

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 of the meeting held at the
2016 ALA Annual Meeting in Orlando, Florida
June 24 and 26, 2016
Draft**

Members present:

Dominique Bourassa, Chair
Mary Anne Dyer
Elyssa Gould
Steve Kelley
Sandra Macke
Dr. Elizabeth Anne Shoemaker
Tina Shrader
Larisa Walsh

Heather McIntosh, Intern
Amada L. Ros, Intern

Ex-officio representatives:

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

ALA Liaisons present:

Tassanee Chitcharoen, ALA/GODORT [Saturday only]
Felicity Dykas, ALA/ACRL
Peter V. Fletcher, ALCTS/CRS [Saturday only]
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM [Saturday only]
Matthew Haugen, ALA/ACRL/RBMS
Jessica Hayden, ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group
Yoko Kudo, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons:

Robert Bratton, AALL
Diane Hillmann, DCMI
Mary Huismann, MusLA

Heidi G. Lerner, AJL [Saturday only]
Dorothy McGarry, SLA
John Myers, MAC
Diane Napert, ARSC
Cory Nimer, SAA
Lori Robare, PCC
Karen Stafford, ARLIS/NA
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/liasons 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/liasons 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 “liasons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

AALL = American Association of Law Libraries
AAP = Authorized access point
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
AP = Application profile
ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America
ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections
BIBFRAME = Bibliographic Framework Initiative

BSR = BIBCO Standard Record
CaMMS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
CC:AAM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:DA = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
CCM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
CRS = ALCTS/ Continuing Resources Section
CSR = CONSER Standard Record
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
DCRM(C) = Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)
EURIG = European RDA Interest Group
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
FRBR-LRM = IFLA's *FRBR-Library Reference Model*
FRBRoo = FRBR-object oriented
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LC-PCC PSs = Library of Congress Policy Statements
MAGIRT = Map and Geospatial Information Round Table
MAC = MARC Advisory Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MIG = ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group
MulDiCat = IFLA's *Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing Terms and Concepts*
MusLA = Music Library Association
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
OMR = Open Metadata Registry
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PSD = Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RSC = RDA Steering Committee
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RDF = Resource Description Framework
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SAA = Society of American Archivists
SCA = PCC Standing Committee on Automation
SCS = PCC Standing Committee on Standards
SCT = PCC Standing Committee on Training
SES = Syntax/string Encoding Scheme
SLA = Special Libraries Association
URI = Uniform Resource Identifier

VES = Vocabulary Encoding Scheme

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

*Saturday, June 25, 1:00–5:30 p.m.
Hilton Orlando, Orange Ballroom G*

1357. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Dominique Bourassa, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members. She announced the following members who joined the table for the first time: Mary Huismann, liaison from MusLA and Karen Stafford, liaison from ARLIS/NA. She also announced that this would be her last meeting as chair, and Tina Shrader will take over.

1358. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

1359. Adoption of agenda: Chair

The **Chair** asked for comments, changes, or additions to the agenda. The **Chair** announced that she would be giving the Webmaster's Report on Monday. The agenda was adopted with stated revision.

1360. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2016 Midwinter Meeting: Chair [[Minutes of the Meeting held at the 2016 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts January 9 and 11, 2016. Draft](#)]

The **Chair** explained that a draft of the minutes had been distributed to CC:DA prior to this meeting. Members' suggestions have been incorporated into the document. The **Chair** asked for additional changes to the minutes. None were posed. The minutes were adopted as posted.

1361. Report from the Chair [[Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions, January-June 2016](#)]

The online report lists the votes that CC:DA had taken via e-mail between January 15 and April 27, 2016: Motion to form a Task Force to investigate definitions of and instructions for accompanying material in RDA, Motion that the new Deseret Romanization table be included in the ALA-LC Romanization tables, Motion that CC:DA form a Task Force for the Review of the FRBR-Library Reference Model, Motion that the amended report of the Task Force for the

Review of the FRBR-Library Reference Model be sent to the chair of the FRBR Review Group. All votes were passed 8-0 or 7-0. The **Chair** invited a motion from a voting member to confirm the preceding votes. **Walsh** moved; **Kelley** seconded. The motion passed 8-0.

The Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA was charged to work in collaboration with the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing to resolve issues that were raised by the ALA proposal to revise RDA 3.1.4, Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type, and RDA 3.4.1.3, Recording Extent (6JSC/ALA/40), and to develop a joint CC:DA/CCC discussion paper in time for ALA annual.

The Task Force for the Review of the FRBR-Library Reference Model (FRBR-LRM) was charged with preparing a review of the draft of the FRBR-LRM and its accompanying Transition Mappings, for transmittal to CC:DA by April 8, 2016. After approval by CC:DA, the amended report of the Task Force was forwarded to the FRBR Review Group. The task force was subsequently discharged.

1362. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Reser [[Library of Congress Report](#)]

Reser discussed highlights from his report posted on the CC:DA website. A fuller report is available at <http://www.loc.gov/ala/>.

Topics included:

- President Barack Obama's nomination of Dr. Carla D. Hayden to be the next Librarian of Congress was approved by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration on Thursday, June 9, on a unanimous voice vote with 10 panel members present. The nomination now goes to the full Senate for its consideration.
- Staffing and personnel changes not only include retirements but also a record number of open positions open to external applicants in Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access.
- Legislative Branch appropriations bills have been passed by both the House and the Senate appropriations committees (but not by either of the full chambers) appropriations committees for fiscal year 2017.
- *Cataloger's Desktop* has had a number of enhancements for searching and security as well as being moved to the cloud. Questions and suggestions should be sent to Bruce Johnson.
- RDA 2016 Update was published in April 2016; a summary is published on the PSD (Policy and Standards Division) website. The next release including LC-PCC PSs will be published on August 9, 2016.
- Project updates on the headings for Malaysian and Taiwanese jurisdictions.
- LC's online catalog has undergone changes for a new, responsive redesign.
- LC's BIBFRAME pilot officially ended in March, but has been extended to July 2016 for some formats.

The **Chair** asked for an update on Phase 3 of NACO file conversion to RDA. **Reser** responded that they are waiting on infrastructure changes and testing to be completed by various LC units.

1363. Report of the ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee: Glennan
[\[Report on RSC Activities, January-June 2016\]](#)

Glennan reported on the following topics:

- The reconstitution of the RDA Board is in progress. European representation has already decreased from 3 members to 1.
- The RSC worked through March 2016 to finalize the changes and additions to RDA instructions arising from the 38 proposals and discussion papers considered at the JSC's 2015 meeting. The RSC also approved 184 fast track and related changes, which were included in the February 2016 release and the April 2016 update to the RDA Toolkit.
- The RSC refreshed the membership of 8 existing working groups. 2 additional working groups were created:
 - RSC Rare Materials Working Group
 - RSC Translations Working Group
- The RSC evaluated the following working drafts:
 - Requirements for online tools and functionality to support the new RDA governance structure.
 - A consolidated version of the RDA Glossary, designed to make it possible to generate the Glossary automatically from the open metadata registry without the need for further manual intervention.
- The RSC created a new protocol with LC to facilitate communication with other organizations developing and supporting international standards.
- **Glennan** highlighted RSC activities related to 6 ALA fast-track proposals.
 - ALA's proposal regarding adding instructions for international courts will be considered as a "fast track plus" proposal for the August RDA Toolkit release.
 - "Fast track plus" is an experiment to see if proposals that do not generate discussions can be put through sooner.
- **Gordon Dunsire, James Hennelly, and Glennan** served as panelists on an RDA-focused episode of American Libraries Live in February 2016.
- No further progress has been made on planning for the creation of the North American RDA Committee.
- **Glennan** has been reappointed to a second 3-year term as ALA's RSC Representative, effective July 1.
- Deadlines for CC:DA in relation to the November 2016 RSC meeting were provided.
- Consensus-driven decision making at the international level will not continue.

Responding to a question by the **Chair**, **Dunsire** noted that he foresaw an additional 6 or 7 papers for consideration by the RSC.

1364. Proposal from the ALA Representative to the RSC: Glennan [[Greater Flexibility in Creating Variant Access Points](#)] [[Discussion of revised version](#)] [[Discussion of earlier version](#)]

RDA provides different types of instructions for creating variant access points for works/expressions vs. persons/families/corporate bodies. For works and expressions, the types of variant access points are explained in detail, and a final paragraph provides for additional flexibility in the relevant instructions: “Construct additional variant access points if considered important for access”. For agents, the instructions are less prescriptive, as evidenced by the introductory sentence in these instructions: “When constructing a variant access point to represent...” Although the two styles of instructions to create variant access points offer some level of flexibility, in all cases the variant access point is based on a variant of the preferred title (Chapters 5-6) or of the preferred name (Chapters 9-11); no provision exists to use the preferred title + variations or the preferred name + variations to create a variant access point. However, this situation does occur, and the instructions should be expanded to make this possibility explicit.

Proposal:

For works and expressions (Chapters 5 and 6):

1. Using “a title of the work” instead of “a variant title for the work” in creating variant access points.
2. Where that change is not practicable, using “a variant title for the work, or a variant of an addition used in constructing the authorized access point representing the work.” [language based on 6.27.4.5.b]
3. Within the text, updating instruction names and references as needed.
4. Expanding the paragraph explaining about the use of additional elements in the variant access point to include differentiating it from the authorized access point.
5. Making these changes in all paragraphs that currently use the same text.
6. Adding or moving examples.

For persons, families and corporate bodies (Chapters 8-11):

1. Using “a name of the [person/family/corporate body]” instead of “a variant name...” in creating variant access points.
2. Within the text, updating instruction names and references as needed.
3. Expanding the paragraph explaining about the use of additional elements in the variant access point to include differentiating it from the authorized access point.
4. Making these changes in all paragraphs that currently use the same text.
5. Adding examples.

Seeing no opposition, **Shrader** moved to approve that **Glennan** turn the proposal into a formal ALA proposal for RSC consideration. **Shoemaker** seconded the motion which carried 8-0.

1365. Report of the Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA: Gould [[Report and discussion paper](#)] [[Appendix 1 Chart](#)] [[JPEG](#)] [[Discussion](#)]

The CC:DA Task Force to Investigate Definitions of and Instructions for Accompanying Material in RDA was charged to work with the Canadian Committee on Cataloguing to investigate definitions of and instructions for accompanying material in RDA, and specifically to:

1. Analyze how the choice of analytic vs. comprehensive description (see RDA 2.2.2.1) affects the treatment of accompanying material.
 - Discussion followed about too much focus on PCC Policy Statements; otherwise, there was agreement.
2. Evaluate the definition of accompanying material in RDA 2.2.4.
 - There was agreement that “material” has outlived its usefulness in the terminology with respect to RDA.
3. Consider how to revise RDA to resolve inconsistencies in defining the “resource itself” (see Mode of Issuance, Carrier Type, & Color Content).
 - The discussion focused on “resource” being expanded to include “accompanying materials”. Clarification might be necessary at a higher level depending on how the items are cataloged (comprehensively or analytically). The Task Force will tweak the definition.
4. Consider accompanying material in relation to the Mode of Issuance (RDA 2.13.1.2): does the presence of accompanying material require describing the resource as a multipart monograph? If not, how can the carrier of the accompanying material be described?
 - The consensus was “no”. A question was raised about physicality of “parts” and the definitions in RDA. The outcomes of the Task Force could be referred to the Aggregates Working Group of RSC.
5. Investigate how RDA should distinguish between a minor accompanying part and a part of a multipart monograph.
 - The task force recommended allowing RDA 3.1.4 to be the general guide.
 - **Glennan** noted that a previous proposal to address this problem was rejected by the JSC.
6. Investigate the distinction between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material.
 - No additional discussion occurred.
7. Consider how extent of accompanying material of the same carrier type should be recorded: when is the extent recorded as “2 volumes” vs. “XX pages ... + 1 [name of accompanying material] (XX pages)”? How should RDA be revised to support these various options?
 - A distinction between “content” and “carrier type” was a concern for CCC. A suggestion was made to adjust the examples to show carrier but not content.

The motion to authorize **Glennan** and **Gould** to work with CCC to turn this into a joint ALA-CCC Discussion Paper was made by **Kelley** and seconded by **Dyer**. The motion carried 8-0.

1366. Presentation of the RSC Chair: Dunsire [[RDA internationalization and application profiles: applying the global to the local](#)]

Dunsire confirmed that the 3 European representatives have been reduced to 1, which is currently called Interim Europe Region for legal reasons effective immediately. The representative comes from the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. The European RDA Interest Group remains intact and may become the basis of the Europe Region model. The RSC has determined that the two best feedback methods from RDA users are from the Hackathons (Jane-athons) and the translation teams (Translations Working Group). The translators are providing valuable feedback and with no preconceptions, they are helping clarify definitions.

FRBR-LRM is a consolidation of FRBR, FRAD, and FRSAD that builds on the concepts developed in FRBRoo. As per recommendations from the IFLA FRBR Working Group on Aggregates years ago, the RSC has put off working on aggregates until now, when the models are finally consolidated into the FRBR-LRM.

The LRM framework introduces 4 new elements at a broad overview (not operational) level:

- The superentity *Res*, which is a high level model covering any Thing. The relationships to *Res* are just the top of the model and not meant to be operational relationships. (Latin names are being used because of the baggage that comes with English words.)
- *Nomen*. The *Res* has appellation *Nomen*, which means Things can have names.
- *Place* and *Time-span*, which are not FRBR group 3 entities, but rather first class entities in their own right. These are frameworks for building operational structures.

Agent and *Collective Agent* are two more new entities. *Agent* is already implicit in RDA and explicit in the RDA element set in the registry because it is useful as a superentity of other types of *Agent*. A *Collective Agent* is two or more people (not just corporate body), and is a type of *Agent*. **Dunsire** noted that *Item (is modified by) Agent* is an important relationship for archival communities because *Agents* can do things to individual items, such as writing in the margins.

The role of RDA is to refine the LRM high level (coarse) model into something that is of practical/operational use (fine). The LRM is optimized for linked data. The relationships that RDA defines will always be a sub-property of one of these high level relationships so that they will always be semantically coherent with the underlying model, but they will be refined to the point where they become practical. *Res1* (representing WEMI) and *Res2* (representing agent) have 2 relationships: is associated with, has creator/artist. *Artist* is a type of creator, and creator is a type of association. If both things are Expressions, one *Res* could have a derivative relationship (E) with this other. If appropriate, this can be further refined as “is adapted as” (E), or even “is adapted as graphic novel” (E).

FRBR-LRM introduces a *manifestation statement* like a *publication statement* (which is transcribed). The publication statement can be separated into the 3 separate entities (that are recorded): Place (has place of publication), Corporate body (has publisher's name), Time-span (has date of publication). This moves from attributes to relationships (which can be linked to). It also shows why the compromise of transcription becoming recording exists. *Nomen* is an entity that is a literal string and is also a bridge between things and strings.

The RDA and translations policy introduces the concept of RDA Reference, which consists of the RDA element sets and value vocabularies: the RDA entities, relationships, and controlled terminologies, with labels, definitions and scope notes. This is a data dictionary, serving as reference material in the traditional sense of the word. Per the translations policy, a translation of the RDA Toolkit text also requires a translation of RDA Reference in the OMR for linked data purposes. This allows RDA to become truly international. The RDA Development Team has decided to use RDA Reference to populate much of the Toolkit content, although there is no intent at this time to have RDA Reference drive the content of the instructions – but that's not ruled out for the future. Linked data representations will become the core of RDA Reference, from which the Toolkit data (glossary, relationship designators, etc.) will be derived. This will be folded into the Toolkit redesign project, which is about to begin. The RSC started reviewing the glossary to improve consistency and completeness. This review is being driven by the translations team feedback, which will result in easier translations in the future. The RSC is also reviewing and consolidating sub-vocabularies to publish all value vocabularies in OMR. Ultimately, everything in the glossary will be in OMR.

A new value vocabulary is being created in RDA not *for* the data you use in RDA, but for *how to create* the data in RDA. The value vocabulary will be expressed as linked data, which may allow linking to other vocabularies such as IFLA's *Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing Terms and Concepts* (MulDiCat). This could facilitate linking or cross-walking library descriptive standards with other communities such as archives and museums. Definitions might be able to match/link RDA terminology to terminology in archives and other communities. There is a good possibility of having mouse-over definitions in the new toolkit.

RDA policy statements/local application profiles provide for local choice and variation in general instructions. RDA provides for local choice of data value vocabularies (controlled terminologies). Local terminology can be substituted for RDA vocabulary provided the scheme is identified, called Vocabulary Encoding Scheme (VES). In general, RDA intends to move away from prescriptive rules like ISBD. How you specify the components and the way they connect to each other in the statement is called a Syntax/string Encoding Scheme (SES).

RDA core elements are suggested, and agencies may choose to define local application profiles that may be applied generally or to specific categories of resources or entities. An application profile specifies: each element used by the agency, how it is aggregated into logical units of information, and if it is:

- mandatory or optional

- repeatable
- associated with a VES
- associated with an SES or datatype.

Datatype is normally associated with times/dates. The application profile provides for a local core.

Dublin Core application profile developed in 2009 is “a generic construct for designing metadata records that does not require the use of metadata terms defined by DCMI.” The DC application profile can be found on the DCMI website and is designed for catalogers, not for developers. The Singapore framework refers to the application profile DCMI finalized at the Singapore conference in 2009. It is highly relevant to RDA work. The basic framework says that to specify a full application you need to define a domain model (entities). The defined entities are brought together to create description set profiles, while instructions for building records are specified in usage guidelines. The human readable part of the framework is built on metadata vocabularies such as OMR and DC. The entire framework is built on RDF which is linked data.

For RDA to follow this model, the RDA Toolkit would constitute the usage guidelines while RDA Reference specifies the underlying domain model and vocabularies. Local application profile would select a set of RDA elements for the application and assign local vocabularies and syntax. RSC halted work on developing an application profile; however, the fact that CC:DA asked **Dunsire** to report on it has moved completing the application profile back to being a high priority.

The draft very basic RDA application profile took core elements from RDA and associated them with either syntax encoding schemes or content types. It also identified whether it was to be literal or a string that is to be a thing. The language is slightly fuzzy and not quite the same language used in RDA itself.

RDA application profile can define RDF domains and ranges, but allow local vocabularies to specify controlled terminology, and that this structure works within the RDA theory of the 4-fold path to access. An example is 3 types of strings that are recorded as literal: unstructured description *the capital city of Scotland*, structured description/access point *Edinburgh (City of Edinburgh, Scotland)*, or identifier *N 55° 57' 7"/W3° 11' 47"*. The URI (tgn:7009546) provides access to all of the above, and that is why things are better in strings. Linked data can accommodate RDA's fourfold path of representing descriptive bibliographic information, because the object of a triple can be either a URI or a literal string. Therefore a triple can accommodate an object URI, an identifier (preferably also a URI, but possibly a string), or a structured or unstructured description in a literal string.

The controlled vocabularies removed from RDA may become local vocabularies for specific communities of practice. For example, 9.7.1.3 Recording Gender used to be “female”, “male”, or “not known.” CC:DA’s suggestion of adding transgender released a maelstrom of intellectual

angst because of international considerations. It was determined that gender is subjective and should not be determined by librarians. The decision was to retain the element “Gender” because some applications require it and deprecated both the vocabulary value and recommended vocabulary in RDA. ALA wants the value vocabulary retained as a local vocabulary; therefore, it has been removed from global RDA, it has not been deregistered in the Registry, and the RSC is working out how to make it a local vocabulary in the Registry without changing anything. This is a test case for adding other local variations of vocabularies to RDA. This is on the development team agenda for resolution by the end of the year. Local AP for gender would use a local VES (ALA) that is not mandatory and is non-repeatable.

As a result of translation team feedback, another gender issue (not yet explored with RSC) is the removal of gender distinctions in roles (relationship designators) in favor of gender-neutral like “actor” in Anglophone countries, but not necessarily other languages. As a compromise, they have to make a compromise to use only one. What can we do? Make local refinements to vocabulary terms: Local *acteur* and *actrice* can be sub-properties of actor. The range of an *actrice* contributing to an expression- RDA Person, Sub-class Male and Female.

Conclusion. RDA is becoming about how to accommodate local in the global, accommodating national practice in an international framework, and presenting global data in local applications, which means we can focus on the individual in the crowd.

Discussion:

- CC:DA/ALA cannot use an AP to accommodate fictional characters because Person cannot be divided into fictitious and non-fictitious. **Dunsire** suggested introducing a local element qualifier for an entity: fictitious. This would be beneficial because fictitious places, etc., can also be included.
- FRBR-LRM will probably remain intact due to being an international model, but there are likely to be adjustments. It will definitely not be approved before the end of the summer, but **Dunsire** is trying to get it passed within the next year.
- The RSC response to the LRM draft is available by contacting **Glennan** (the constituent) for a private copy. There was a request for IFLA and the RSC to collect all of the responses in one place. IFLA is only publishing comments when they choose to make official responses to those comments.
- The RSC Relationship Designators Working Group was asked to produce a report of recommendations for the RSC meeting in November, where they should make a decision because of the moratorium.

Dunsire concluded by inviting anyone to reuse his PowerPoint presentation for future training sessions.

*Monday, June 27, 8:30–11:00 a.m.
Hilton Orlando, Orange Ballroom G*

1367. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Dominique Bourassa, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members.

1368. Report from the PCC liaison: Robare [[PCC Report](#)]

Robare highlighted key areas of her written report. Following the PCC Strategic Directions, the PCC has appointed several additional new committees:

- Linked Data Advisory Committee is working to advance the community's understanding and learning what is needed for the transition to a linked data environment
- Task Group on URIs in MARC
- Task Group on Identity Management in NACO, which is working on the shift in authority control from text strings to identities and entities
- BIBFRAME Task Group, which creates programming around BIBFRAME and other linked data activities

The SCS approved an updated version of the PCC Guidelines for Creating Bibliographic Records in Multiple Character Sets. Notification will be sent to the PCC list when the policy statement revisions incorporating changes from the April 2016 Toolkit release and the BSR and CSR revisions to incorporate DCRM(C) are complete. The SCS is continuing work on a proposal about language expressions to provide recommendations regarding authorized access points for translations. A task group has been formed to produce a white paper on the issues surrounding the identification of work entities.

The SCT has been working on series training following the major revision of the NACO series manual. The SCT published a report on available linked data training resources that is being kept up to date. A joint SCS-SCT working group is nearly finished developing guidelines for relationship designators in authority records.

The SCA is investigating omitting ISBD punctuation from MARC records, and a report is forthcoming.

The PCC Orlando meeting focused on a discussion about the inferences and assertions we currently make while cataloging and how that would translate into a linked data environment. The participant's meeting had presentations on linked open data and scripted cataloging of library books.

Discussion followed about relationship designator problems that come up in authority records.

1369. Report of the MAC Representative: Myers [[Report of the MAC Liaison \(Preliminary\)](#)]

Myers reported on MAC's actions regarding the 25 proposals and discussion papers considered, which are explained in the written report. 10 of the proposals passed, 1 will need to be reworked. 7 of the discussion papers will be proposals, 5 were converted to proposals and subsequently passed. 1 will return as a re-worked discussion paper, and 1 was effectively withdrawn because the committee figured out how to solve the problem using existing MARC structures.

The MAC meeting schedule has gone from 9 hours down to 4 hours of scheduled meeting time, so the dynamics of the committee are changing. They are beginning to respond to proposals in advance and compile information ahead of time. The executive group for MARC will also be exploring ideas for using fast track proposals. **Myers** will begin passing on more papers for CC:DA's input throughout the year. It was suggested that **Myers** identify in advance the papers most pertinent to CC:DA (descriptive rather than systems).

1370. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Chair on behalf of Guajardo

The **chair** advised new CC:DA members and liaisons that the Webmaster will coordinate with the new Chair to create their accounts for the blog. The webmaster updated all documents on the website to reflect the changes from JSC to RSC and from MARBI to MAC. WordPress has been upgraded to version 4.5.3. Spam filtering is working well considering the volume of traffic. Please email the Webmaster with any questions.

1371. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Hennelly

Hennelly discussed the following:

- With 2 more months in the fiscal year, 2016 peaked with 2,051 subscriptions. The renewal rate is running at 94%. Users are up about 5% (8,969), with an average of 3.3 users per subscription. Revenues are looking to be right on target. Toolkit sessions were up 20% from last year.
- *RDA Essentials* was released in April, but it did not include the April Toolkit updates. 688 copies were sold in the first month. There was a free webinar at the end of May to support the book that attracted about 300 registrants and 220 live views.
- International sales outside of the United States have grown to 43% of the total subscriber base and 54% of users.
- An aggressive marketing campaign in Latin America is beginning.
- ALA Publishing is still providing online RDA training courses: 3 over the past year sold 77 total units.
- No print release of RDA this year. ALA Publishing will wait for the LRM to be fully rolled out and implemented in RDA, at which time it will publish a new edition and also a new edition of *RDA Essentials*. It wants to get Thomas Brenndorfer, author of the *RDA Essentials*, more involved with the RSC in order to avoid releasing a new edition before the updates, as happened in April 2016.

- Toolkit releases will stay on the same schedule, with the next release in August to include the fast track changes and updates to the translations.
- All translations will be current with the April 2016 release no later than October. The goal is to have the translations out in a reasonable amount of time after each update.
- For 2017, there will be 4 releases: February, April, August, and October. Expect to see new translations for Catalan and Norwegian. At the request of the Swiss, the German policy statements will be translated to French and Italian.
- Translations of the RDA glossary are added to the registry when any kind translation contracts are made, including the print-only translations in Slovakia and Vietnam.

RDA Toolkit updates:

- Improvements have recently been made to the admin interface which introduced a “master profile” that allows the head cataloger to control what is displayed for all of the users of their institution. This should be useful for hiding irrelevant policy statements.
- Ongoing project of creating a synchronization platform to sync the registry and the Toolkit so that when glossary work gets done in the registry, it is automatically pulled and disbursed throughout the instructions.

Toolkit redesign and restructure (not only user interface, but also backend changes) broad goals:

1. Improve accessibility of the site and move to a responsive design platform so that it can be used on tablets and smart phones.
2. Restructuring of data to incorporate changes caused by the LRM and also to improve work processes and allow a greater flexibility of content.
3. Improved user experience to make the Toolkit more valuable to catalogers.

Hennelly is forming a user group of catalogers who frequently use the Toolkit to provide more feedback. He hopes to have the group up and functioning by the end of July. RDAToolkit.org is being revised and will have regular updates as to the progress of the review and restructuring.

There was a question about how the redesign will allow catalogers to continue using the same instruction numbers. **Hennelly** responded that since the instruction numbers are just labels in the database, it is just about linking to the ID, so continuing to display the numbers is not a problem. The Toolkit designers are also working on the element set display from the Tools Tab, where the instructions are in parenthetical statements. **Hennelly** advised that the RSC discuss the numerical structure when implementing updates. Referring to Dunsire’s mention on Saturday of having glossary definitions as mouse-overs, **Hennelly** noted that mappings can be automatically generated, but it won’t affect the print edition.

Another question addressed the composition of the user group. **Hennelly** said to email him if anyone is very interested in joining, but the group will be mostly people he works with regularly so he knows he will receive concise and valuable feedback. There will also be translators and international perspectives, but he wants to keep the number under 10. He noted that anyone is always welcome to submit suggestions.

The final question was about technical difficulties with the Toolkit. **Hennelly** requested he be notified any time users receive error messages or slowness so that he is able to address problems as they occur.

1372. Proposal from AALL: Bratton [[Revision proposal for RDA instructions for laws governing more than one jurisdiction \(6.29.1.3\)](#)] [[Discussion](#)]

Bratton explained that the proposal was created because no instructions existed for the situation. In the proposal, the AALL came up with 4 possibilities:

1. Construct the authorized access point (AAP) using the first-named jurisdiction governed plus the preferred title. This was not ideal because it creates incorrect implications.
2. Construct an AAP for each jurisdiction governed by the law plus the preferred title. Then multiple authorized access points would have to be created for a single work, which goes against the spirit of RDA.
3. Construct the AAP using only the preferred title of the law. This only works in cases where the jurisdiction is unclear.
4. Construct the AAP using the enacting jurisdiction plus the preferred title. This only works in cases where the jurisdiction is clear, which is nearly all of them, so this was the preferred option of the four.

Discussion ensued regarding how meaningful the authorized access points need to be. Normally in RDA, the authorized access point is the principal creator, which is normally the jurisdiction governed. Multiple access points are necessary, and should include who enacts the law, and who is governed by the law. RDA 6.29.3 covers variant access points, and adding an example which covers the situation is all that is needed. This follows the spirit of having simplified instructions in RDA.

The **chair** invited a motion to approve the proposal that **Glennan** and **Bratton** will update per the discussion. **Porter** moved, **Dyer** seconded, and the motion passed 8-0.

1373. Proposal from OLAC: Huismann on behalf McGrath [[Addition of new controlled vocabulary for 3.19.6 Regional Encoding](#)] [[Discussion](#)]

Huismann noted that regional encoding does not have a controlled vocabulary in chapter 3 of RDA, and OLAC is suggesting that adding one would be beneficial to users by improving consistency and improve data quality for machine manipulation. The proposal seeks to:

- A. Broaden the definition of regional encoding to encompass videodiscs and all video game carriers as some non-disc video game carriers use regional encoding schemes.

A suggestion was made to expand the definition of regional encoding even further to include all regions for which a carrier has been encoded. **Huismann** will share the suggestion with **McGrath** and OLAC after the meeting.

B. Establish standard terminology for discs that are intended to be playable on players designed for any region. They would prefer to use one term rather than having to use multiple terms or even trying to determine which of the 8 regional flags are set. They proposed 3 different solutions:

- 1) Choose one of the terms that may appear on commercially-distributed discs and make cross-references from the others.
 - All regions
 - Region 0
 - Region 9
 - Region free
- 2) Choose a term that is not known to appear on commercially-distributed discs and make cross-references from the terms in the list above. They suggested the term "no regional encoding." This would prevent the misconception that any given disc used the particular approach associated with one of the terms in the first list.
- 3) Record all regions in which it is known that the disc will play, which requires more data entry and is more difficult to implement with video games.

Discussion followed and the consensus was to have one specific term. The term "no regional encoding" was not favored due to implications about the cataloger not being sure where it could be viewed/played. The term "all regions" was ultimately found most favorable.

C. Lack of standardization of video game region encoding and the conflation with television broadcast standards.

Discussion followed about video games being too unstandardized for a controlled vocabulary. A suggestion was made to remove the video game portion of the proposal. A simple solution could be to use the instructions in 3.21.1 (Basic Instructions on Making Notes on Carriers) to record the encoding in an uncontrolled way.

OLAC developed a Plan B: to consider only regional encoding for DVD video, video on Blu-Ray, and the lettered video games (the only video games that are definable), i.e., Plan A without the numbered regions for video games.

A suggestion was made to add instructions clarifying that numbered regions for video games need to be recorded under carrier notes as opposed to being recorded under regional encoding.

The **chair** called for a straw poll to see who favored the plan as written (0 hands) versus Plan B (many hands).

The **chair** then invited a motion to approve the proposal revised to Plan B using the term "all regions" based on committee discussion. **Shoemaker** moved, **Kelley** seconded, and the motion passed 8-0.

1374. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

CAMMS Committee Chairs were requested to attend the CAMMS Executive Committee meeting to meet with the ALCTS president and president-elect, Norm Mederios and Vicki Sipe and to provide reports. The **Chair** reported that ALCTS has budget challenges, although it is doing better than expected. The association needs to become a more financially sustainable organization. It is hoping to grow revenue in 2017, the 60th anniversary of ALCTS, with a giving campaign, interactive engagements including in-person events at 2017 Annual with the possibility of a cruise. It is working on bringing in new members and growing the mentoring program. There is a new ALCTS slogan: “creating the future, preserving the past.”

The **chair** noted that she plus 4 voting members would be leaving the committee this year: Steve Kelley, Gayle Porter, Larisa Walsh, and Elyssa Gould. The **chair** thanked them for their service on the committee over the last years. Amanda Ros, one of the current interns, will become a voting member, and Heather McIntosh will continue on as an Intern. Shrader will announce the official new voting members on the listserv. Emily Thaisrivongs will take the second intern spot. Five liaisons are also leaving: Tassanee Chitcharoen (ALA/GODORT) will be replaced by Andrea Morrison, Matthew Haugen (ALA/ACRL/RBMS) will be replaced by Amy Tims, Cory Nimer (SAA) will be replaced by Weatherly Stephan, Judy Knop (ATLA) will be replaced by Armin Siedlecki, and Dorothy McGarry (SLA) will be replaced by Leoma Dunn. The **chair** thanked them for their service.

Myers introduced the following resolution:

Resolved:

Whereas, **Dorothy McGarry**, began service on CC:DA in 1982;

Whereas, her service has constituted two terms as voting member (1982-1986, 2001-2005), a term as chair (1985-1986), and two terms as liaison from the Special Libraries Association (1992-1993, 2004-2016);

Whereas, she has served on numerous CC:DA Task Forces, including those on “an Alpha Prototype of Reorganized Part I [of AACR2],” on “Consistency across Part I of AACR2,” to “Revise *Building International Cataloging Standards*,” and to “Review the *Statement of International Cataloging Principles*” to name an inadequate sample from just her current active tenure from 2001;

Whereas, over two-thirds of her ongoing service to CC:DA has been since her formal retirement from full-time work at the UCLA Libraries in 1993;

Whereas, she served the wider library cataloging community through membership on the IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records;

Whereas, she additionally served on the Advisory Group to the IFLA Working Group on the Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records;

Whereas, she additionally served on several IFLA groups concerning the maintenance of the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD);

Whereas, she preserved the historical roots of contemporary cataloging by being co-compiler and co-editor with Elaine Svenonius, of the writings of Seymour Lubetzky;

Whereas, she made her own contribution to those historical roots as an interview subject for “Capturing Our Stories: Oral History Program of Retired/Retiring Librarians,” a presidential initiative of former ALA President Lorienne Roy;

And, whereas, she has served as a ready friend and consultant to numerous Chairs and Interns in carefully reviewing the minutes of CC:DA meetings, and thereby elevated the formal record of the committee’s deliberations;

CC:DA rises in universal acclaim of her lengthy service on and significant contributions to CC:DA and the wider cataloging community.

Shrader moved that CC:DA issue the statement into the record as an official declaration of our thanks to Dorothy. The motion was seconded by **Gould** and a standing ovation ensued.

The next meeting will be held in Atlanta, Georgia at the 2017 ALA Midwinter Meeting. The following times were requested:

Saturday, January 21
Monday, January 23

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 10:47 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Heather McIntosh, Intern
Amanda Ros, Intern