

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
2018 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Denver, Colorado
February 10 and 12, 2018
Draft**

Members present:

Tina Shrader, Chair
Daniel Jergovic
Teresa M. Keenan
Tim Kiser
Heather McIntosh
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann
Amanda L. Ros
Glen Wiley
Kathryn Lybarger, Intern
Emily Thaisrivongs, Intern
Richard Guajardo, Webmaster

Ex-officio representatives:

Dominique Bourassa, ALA Representative to the NARDAC
Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the NARDAC
Nathan Putnam OCLC, ex officio

ALA Liaisons present:

Felicity Dykas, ALA/ACRL
Peter V. Fletcher, ALCTS/CRS
Jessica Hayden, ALCTS/MIG
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC
Andrea Morrison, ALA/GODORT
Amy Tims, ALA/ACRL/RBMS
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Jia Xu, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons:

Jean Pajerek, AALL
Diane Hillmann, DCMJ
Mary Huisman, MLA
Armin Siedlecki, ATLA

Kelley McGrath, OLAC
John Myers, [CC:DA liaison to] MAC
Diane Napert, ARSC
Weatherly Stephan, SAA
Everett Allgood, PCC
Karen Stafford, ARLIS/NA
Amanda K. Sprochi, MedLA
Jay Weitz, IFLA Cataloging Section Liaison

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:

AALL = American Association of Law Libraries
AAP = Authorized access point
ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate
ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries
AJL = Association of Jewish 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*
FRBRoo = FRBR-object oriented
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
IFLA-LRM = IFLA-Library Reference Model
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (up to 2016)
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
NARDAC = North American RDA Committee
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
OMR = Open Metadata Registry
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PRESSoo = extension of FRBRoo to describe serials and continuing resources
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
SLA = Special Libraries Association

URI = Uniform Resource Identifier

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

*Saturday, February 10, 1:00–5:30 p.m.
Sheraton Denver Downtown, Plaza Ballroom F*

1407. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Tina Shrader, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and welcomed voting members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members.

1408. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

The **Chair** recognized **Bourassa's** return to CC:DA as one of the ALA representatives to NARDAC. Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

The **Chair** invited committee members, liaisons, and representatives to initial a roster sheet and audience members to sign a separate attendance sheet.

1409. Adoption of agenda: Chair

The **Chair** noted that **Reser** is not able to give the Library of Congress report in person. The **Chair** asked for additional changes to the agenda. None were posed. The **Chair** invited a motion to adopt the agenda. **McIntosh** moved, **Ros** seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

1410. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2017 Annual Meeting: Chair [[Minutes of the meeting held at the 2017 ALA Annual Meeting in Chicago, Illinois](#)]

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 **Chair** invited a motion to accept the minutes as final. **Ros** moved, **Poehlmann** seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

1411. Report from the Chair [[Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions July-December 2017](#)]

The Chair reported that the CC:DA activities since Annual consisted of the formation and final report of the CC:DA Faceted Vocabularies Task Force, as well as the continuing work of the 3R Project Task Force. The **Chair** invited a motion to accept the report as final. **Wiley** moved, **Jergovic** seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

1412. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Reser [[Library of Congress Report](#)]

Reser was unable to present the report in person. The **Chair** asked for comments. None were given. A fuller report is available at <http://www.loc.gov/ala/>.

1413. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo

Guajardo stated that there has been little blog activity since Annual. ALA has been working on upgrades to some of its servers. The ALA division websites are also being refreshed and being rolled out one division at a time. **Guajardo** said we might want to update the look and feel of the CC:DA blog site in light of that. Most of the plugins that we are using on the CC:DA blog have been shareware (i.e. free of charge), but some of the plugins will now be fee-based. We will need to decide if we want to use some of those fee-based plugins.

1414. Report of the CC:DA 3R Task Group: Ros

Ros reported that the task force is using Google Team Drive to share documents because some of the documents are proprietary in nature. Since June 30th they have reviewed 50 documents. They have taken a comprehensive look at what has been going on with the 3R project—from a draft of the introduction, to element clusters, to manifestation statements. **Ros** referenced yesterday’s preconference “RDA Toolkit Redesign Update and Preview” where there was a lively discussion about how many past versions of the Toolkit should be archived and continue to be accessible. The task force had looked at the background document for changes over time for the instructions in the Toolkit; they agreed that more than a short period of time should be kept. The task force has also looked at the reasoning behind the non-human personages decision and concurred with how that work is progressing.

Ros believes that the task force has provided the RSC with a lot of constructive feedback and has tried to represent CC:DA and its constituents well in the process. She thanked members of the task force for all of the hard work they have put in, particularly as they were under short deadlines. **Glennan** also thanked the task force members. She stated that one of the reasons that the task force was formed was to make sure all of the ALA feedback was not only coming from her. **Glennan** said that the task force has not had much work to do since the RSC meeting in October 2017. The task force has not been dissolved yet because there is a possibility that the RSC will work with the task force again before the June 2018 release of the Toolkit.

The 3R Project Task Force roster [is posted on the CC:DA blog](#).

1415. Report of the ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee: Glennan [[Report on RSC Activities, July-December 2017](#)]

Glennan reported on RSC Membership and Governance changes, NARDAC developments (including its Terms of Reference), 3R Project highlights, RSC website updates, RDA issues under discussion, the RSC Plus meeting, and IFLA documents of interest.

Additional information about NARDAC developments:

- Because **Glennan** is chair-elect of the RSC, she was appointed to a one-year term. ALCTS will be looking to fill one of the two positions for the NARDAC representative in the fall. If you are interested in serving on NARDAC, let **Glennan** and **Bourassa** know.
- NARDAC must identify the NARDAC chair and its RSC representative. That might be the same person, but it does not have to be.
- The NARDAC members were announced this week:
 - ALA: **Glennan** and **Bourassa**
 - CCC: Thomas Brenndorfer (Guelph Public Library) and Nathalie Mainville, (Library and Archives Canada)
 - LC: Damian Iseminger (Head of the Bibliographic Access Section in the Music Division and current chair of the RSC Music Working Group) and Kate James (Head of Policy and Standards Division and current RDA Examples Editor)
- NARDAC will be meeting virtually.
- NARDAC is an umbrella committee and not intended to replace CC:DA, CCC, or LC.
- The charge of NARDAC is to:
 1. Formulate North American positions on RDA proposals, discussion papers, and drafts.
 - Initiate, review and/or finalize proposals and discussion papers emanating from the various North American communities.
 - Develop formal responses to proposals and discussion papers emanating from other regions and RSC Working Groups.
 - Suggest acceptable bases for negotiations during RSC discussions.
 2. Keep the North American communities informed of RDA developments and RSC decisions.
 - Encourage members of the North American communities to participate in the development and revision process by expressing opinions on the issues, volunteering to serve on RSC working groups, drafting papers, etc.
 3. Select a member of NARDAC to serve as the North American regional representative to the RSC. The representative's responsibilities include:
 - Attending RSC meetings, participating in discussions, presenting proposals and discussion papers from North America, and participating in the discussions at the RSC meeting.
 - Serving as the primary "point person" for regular communications with the RSC, and between the RSC and other NARDAC members. Consulting with NARDAC members and other experts as needed.
 - Keeping NARDAC informed of RSC decisions.

4. Respond to other RSC initiatives as they arise.
 5. Support the work of the RSC by helping to identify possible members for the working groups that have the appropriate expertise within the North American region.
- If you hear of something that you would like to be involved with, let your NARDAC representatives know that you have the time and interest to serve.
 - NARDAC has the ability to co-opt up to two additional members based on the needs for expertise as determined by NARDAC. The terms for the co-opted members will be set at the time of appointment and co-opted members have the same voting rights as regular members.
 - The term of the NARDAC chair will be three years; no more than two terms may be served consecutively and the chair will rotate among representatives from the communities (i.e. ALA, CCC, and LC).
 - The RDA Board representative for North America will be a nonvoting ex-officio member of NARDAC.
 - The selection of and term limits for NARDAC members are based on the requirements of their respective communities.
 - The Terms of Reference also outlines how to replace someone if necessary, defines what a quorum is, and states that members are expected to attend at least 50% of the meetings.
 - The Terms of Reference will be continue to be revised.
 - NARDAC will have a space on the RSC website, as will the rest of the RSC regional groups. The Terms of Reference will be added to the website as well.
 - The frequency of communication will vary depending on tasks facing the committee and the timeline of the RSC.
 - When appropriate, NARDAC members will vote on documents to be forwarded to the RSC.
 - NARDAC will always aim to reach a decision by consensus, although it is acknowledged that there are times when agreement cannot be reached in this way. In this case decisions will be reached by simple voting majority of the members. When opinions are divided, the minority positions will be identified and explained in documents to be forwarded to the RSC. For example, if ALA supports a proposal that CCC and LC do not, that proposal can still be presented to the RSC as long as it meets the expectations of the RSC in what kinds of things are under consideration.
 - NARDAC should maintain a relationship with the editors of policy statements included in the Toolkit.
 - NARDAC will establish guidelines for open postings of documents, announcements, and minutes of its deliberations as appropriate.
 - NARDAC has not met yet. **Glennan** will be sending out the first message to the members next week.

Allgood asked why the RSC governance change occurred in the first place. **Glennan** replied that the governance change at the RSC level has been mirrored at the RDA Board level. RDA is becoming more international and there is a need to make sure that all of the regions that adopt RDA have a voice. The RDA Board transition—moving to include 6 regional representatives

based on UN regions—happened first, and they decided that the RSC should adopt a similar approach. **Reser**, Bill Leonard, and **Glennan** were charged with determining the structure for the North American constituency. Based on feedback, they decided that the best structure was an umbrella committee approach—not trying to recreate CC:DA or its equivalent at the North American level, instead building on the committee structures already in place.

Additional information about the 3R Project:

- The RSC wants to make the process by which communities submit proposals to revise RDA more responsive. The RSC feels that the current process is very time consuming. It can take over a year from the time a proposal is submitted to when the change appears in the Toolkit. If the RSC keeps the current approval process, proposals from CC:DA could take longer now that NARDAC is in place.
- For a period of time after the new Toolkit is released the RSC will likely only be accepting proposals that are refinements to RDA rather than significant overhauls.

Additional information about the RDA issues under discussion:

- **Glennan** highlighted the following issues under discussion: coreness, non-human personages, provenance for information (i.e., where did this data come from, who said it, how reliable is it), representative expression elements, serial harmonization, use of nomen, and user tasks.
- **Bourassa** asked what the new Expression elements and glossary terms are (referenced in **Glennan's** “New RDA content from specialist communities section” of the report). **Glennan** stated that it should be covered in Gordon Dunsire's presentation that **Glennan** will give later at this meeting.

Additional information about the RSC Plus meeting

- There is now a working group on serials. Serials experts within our community have been involved, including Les Hawkins and Regina Reynolds.

Discussion about the RSC Plus meeting

- Comment about “LRM and serials” from **Allgood**: There's a cleanness and simplification of serials and other works that change over time in LRM that doesn't exist in nature or on a practical level. One of the major criticisms of AACR2 before the 2002 serial rule revisions was that AACR2 was very item and very print specific. Want to encourage **Glennan** and the RSC to embrace the discussions and progress that have been made in the serials and continuing resource communities. From a practical level, we also need to be aware of where the library community is at this moment in time. Tech services departments are not expanding and therefore we do not want to complicate things too much. The **Chair**, as a serials cataloger, endorsed **Allgood's** comments. **Glennan** said that everyone should be encouraged that both Hawkins and Reynolds are involved in this process.
- Comment about “Removal of appendices” from **Allgood**: Where will the relationship designators be relocated? **Linda Barnhart** (RSC Secretary) replied that those

relationships designators are really also elements so they are going to be interfiled with the rest of the attributes and the rest of the elements underneath the entity to which they belong. **Glennan** added that the RSC knows that more work needs to be done on the relationship designators (e.g., guidelines on the level of granularity, approval process for new relationship designators).

- **Hillmann** suggested a different approach for managing relationship designators. She said that we must work with specialist communities who need something a little bit more granular or something that follows a pattern that RDA created that is not so text and book oriented. If we can figure out how to do properly and how to host that in a way so people can use it within an RDA context without CC:DA having to approve anything and using certain relationship designators as a model like LCSH pattern headings. This approach would be much more useful and would increase the participation. **Glennan** stated that the RSC recognizes that there needs to be change, but is focused on the 3R Project now. **Maxwell** endorsed **Hillmann's** ideas.
- In response to **Glennan's** example of the books of the Bible being relocated to a different area of the Toolkit: **Maxwell** asked why that list needs to remain in RDA if we have authority files. **Glennan** replied that the list has been moved to the Resources tab because it is effectively a policy statement and everyone does not have an authority file. **Morrison** seconded the issue with relationship designators. The GODORT community has wanted to use relationship designators from other vocabularies, but RDA instructs you to use RDA vocabularies. The GODORT community has created a working group on relationship designators and will closely be following developments.
- **Morrison** brought up the visual problems of the current Toolkit. **Glennan** said that there are screenshots of the new Toolkit available on the 3R Project website and **Hennelly** will be demoing the new Toolkit later today at this meeting. They are working to make sure that the new Toolkit will meet the W3C accessibility standards.
- **Hillmann** said that what **Morrison** is talking about is very much remnant of the CC:DA must approve things philosophy. A specialized community like GODORT might have access to other vocabularies. But those vocabularies need to be published and discoverable. The important thing is keeping that choice with the specialized community (i.e. to use RDA or non-RDA vocabularies). **Glennan** replied that one of the things that RDA has been moving more and more towards is not creating more vocabularies, but instead pointing out to external vocabularies (e.g., medium of performance terms). RDA cannot identify and absorb all of the vocabularies that are out there. RDA will tell you what the RDA vocabularies are, but communities can decide what vocabularies are most appropriate for them.

Glennan announced that this is the last report CC:DA will receive from the ALA Representative to the JSC/RSC due to the changes in governance. She noted one correction to her report: she has served in this position for the past four and a half years, not five and a half years. **Glennan** received rousing applause from the CC:DA members and audience. The **Chair** thanked **Glennan** for her service and said that CC:DA looks forward to having **Glennan** serve as one of ALA's representatives to NARDAC.

1416. Report from the PCC liaison: Allgood [[PCC Report](#)]

Allgood highlighted key areas from his report posted on the CC:DA website. More information is available at <http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/>

PCC activities and reports:

- Beginning development on a new PCC strategic plan
- White paper: *Linked Data Infrastructure Models: Areas of Focus for PCC Strategies*
- Update from the PCC URIs Task Group
- Testing use of limited ISBD punctuation in bibliographic records (through July 1, 2018)
- Plans for PCC RDA Authorities Phase 3 have been scaled back due to technical constraints

Standing Committee on Standards:

- Policy statement on language expressions under review by LC
- NACO Consultation Board – Discussions underway with Paul Frank regarding charge and membership, as well as PCC Standing Committee representation
- PCC Task Group on Supplements and Special Numbers for Serials – Re-writing policy statements and related documentation, gathering examples

Standing Committee on Training:

- ISNI Training Task Group
 - Chaired by John Hostage
 - Charged with developing ISNI training curriculum, documenting procedures and workflows, using ISNI tools
- Library Reference Model (LRM) Training Task Group
 - Charge finalized in the next month

Standing Committee on Applications:

- Working with Policy Committee, developing plan to test MARC records with limited ISBD punctuation

1417. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Hennelly

Hennelly reported the following (with statistics current through December 2017):

- RDA Toolkit has 2748 active subscribers, 9399 users (about 3.4 users per subscription). Renewal rate 94%.
- Numbers are increasing, largely due to international sales. But, the ratio of non-US subscribers/users to US subscribers/users is steady.

- Toolkit usage has increased; specifically increase in sessions (nearly 20%), page views, search page views, document page views. Increase in free trials.
- Modest sales of print edition of RDA and *RDA Essentials*; ALA store now includes a caveat that buying print RDA products is not recommended until after completion of 3R
- New products
 - There will be new editions of RDA print and *RDA Essentials* after the completion of 3R
 - Gearing up to provide free training webinars for new Toolkit
 - Translation updates: Norwegian translation is complete and will be released on Tuesday. Signed contract for Hungarian translation after 3R. Close to completion on Arabic translation. In initial conversations with folks in Brazil about Portuguese translation.
 - After Tuesday's release, current Toolkit content will be frozen; no changes or updates until new Toolkit.

1418. Presentation on RDA Toolkit changes: Hennelly

Hennelly demonstrated the new RDA Toolkit website under development.

Highlights included:

- Removed the double login requirement for users that do not access the Toolkit by IP address
- Added “Recently viewed instructions” feature that allows users to see the last 5 instructions viewed
- Entities: page for an entity includes definition, usage, MARC mapping, policy statements
- Documents: shareable user-contributed documents, with visual editor and revision history
- Resources: AACR2, and other useful but non-RDA documents
- Visual browser of RDA elements
- Revision history: For each release they'll put out a document (i.e. release notes) that describes what changes have been made. The old PDFs for instructions will be archived. Hennelly's initial solution was to keep the release reports for the last two years, after which they would be moved into the ALA archive. There has been pushback on this idea and Hennelly stated that he was open to a different approach. But, there are space considerations for keeping revisions and it is important to have use cases. This generated lively discussion:
 - **Allgood**: preservation is core to what libraries do. Keeping only the last two years of release reports is not sufficient. Digital storage costs have been decreasing, so could explore different storage options for revision histories.
 - **Morrison**: as a researcher, she needs to be able to cite RDA rules in her publications.
 - **Maxwell**: wanted clarification that the revision history in the new Toolkit will include the revision history of the current Toolkit. Hennelly responded that the revision history of the current Toolkit will most likely need to be PDFs.

Schedule:

- Release date: June 13. There are lower expectations for what will be ready for that release: should include all English-language material, one policy statement. Full 3R rollout will be in August.
- Old RDA Toolkit site will remain active for one year following completion of new site

Lori Robare asked about instruction number on the new site, prompting discussion:

- Numbering often causes problems when instructions change, and implies an order
- New tool is highly flexible, more of a data dictionary than a book
- Could LRM order be used?
- Some kind of order will have to be used for the print version
- URIs are useful for emails, but not for shorthand in cataloger discussion
- Could something other than numbers be used? Element names or similar would have a language bias

1419. Presentation on RDA Pop-up Meeting in Chicago: Glennan (sub for Dunsire)

Glennan reported on the pop-up meeting at ALA Annual, June 26, 2017 held in the second CC:DA slot:

- Representatives were present from special materials cataloging communities: archival, audiovisual, cartographic, government, music, rare materials
- Results
 - Identified low-hanging fruit: enhancements to be included in 3R project for June 2018
 - Informed RDA Steering Committee for post-3R
 - Explored ways of engagement with wider community
- The following proposed RDA elements were accepted:
 - Interactivity mode [audiovisual]
 - Medium of performance of choreographic content
 - Opus number [music]
 - Prime meridian [cartographic]
 - Relief type [cartographic]
 - Serial number [music]
 - Thematic index number [music]
- Representative expression values used to identify and distinguish works – from IFLA-LRM:
 - Some elements moved from Work to Expression (e.g. key of representative expression)
 - Some new elements (e.g., aspect ratio of representative expression)
- General enhancements
 - Treatment of aggregates and serials

- Recording methods, access points, and identifiers
- Alignment with IFLA-LRM
- Subsequent alignment with FRBRoo and PRESSoo (extensions of CIDOC Conceptual Reference Model)

Discussion:

- **Bourassa** asked if there were plans to include performed movement.
- **Maxwell** commented that the new “medium of performance of choreographic content” element may need an associated representative expression element.
- **Dykas asked** if needs of particular communities are not met, how to get those addressed (i.e. online resources)? **Glennan** responded that you should make CC:DA aware of needs, where RDA is falling short; it can be passed up through NARDAC. If there is a broader need, RSC can form a working group.
- **Bourassa** asked if there are needs we’ve identified as a community that won’t be addressed as part of the 3R project, how do we get those needs addressed post-3R? **Glennan** responded that with the governance structure changing, processes are not solidified yet. In cases where RSC does not have the expertise, RSC will consult with experts to get those instructions written.

The **Chair** recessed the meeting at 4:07 p.m.

*Monday, February 12, 8:30–11:00 a.m.
Sheraton Denver Downtown, Plaza Ballroom F*

1420. Welcome, introductions of committee members: Chair

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

1421. Report of the MAC Representative: Myers [[Report of the MAC Liaison \(Final\)](#)]

- At this conference, MAC reviewed 1 proposal and 6 discussion papers.
 - The single proposal (Coding 007 Field Positions for Digital Cartographic Materials in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Holdings Formats) passed with a minor amendment.
 - Of the 6 discussion papers: 4 will likely return as proposals, 1 was converted at the table into a proposal and passed (addition of subfield \$3 to several existing 3XX fields), 1 may be reworked and submitted as a subsequent discussion paper.

1422. New directions for CC:DA: Hillmann

Hillmann began by explaining the context and impetus for this presentation

- She has been involved with CC:DA and MARBI (Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee) for many years. She reflected on two things that have drawn individuals to participate in these committees: the engaged discussions among smart people with various viewpoints; the detailed discussion and wordsmithing on the RDA Toolkit and its predecessors.
- She is unsure if CC:DA has come to terms with the major changes that the RDA reorganization is bringing and how it should adapt. If we decide that CC:DA should have a different focus, one way we could carve out time would be to reduce the amount of time spent on routine reporting during CC:DA meeting, in favor of more substantive discussion.
- She explained that in this presentation she will offer up some comments, ideas, and questions in order to generate a discussion about what the most valuable efforts of this group are and what changes might make this group a much more vibrant place for discussion and a place for people to learn. In order for this group to continue to thrive (including receiving funding from ALA), we need people to understand why there is value in bringing this group together.

Hillmann raised the following comments, questions, and ideas:

- She urged members and liaisons to consider what their interests are in being part of CC:DA—what work would they like to be involved in and how would they like to participate in that work?
- Cataloging and metadata management is undergoing intense changes, which should prompt CC:DA to evaluate its focus and role as we evolve from the current MARC-based environment into an environment of linked open data.
- She noted that CC:DA’s work has always included discussions about and recommendations for RDA as well as larger discussions about policy and end user needs.
- One of the values of CC:DA is the representation of specialized cataloging groups.
 - CC:DA could intensify its focus on representing specialist communities in the RDA development process, and be a more effective advocate for those communities by lowering the barriers to participation in CC:DA.
 - Another area where CC:DA could advocate for and increase the participation of specialist communities is by encouraging vocabulary development to meet the needs of specialist communities.
- CC:DA could increase its involvement in several technical areas:
 - Several communities (e.g., MODS and MADS) use application profiles, but it an incomplete effort because it is only a documentary effort at this point. There is no widely-adopted technical way to create machine readable application profiles. Could form a CC:DA task group to look at application profile projects and report back to CC:DA about ways that CC:DA can impact that work in a meaningful way.
 - Provenance of data. We need to think about the uses of provenance in the kind of world we want going forward. This is not a new issue: there are groups, technical and otherwise, thinking about and writing about this issue. The evaluation of data

becomes increasingly more critical as we move into an open world. We've always been evaluating data, but what we need are more tools to evaluate and more information to evaluate.

- Vocabulary development.
 - This has the potential to really allow us to get into the open world with the ideas that we know about as part of a closed world. **Hillmann** pointed out the RDA Registry website (<https://www.rdaregistry.info/>) as an example for how to develop and manage vocabularies. We need to think of ourselves in some respect as developers and recognize what expertise we can bring to the table in tech environments. There are plenty of people who can code, but not as many who can instruct them on what to code.
 - For an introduction on vocabulary development, see [NISO TR-06-2017, Issues in Vocabulary Management](#).
 - Several of the vocabulary efforts have been grant funded. When the funding dries up, the tools and vocabularies are not always maintained.
- CC:DA could take a greater role in education and training:
 - People want to understand what a linked open data environment will bring and how their work will change in such an environment. Many catalogers don't have the skills necessary for creating linked open data, and there is a need to identify and develop resources for the community to use in adapting to the rapidly evolving environment. For example: teaching catalogers to look at and understand RDF.
 - How do we prepare both ourselves and future members of this group to lead efforts around change? Are there opportunities for CC:DA to partner with other areas of ALCTS or ALA to increase knowledge amongst cataloging practitioners?
- **Hillmann** noted the following gaps in our world:
 - Services to enable libraries to separate their storage requirements from their distribution and sharing needs. The one standard to rule them all is a futile quest. Instead, we need to be aware of what the standards can and cannot do and how to work with them.
 - Practical projects and ways to work with vendors to enable their tools to incorporate RDA and other standards and to push back on system requirements.
 - Ways, besides crosswalks, to prepare data for different uses. Crosswalks are only applicable for taking data from one format to another format.
- We need to be aware of where our view of standards narrows our field of vision. Should we shift from the idea of standards to best practices. Often people want to know how to do their work well and how to evaluate what they are doing and what others are doing.
- **Hillmann** closed with stating that she wants CC:DA to take on the challenge of engaging the communities that it represents, to learn more key issues, and to lead the change.

1423. Discussion of CC:DA directions: Hillmann, Chair

The committee reviewed the CC:DA charge in preparation for discussion of **Hillmann's** report, noting that we can recommend changes to this charge if needed.

Topics of discussion included:

- Should the role of CC:DA change?
 - We already have a role as a place where specialists can bring their proposals
 - We could be reviewing application profiles for specialist communities
 - If PCC changes their scope, will any of their responsibilities be picked up by CC:DA or other committees?
 - When we talk about other activities, we are adding them to our current responsibilities, not replacing them.
 - We should not stop doing our traditional work. Learning more will improve our ability to respond in ways that are more forward thinking, just based on past cataloging standards. We can attract people with these interests to CC:DA.
 - Should consider how this relates to NARDAC.
 - We should consider partnering with LITA and other areas of ALA.
 - This group should have a formal role of lobbying with LLAMA, educate administrations about importance of what we are doing.
 - We should keep in mind that we are in somewhat of a lull right now, but will soon have much more to talk about. After the new Toolkit is released, we will have less time for presentations and training (but will have to discuss vocabulary extension).

- Should CC:DA provide training?
 - We should be seeking out ways within the committee to increase our knowledge of linked data principles and metadata standards other than MARC; we could more effectively discuss and evaluate proposals on those topics if we were more familiar with them.
 - We have liaisons to other groups; could we draw on those relationships to bring in people to help? Could we work more closely with groups in LITA?
 - We rely on PCC to do training and documentation, and do not want to duplicate their effort, but we tend not to provide that support to communities not supported by PCC (like public libraries).
 - If there is interest, could we make an effort to broaden the committee's scope? Choose one topic (e.g. extending vocabularies, application profiles) that seems practical, have a task force explore, and bring back to the group for discussion.
 - Could we provide training before our regular meetings on topics such as creating RDA proposals (so that communities know what we are expecting in a good proposal)?

- Should the structure of our meetings change?
 - Should we have some of our meetings virtually, or allow some virtual attendance? With travel budgets shrinking, this would allow more people to participate. The **Chair** took a straw poll of the room on how much interest there was in exploring virtual meetings and having more flexible liaison relations. There seemed to be broad support for both.
 - With virtual meetings, we would have to make an extra effort to comply with ALA's open meetings policy.
 - Some members find conference calls unfriendly, more difficult to navigate. Such meetings may be more efficient, but less rich. They may work better for small groups.
 - We must strike a balance between the value of face-to-face interaction and the value of involving people who could not be here.
 - Virtual meetings would allow us some flexibility; we could choose to meet quarterly and share updates progressively rather than all at once at the large meetings.
 - Should we continue to meet at both ALA Midwinter and ALA Annual? Our liaisons (such as MLA) may have additional annual meetings to attend.
 - We have a limited amount of face-to-face time with the group at conferences. We should not be spending that time listening to reports that we could read ahead of time. We should be spending that time on networking, brainstorming, and having discussions that are more difficult to have asynchronously.
 - We should explore different models. The ALCTS Forum tried a different model at this ALA Midwinter: facilitated small group discussion, reporting back to the larger group.

Action items for Annual:

- Create a task force to work on increasing liaison activity, and explore virtual meetings as a way of making us more flexible and productive.
- Organize a task force to explore one of these big picture ideas (to be determined on CCDA public listserv).

Other discussion:

- From the audience: New Toolkit Content released in June, just before ALA Annual. Could any content be released early, to allow time for comments or proposals? The timing would be very tight. **Linda Barnhart** shared that RSC is already preparing a list of issues that will need more attention for discussion at their October meeting.
- **Glennan** responded that energy is currently devoted to having a functional product in June that gives an idea of where RDA is going. The RSC will have to make hard decisions about what will not be included at that time, and those decisions are being documented. Much of what may be excluded from the June release may be addressed by

August/September release. If older issues still unaddressed at that time, let the RSC know.

1424. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

Sprochi announced that this is her last meeting as MedLA liaison, MedLA is working to find a new liaison for this position. She thanked everyone for being wonderful colleagues to work with and she has greatly enjoyed her time on the committee.

The **Chair** acknowledged the passing of John Byrum, a well-known member of the cataloging community. John was Head of Cataloging at Princeton University in the 1960s and early 1970s, but was probably best known as a Division Chief at the Library of Congress from 1976 to 2006, when he retired. He was a supervisor and mentor to many catalogers and was very well known amongst the cataloging community. He served as the first ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee for the Revision of AACR1 and was involved with CC:DA and JSC for many years. He was a founding member of IFLA Study Group on the Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records, and served as a chair of IFLA's ISBD Review Group. His passing is a real loss to our community, and we will miss him.

The **Chair** announced that **Glennan** will be ceasing her term as ALA Representative to the RSC, and will now be the ALA Representative to NARDAC. She is also serving as Chair-Elect of the RSC.

The next meeting will be held in New Orleans, Louisiana at the 2018 ALA Annual Conference, on the following dates:

Saturday, June 23

Monday, June 25

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Kathryn Lybarger, Intern
Emily Thaisrivongs, Intern