA Toolkit*.

Policy statements for series (based on the report of the PCC Series Policy Task Group) are being finalized. Progress has been made on ensuring that notes in the BIBCO Standard Record and CONSER Standard Record metadata application profiles are in sync with policy statements in the *RDA Toolkit*, and that will be part of the *RDA Toolkit* February update. The SCS is discussing how to keep these in sync over time.

The Standing Committee on Training has completed a "Training Manual for Applying Relationship Designators in Bibliographic Records." It is 20 pages long and very useful; it gives examples and guidance. It will be widely available very soon after the conference.

**1306. Report from the MAC representative: Myers** [[CC:DA/MAC/2015/1/Final](#)]

**Myers** gave a preliminary report that six proposals and one discussion paper were discussed. All six proposals passed; there were significant amendments to 2015-03. The discussion paper will be turned into a proposal. LC will be doing a BIBFRAME pilot before Annual. Most of the proposals are straightforward. One proposal is adding a new field 884. This will facilitate identification of non-MARC records, and it will be important for BIBFRAME records. There was extensive discussion about various potential subfields for 884, and the British Library had input to give on some aspects. Details were hashed out and it did pass because there is an urgent need for this data.

The **Chair** stated that the committee looks forward to the final report.

**1307. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo**

**Guajardo** explained that the CC:DA blog is a WordPress site. There is ongoing development with WordPress. Updates are fairly minor, and they are installed if it is thought that they will not cause problems. Some updates are urgent for security reasons and installed immediately. Before installation of an update, the blog is backed up to another device. Plugins are used to facilitate options and functions within the blog; these are reviewed periodically and new plugins could be added for new functionality. Since the summer, changes were made to layout and tab organization. A “Task Force” tab was added, and sections on the right were re-ordered. Recent comments are now at the top; however, recent comments move to the bottom when viewed with a mobile device. Usually, new accounts are created as soon as there is an addition to the roster. Passwords can be reset if there are problems. Any issues with accounts or questions about the blog can be sent to the webmaster.

The **Chair** asked about the tagging functionality and tag cloud. The process of tagging the documents has fallen behind. He questioned the conventions are used by CC:DA for tagging and whether tagging is needed. **Robare** asked if the tag cloud will go away if we stop tagging, or if the tag cloud will stay even though it continues to become more outdated. The former webmaster, **Polutta**, replied that tagging was meant to replace the index that was on the previous website. She stated that the tag cloud can be removed from the website. The **Chair** asked Polutta if she recommended continuing to tag posts. **Polutta** recommended keeping the tagging functionality because sometimes the tagging will make up for not being able to search inside a PDF document. **Polutta** created documentation on tagging conventions, which she passed on to Guajardo for reference.

### 1308. Proposals from AALL: Bratton

**Revision proposal for RDA instructions for laws, etc.** [[CC:DA/AALL/2014/2](#)]  
[[Discussion](#)]

**Bratton** reported that the proposal is from AALL to eliminate the collective title, “Laws, etc.” This is similar to the previous elimination of “Treatises, etc.” The consensus is that it does not facilitate FRBR user tasks, and it is difficult to apply. It only applies to a compilation of laws that are not on one subject, but not individual laws nor a compilation of laws covering one subject. It is not well understood by users nor by reference librarians, and it is not consistently applied by catalogers. Feedback from the mailing list was that few legal reference librarians knew of its existence.

Discussion during the meeting included:

- There was expression of support for the proposal. The art community does not see that the collective titles add benefit; genre heading are preferred. **Bratton** replied that extensive genre terms have been added in the past few years that are now available to them.
- **Glennan** noted that this is an exceptional practice for naming compilations, carried over from AACR2, that the committee does not see a need to perpetuate. She suspected that the JSC would agree to removing the exceptional practice and that the proposal would be successful. **Bratton** responded that it only applies to a

- compilation of laws that are about a particular subject, so it is an exceptional practice that is difficult to apply.
- A compilation can be considered a work in its own right because RDA distinguishes between collaboration and compilation. Is this related to broader issues of conventional collective titles? **Glennan** responded that the JSC is aware of the wider issues that are raised by this proposal. She went on to say that it is beneficial to remove the exceptional practice in this proposal for now.

Discussion from the blog included:

- **Glennan** wrote that the JSC had agreed to wording changes for 6.2.1.9. The wording for that instruction in this proposal will have to be adjusted accordingly. **Bratton** asked for clarification about the wording change, and **Glennan** responded that he had made the correct edits.
- **Glennan** commented that “as applicable” should be added to the final paragraph in 6.2.2.10.3 because not all of 6.19.2 applies to compilations. **Bratton** agreed.
- **Glennan** suggested that the term “designation” be changed to “title” in 6.19.2.5.1.d. **Bratton** thought that “title” was a better choice.

The **Chair** asked Bratton if the proposal was ready to vote on. **Bratton** replied that revisions were already done on the proposal based on helpful input from the catalogers at the Law Library of Congress and the proposal was ready for a vote.

The **Chair** invited a motion to approve AALL/2014/2. **Kelley** moved to pass the proposal, and **Shrader** seconded. It was approved with 8 votes in favor and none opposed.

### 1309. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Hennelly

**Hennelly** reported that the *RDA Toolkit* has more than 3000 active subscribers, up slightly from last year. There are approximately 7000 users, around 2.4 users per subscription. In the fiscal year 2014, which runs September 1 to August 31, there were 640 new subscribers and 2,239 renewals. The renewal rate was 84% for fiscal 2014, which was lower than expected, but still a good renewal rate. The reason that subscribers gave for not renewing was that they were not using the *Toolkit*. Budget goals were met for subscribers for last year. It was the first time that budget goals were met. There was a 2% decrease in page views and a 1% increase in searches. There was a 45% increase in number of sessions. It seems that the people who were using the site were able to use it more efficiently.

The print version of the *RDA Toolkit* has done well. It was late getting out. There were 610 print sales through December, which was better than expected. Important changes were made to the print *RDA Toolkit*. It used to be distributed as loose-leaf pages with updates, but the JSC changes are so substantial that an update packet is not practical. The format has changed to a bound paperback book using a print-on-demand model. There is no extra cost for print-on-demand. Now, a new revised version of the print *RDA Toolkit* is produced each year. ALA Publishing did not produce an ebook for 2014, and they received a lot of feedback regarding that decision. They will put an ebook back on the table for 2015. They

have never seen significant sales for the ebook, although Australia LIS education systems in particular want the ebook.

It was hoped that a Spanish translation would be available next week. It is not ready yet, but it is close to finished. They hope to roll it out in March, before the April release to the *Toolkit*. Italian and Finnish translations will be coming out. They are exploring contracts for Arabic, Catalan, Russian, Ukrainian, Slovakian, and Vietnamese. Iceland has expressed interest in translations of the introductory chapter and glossary. In August 2014, an update brought the German edition entirely in line with the English. This was the first time a translation has caught up with English version.

The February release will include MLA Best Practices fully incorporated into *Toolkit* in the way that LC-PCC Policy Statements are incorporated. The April release will include the RDA update, with changes from the JSC proposal process. Releases are anticipated for August and October, and it is possible that one will include the Italian and Finnish translations.

The *RDA Essentials* manuscript is complete, and it is with the JSC for review. It is hoped that the book will be ready for publication in the fall.

Discussion from the meeting included:

- **Glennan** asked if fast track changes will be unable to be included in August and October releases, as happened last year. **Hennelly** replied that they were very busy last year with CMS upgrade. In the past, new release rollouts prevented anyone else from working in the system. With the new CMS, there will no longer be any restrictions on including fast track changes in new releases.
- The **Chair** inquired about the status of the French translation. **Hennelly** responded that the French translation team has been sorely understaffed due to illness, other responsibilities, and cuts. They are doing their best but are lagging behind. It is hoped that they will be caught up by October 2015.

### 1310. Proposals from AALL: Bratton (continued)

#### Revision proposal for RDA instructions for armed forces (11.2.2.22.1)

[\[CC:DA/AALL/2014/1\]](#) [\[Discussion\]](#)

**Bratton** explained that this proposal is about numbering in corporate bodies for certain groups in the armed forces. The proposal clarifies when the cataloger should invert and use a comma with the numbering in these corporate bodies. Some instances of improper commas were found, where inversion is not actually appropriate.

Discussion from the meeting included:

- It is an excellent proposal, but it would be helpful to have more examples in the middle. **Glennan** added that the RDA Examples Editor will have the final say in

what examples make the cut into RDA, so the provided examples serve as a suggestion only.

- Some felt that there were too many examples and that it was unclear why some of examples were there.
- **Glennan** thought that the second paragraph should be an exception regarding a number at the beginning of the name being recorded at the end.
- In Canada and the U.S., the number often comes first, so it is common rather than an exception.
- The parenthetical clarifications under the example about inversions seem particularly important. It is normally expected to have an ordinal number be a lead unit.
- There should be an example of the “5<sup>th</sup> Unit of 22<sup>nd</sup> Corps” to show a double-inversion.
- **Glennan** advised determining which paragraph is the primary paragraph and what examples are still needed.
- The proposal first addresses whether a number is cardinal or ordinal, and then the position of the number in the resulting string. **Glennan** noted that the examples fall in a group after these two instructions are given. She advised breaking up the examples so that they fall directly under the instruction that they represent. There was agreement because it is difficult to see that there are two instructions represented in the examples.
- It was thought that “recording what you see” should be the first instruction, and inversion should be the second instruction. Also, a reason should be given for inversion.
- The reason for inversion is collocation. For example, infantry divisions are collocated with inversion.
- Since inversion is the exception, it should fall after the rule about “take what you see.”
- There was discussion about whether an inversion is an exception (because it is a manipulation) or not (because it is commonly done with proper names).
- An audience member asked why some numbers are kept in the middle, if inversion is done for collocation purposes.
- **Glennan** was thankful for all of the comments and responded that she would help revise the proposal to offer multiple options.

Discussion from the blog included:

- **Glennan** advised putting the exceptional treatment for the “Royal 22<sup>nd</sup> Regiment of the Canadian Army” example in a new section. **Bratton** concurred.
- **Glennan** offered wording for the new clause that better matches RDA style and thought that additional instruction would be helpful about what to do when a number is not at the beginning of a name.
- Perhaps the number occurring at the end or in the middle of the name could be treated as an exception since it rarely happens.

- **Bratton** suggested first giving the instruction to follow the style of numbering found in the name, and then giving the second instruction to record the number after the name.

There was agreement that the proposal should be revised and perhaps fast tracked.

**1311. Multiple sources for statements of responsibility: Glennan** [[CC:DA/JSC Rep/KPG/2015/1](#)] [[Discussion](#)]

**Glennan** described a situation that occurs in cataloging music in which the fullest form of the composer's name is not on the title page but is elsewhere in the resource. In AACR2, catalogers would give the fullest form in brackets to show that it was not taken from the title page. In RDA, catalogers can add the information without brackets. It is possible that RDA could be easier to understand for this situation; it is not entirely clear what RDA means by "associated with" for a statement of responsibility associated with a title proper. Though this comes up often in music, it has broader application than music.

Discussion during the meeting included:

- For the statement of responsibility to be associated with a title page, it does not have to be physically near it. They are intellectually associated. Currently, the instructions for the statement of responsibility say to take it from a list of sources, in order of preference. It says to take the statement of responsibility from the title page if it is there, and nothing is said of augmenting it with fuller information even from other sources in the resource. To change this practice, a change in RDA is needed.
- Some felt that the statement of responsibility should be associated with the manifestation because the title page is for the manifestation.
- Some voiced that currently the practice is to record what is on the title page, and that it is done for identification purposes. The access points serve the purpose of giving fuller information. Adding brackets would be reverting to AACR2 and should not be done. It would be acceptable in RDA to have a note about the composer's name being on the cover in full.
- This issue has come up from real examples in the music world. A statement of responsibility could say, for example, "Glennan. Snyder." If these two entities played different roles (one composed, another arranged), the statement of responsibility is misleading. Are the rules flexible enough to allow the cataloger to insert clarifying information from other sources in the resource?
- Other sources for the statement of responsibility from within the resource are allowed in RDA, even if one is already available on the chief source, and this opens the door to mixing information. For example, information on the title page and title page verso can be mixed. The list of sources is given in a preferred order. The RDA instructions are adequate as they stand. There was agreement that this is allowed through cataloger's judgment.
- For edited medical books, the title page often lists only two names. Catalogers still use the bracketed convention [edited by]. Then the title is the preferred access point. This is also considered a best practice for music.

- This involves self-describing versus non-self-describing resources. There are manuscripts with things written on the piece and there is no certainty about who wrote it. This is written ambiguously so that a choice can be made.
- Two different issues are being confused, the completeness of form of name with the absence of clarification of role.
- Catalogers should usually transcribe. Will catalogers have to search the entire resource to check whether there is a fuller form available?
- What if information is taken from a location very deeply buried in the resource? Perhaps there should be an instruction to make a note whenever information is taken from an unexpected place in the resource.
- **Glennan** recommended taking a step back. How much are we expecting the statement of responsibility to transcribe or supply? What are we expecting access points with relationship designators to do? There is the option to create notes to clarify how the statement of responsibility is being transcribed. There is the option to use relationship designators with access points. The statement of responsibility helps with identification and selection, but the primary purpose of the statement of responsibility is not for identification. If the wording “associated with” was replaced, perhaps it would stop being thought of as a physical association.
- It is ironic that if the title page is very misleading, catalogers transcribe it as seen, while if there is no statement of responsibility on the title page, catalogers are allowed to add information from elsewhere in the resource.
- **Glennan** stated that if we are only allowed to take statements of responsibility from one source, it is too limiting. The instruction uses a plural. RDA intentionally walked down the path to this irony.
- The instructions are confusing where they say “any” versus “preferred” order. If “order of preference” is taken to mean the cataloger’s preference, then that wording should be tightened up.
- Some manifestations have unusual, short, or incomplete, statements of responsibility and that quirk may be useful in differentiating them from different manifestations or related expressions and works. There was agreement from an audience member that today’s common resources are tomorrow’s special and rare resources. The distinction between one manifestation and another that look very different on the surface can be critical. Catalogers could properly describe that now to make that information clear for future researchers.

Discussion during the blog included:

- There is general support for interpretation number two from MLA commenters. This is also supported by MLA’s Best Practices for RDA. Some MLA commenters indicate that clarification can happen in a best practice or application profile rather than changing RDA. However, enough confusion has been expressed already that the present text of RDA could be clarified.
- The way RDA is written now allows for flexibility in recording statements of responsibility and the best way to clarify this practice is with application profiles.
- The meaning behind the phrases of the statement of responsibility “associated with the title proper” or “relating to the title proper” could be clarified. MLA

commentators feel that the phrases are confusing. One suggestion was to change it to “associated with the manifestation.”

- MOUG-L discussions indicated that there was confusion about whether it was acceptable to use the container as a source for a part title or enumeration. These involved CDs where the enumeration or the part title was present on the container with the title proper but not on the disc label.
- Interpretation number two is preferred. A note could be added if any part of the statement of responsibility comes from a non-obvious source within the resource. Even if the name is not complete, the authorized access points for the creator or person associated with the resource will be complete. In addition, a relationship designator can indicate the role.
- Interpretation number four would be most in line with current rare materials instructions. However, this may not be the intent of the RDA instruction, nor is interpretation four necessarily appropriate for all types of resources.

The **Chair** stated that possible directions for this proposal will continue to be investigated.

### 1312. Report from the TF on Pseudonymous Corporate Bodies: Sprochi

**Sprochi** stated that the Task Force has worked diligently on pseudonymous and fictitious names. A similar proposal from the British Library was tabled by the JSC due to a comment from the Canadians about the FR model consolidation coming up. Until IFLA issues a report, it is difficult to know exactly how to proceed. At a meeting on Saturday, Dunsire and Glennan explained that the JSC is planning to form a working group on this topic which will take over our Task Force’s work. CC:DA Task Force members are encouraged to join the forthcoming JSC working group. Anyone interested in working with the JSC on this should contact Glennan, so that she can put names forward about CC:DA representation in the JSC working group. **Sprochi** asked that the Task Force be put on hiatus until involvement with the JSC can be sorted out.

Discussion during the meeting included:

- The **Chair** asked for an estimated timeframe because a formal hiatus would be appropriate for a long time period.
- **Glennan** said that the JSC working group is expected to be established next month.
- The **Chair** replied that no action would be taken at this point.
- **Sprochi** asked that any concerns about pseudonyms and fictitious entities be sent to the Task Force.
- **Glennan** stated that the Task Force has received assurance that their work is not wasted, and the work that has been done will continue.

The **Chair** thanked the Task Force for its work and patience.

### 1313. Update on the TF on Place Names in RDA: Chair

The **Chair** recommended discharging this Task Force, which has been inactive for over a year. It has been superseded by a JSC working group on the same topic. Many members of

the Task Force have joined that working group. A new Task Force could be created if it is needed in the future. There were no objections to discontinuing the Task Force, and the Task Force was discharged.

#### 1314. Encouraging more blog feedback on proposals: Chair/Glennan

The **Chair** encouraged CC:DA members to contribute more feedback on the blog. It seemed that when it was time to comment on 34 more proposals from other constituencies in the fall, comments dried up after what was a busy season. But the JSC Representative needs to have sufficient feedback to be confident that she is representing the views of the whole committee to the JSC. Comments do not have to be extremely long and thought out, and it is understood that new members may need to learn how the Committee works before they are comfortable contributing publicly. There are some factors that might be keeping people from participating. It can be hard to “go first” before anyone else has responded and risk missing the point. And it can also seem trivial to contribute a short reaction after someone else has left long, well-thought out comments and it seems that everything is figured out already. But emails and blog comments from multiple contributors are needed to know what the consensus of the committee is. It is difficult to know if silence is agreement, confusion, or neutrality. Are there ways to encourage more comments?

Discussion from the meeting included:

- **Glennan** stated that even if a comment goes in a wrong direction, that is still helpful. Someone else trying to understand the language will also have that same reaction. Overall, CC:DA’s influence is stronger with more responses from members. Even if CC:DA’s position is split, that is useful. It is helpful to be able to give arguments for and against. Also, note that Glennan is not the expert in the areas where the liaisons are the experts. What is useful about CC:DA is that the members are practitioners who can see what does and does not work, especially the liaisons because they represent communities for which they have specialized knowledge to contribute to discussion. Glennan’s expertise is in music cataloging. If she were to give comments on a law proposal, for example, then Bratton could correct her.
- A member mentioned that it is helpful when Glennan personally forwards items of interest to subject liaisons. **Glennan** responded that she is incredibly grateful to a number of members in the room. During the JSC meeting in November, she asked the JSC to defer a decision while she asked specific experts for input. She gave them a deadline of three hours or so for response and all of them came through with thoughtful comments. The backing of their expertise at the JSC meetings is instrumental.
- Chair emeritus **Rolla** echoed the Chair and Glennan’s comments that it is good and beneficial to comment. He added that for voting members, it is their job. Voting members are here to participate and bring their opinions. **Rolla** stated that he was proud of the Chair and Glennan for bringing up the discussion because not having enough participation is a problem.
- There are several practical solutions to consider. It is helpful when the proposals are broken up into groups that are smaller at shorter intervals. When related things are grouped, then reading them all at the same time is easier. Even though people

respond on the blog, it can feel like speaking into the ether. It might be efficacious to have scheduled chat discussions or phone-in conversations for 30 minutes or one hour. During real-time conversations, there is cross-pollination of ideas. It could be scheduled on an on-going basis, as needed.

- There was agreement that a real time scheduled conversation would be desirable for the committee. Everyone would have the opportunity to look over the proposals in advance and be prepared for a discussion. Sometimes conversation on the blog moves ahead and the conversation is over before all members have a chance to contribute. Other times the immediate needs of one's institution must take priority, and it becomes easy to miss comments on the blog. A scheduled conversation in real time would alleviate these problems.
- One member shared that he had gained most of his committee work education through error, so new members should not be afraid to comment and learn from mistakes. Another member added that Stephen Jay Gould said something to the effect of "an interesting failure is frequently more useful than success." Sometimes asking a question that seems destined to flop leads to interesting dialogue. New members are also encouraged to share their differing perspectives because it is a powerful tool to coalesce ideas. A new member responded that she was glad for the encouragement because it was helpful to know that new member comments were desired.
- It is a good idea to try to gather feedback from other communities, such as the dance community, to share with the committee. People are happy to be asked. They know that everything may not go their way, but they are happy to have the chance to give their opinions.
- It would be helpful to receive email alerts about new posts on the blog. The webmaster replied that there are plans to install a plug-in that allows blog commenters to receive notifications for additional comments made after their posts.
- It is possible to subscribe to the RSS feed on the current website and receive an email whenever there is a comment.
- It would be a good idea to have the ability to "like" comments on the blog; it would be the fastest way to say "me, too."
- It would be helpful to separate blog comments by question to break proposals into smaller sections. The **Chair** agreed that those who have been on the committee long enough know that the wiki platform had that functionality and it is especially missed.
- Doodle is a helpful tool that facilitates "me, too" responses and taking votes. It provides a way to know the level of engagement of people sitting around the table. The **Chair** thought that would work best for big issues that are clearly definable and that it is a good suggestion.

The **Chair** thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussion. He asked that forthcoming ideas be shared with the list, and the committee will try out some of the suggestions.

**1315. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting; and adjournment: Chair**

**Glennan** reported that in the future, there will be an international review of two IFLA standards. There will be FR consolidation and a 5-7 year review of ISBD. It might happen between ALA meetings. Anyone with interest, including the audience, could participate on these task forces.

**Glennan** introduced a topic that she is willing to pursue as her own proposal. There is a gap in RDA; there are no instructions for a note such as taking a series statement from a dust jacket or spine. Other members expressed interest in pursuing the proposal. The **Chair** requested that Glennan follow up with the proposal.

The **Chair** asked for new business. An audience member (Amber Billey, University of Vermont) stated that she has submitted a proposal to the JSC Representative to add transgender terminology as a fast track change. The **Chair** responded that the proposal will be given consideration.

The **Chair** announced that the next meeting will be in San Francisco, and he will look into wireless access for the next meeting. He thanked everyone for coming. He adjourned the meeting at 11:29 a.m.