

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  
2019 ALA Annual Meeting in Washington, DC  
June 22, 2019  
Draft**

**Members present:**

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

**Ex-officio representatives present:**

Dominique Bourassa, NARDAC  
Stephen Hearn, NARDAC  
Kate James, LC  
Nathan Putnam, OCLC  
Jay Weitz, IFLA Cataloging Section Liaison

**ALA Liaisons present:**

Felicity Dykas, ALA/ACRL  
Peter V. Fletcher, ALCTS/CRS  
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC  
Ryan Mendenhall, ALCTS/MIG  
Honor Moody, ALA/ACRL/RBMS  
Andrea Morrison, ALA/GODORT  
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

**Non-ALA Liaisons present:**

Everett Allgood, PCC  
Thomas M. Dousa, CLA  
Mary Huismann, MusLA

Kelley McGrath, OLAC  
John Myers, [CC:DA liaison to] MAC  
Diane Napert, ARSC  
Andrea Puccio, ARLIS/NA  
Ryan Tamares, AALL  
Donna Wells, ATLA

**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:

**3R Project** = RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign Project  
**AALL** = American Association of Law Libraries  
**ABA** = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate  
**ACRL** = Association of College and Research Libraries  
**AFOS** = Acquisitions Fiscal and Overseas Support Division  
**AJL** = Association of Jewish 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  
**BIBFRAME** = Bibliographic Framework Initiative  
**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  
**CCM** = ALCTS/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee  
**CIP** = Cataloging in Publication  
**COIN** = Cooperative and Instructional Programs Division  
**CRS** = ALCTS/Continuing Resources Section  
**CSM** = Classification and Shelving Manual  
**CSR** = CONSER Standard Record  
**EURIG** = European RDA Interest Group  
**FRBR** = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*  
**GODORT** = ALA/Government Documents Round Table  
**IFLA** = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions  
**IFLA-LRM** = IFLA-Library Reference Model  
**ISNI** = International Standard Name Identifier  
**ISO** = International Organization for Standardization  
**ISSN** = International Standard Serial Number  
**LC** = Library of Congress  
**LC/NAF** = LC/NACO Authority File  
**LC-PCC PSs** = Library of Congress Policy Statements  
**LCDGT** = Library of Congress Demographic Genre Terms  
**LCGFT** = Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms  
**LCMPT** = Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus  
**LCSH** = Library of Congress Subject Headings  
**LD4P** = Linked Data for Production  
**LD4P2** = Linked Data for Production Phase 2  
**MAGIRT** = Map and Geospatial Information Round Table  
**MAC** = MARC Advisory Committee  
**MARC** = Machine-Readable Cataloging  
**MedLA** = Medical Library Association  
**MIG** = ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group  
**MusLA** = Music Library Association  
**NAR** = Name Authority Record  
**NDMSO** = Network Development and MARC Standards Office  
**NHP** = Non-human personage  
**NARDAC** = North American RDA Committee  
**OLAC** = Online Audiovisual Catalogers  
**PCC** = Program for Cooperative Cataloging  
**PSD** = Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress  
**PTCP** = Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division  
**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 Applications  
**SCS** = PCC Standing Committee on Standards  
**SCT** = PCC Standing Committee on Training  
**SES** = String encoding scheme  
**SHM** = Subject Heading Manual  
**SLA** = Special Libraries Association  
**URI** = Uniform Resource Identifier  
**VES** = Vocabulary encoding scheme  
**WCAG** = Web Content Accessibility Guidelines

*Saturday, June 22, 1:00–5:30 p.m.  
Marriott Marquis, Liberty BR Salons I-L*

**1456. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair**

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

**1457. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group**

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

**1458. Adoption of agenda: Chair**

The **Chair** asked for any changes to the agenda. None were posed.

**1459. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2019 Midwinter Meeting: Chair** [[Minutes of the meeting held at the 2019 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Seattle, Washington, January 25, 2019](#)]

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

**1460. Report from the Chair** [[Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions, January-June 2019](#)]

The **Chair** reported on CC:DA activities since ALA Midwinter:

- Due to the RSC 3R Project, CC:DA has had no discussion paper or proposals to work on.
- Two CC:DA Task Forces have been in operation between January and June 2019.
- **Jessica Hayden** stepped down as Chair of the Virtual Participation Task Force. The “virtual test” will be delayed until Midwinter 2020.
- CC:DA is up for the mandatory 5-year review to continue as an ALCTS CaMMS committee. The report was completed by the Chair with input from the previous Chairs and submitted to the ALCTS CaMMS Policy and Planning Committee on June 7, 2019.

The **Chair** invited questions on the activity of CC:DA between January and June 2019.

**Bourassa** asked whether **Hayden** would be replaced as chair of the Virtual Participation Task Force. The **Chair** has communicated with the members of that task force; this topic will be addressed during this meeting as part of future work for CC:DA.

**1461. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: James** [[Library of Congress Report](#)]

**James** discussed highlights from her report posted on the CC:DA website. A fuller report is available at <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/LC-2019-02.pdf>.

The report includes information about the following:

- General
  - Library of Congress Exhibit Pavilion
  - Special Events and Tours at the Library of Congress
  - Federal Budget
  - Significant Library-wide Personnel Changes
- General Cataloging
  - PSD and COIN Merger
    - A new division is called the Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division (PTCP). Judith Cannan is the chief of the new division.
  - Staffing Changes
  - BIBFRAME
    - The NDMSO and the COIN continue to work together on BIBFRAME development and testing.
    - PTCP and NDMSO staff members continued to exchange ideas about BIBFRAME with partners in the LD4P project and completed initial BIBFRAME training for the 17 institutions within the PCC that are members of the LD4P2 Cohort.
  - AFOS

- The former Overseas Operations Division and the former Acquisitions Fiscal and Support Office were merged to form AFOS.
- CIP
  - PrePub Book Link launched for publishers and authors to request CIP data. LC staff and CIP partnership libraries began using the new system to distribute CIP applications, input data, and return cataloging data to publishers.
- Cataloging Policy and Standards
  - LC-PCC PSs
    - Frozen due to the preparation for the 3R Project.
  - New Editions of LC Vocabularies and LC Classification
    - The 2019 PDF editions of LCSH, LCGFT, Library of Congress LCDGT, LCMP, LC classification schedules and tables were published in May 2019.
  - New SHM and CSM Instruction Sheets
    - Two new instructions (SHM instruction sheet H 1629.5, Forenames and Surnames, and CSM instruction sheet F 177, Translations) were published in June 2019.
  - Classification Web 4
    - An updated interface will be released in late summer or early fall of 2019.
    - Janis Young will demonstrate it at the PCC At Large meeting.
  - Linear Name Changes for Macedonia (Republic) and Swaziland
    - The national governments of the Republic of Macedonia and Swaziland changed the names of their countries to North Macedonia and Eswatini, respectively. PTCP undertook projects to update the LC/NAF, LCSH, and LCC to reflect the new country names.
  - “Multiple” Subdivisions
    - PTCP has begun a project to cancel “multiple” subdivisions from LCSH.
    - Individual multiple subdivisions should continue to be used according to the instruction in SHM H 1090 until they are cancelled.
  - Art Terms in LCGFT
    - An instruction sheet for the draft genre/form manual will be published this summer.
    - PTCP will begin to accept proposals for new and revised terms after the instruction sheet is published.
  - Moratorium on LCDGT Proposals
- U.S. ISSN Center
  - ISO 8
    - A significant revision of the ISO 8: 1977, Presentation and Identification of Periodicals, was published by the International Standards Organization April 1, 2019, which incorporates extensive information and guidance about ISSN.
  - Revision of ISO 3297, the ISSN Standard

- A ballot on the first draft closed March 14, 2019. The final draft standard will be put to a vote of eligible IOS members.

**1462. Report of the ALA Representatives to the North American RDA Committee: Hearn and Bourassa** [[Report on NARDAC and RDA-Related Activities, February-June 2019](#)]

**Hearn** reported on NARDAC activities:

- NARDAC members have
  - engaged in outreach activities to the ALA community;
  - reviewed and provided comments on documents from the regional RDA committees and NARDAC constituencies;
  - worked in an advisory role to RSC regarding the 3R project.
  - discussed its plans for reporting at the ALA Annual via the RDA Forum and its report to CC:DA and the ALCTS Board;
  - discussed options for ensuring continued communication between LC, RSC and the RDA board after the end of 2019.

**Bourassa** asked CC:DA members to contact, not only her, but also **Hearn** when the members would like to communicate with NARDAC on behalf of CC:DA. **Bourassa** reported on RSC activities:

- RSC membership and governance changes
  - **James's** term as Examples Editor will end on December 31. **Moody** will replace **James**.
  - The Technical Working Group and the Translations Working Group will not be dismissed.
  - RSC is planning to form an Application Profile Working Group.
  - Creation of an RSC Archives Working Groups is on hold.
- 3R Project Highlights
  - Beta Toolkit
    - Three major releases affecting content, display, and functionality of the RDA Toolkit were posted since Midwinter.
    - The project to add a visual browser to the beta Toolkit was suspended. Instead, a breadcrumb navigation has been added to give more options to users navigating through the Toolkit.
  - Stabilization of the English text
    - Published in the April 30 release of the beta Toolkit.
  - Completion of the 3R project
    - The text of RDA having been stabilized, the next phase of the 3R Project has started. This phase of development focuses on translating RDA, adding policy statements to the beta Toolkit, etc.
    - The projected date for the completion is early 2020 at the earliest.

- Outreach activities include the preconference on RDA at the ALA Midwinter 2019. Two series of orientation webinars will be presented this summer.
- Next meeting – Santiago, Chile, the week of October 21.

#### 1463. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo

Guajardo reported the following:

- The website/blog activities have been mostly maintenance-related, such as document indexing. It will be up to date fairly soon.
- **Guajardo** should be notified to update the account or create a new one when a member's or liaison's email address or institution has changed.
- Participated in the Virtual Participation Task Force. As a member of the Task Force, **Guajardo** has been looking for options for virtual community work platform and tools, such as WebEx, Google Docs, Basecamp, blog and listserv.

#### 1464. Report of the PCC liaison: Allgood [[PCC Report for CC:DA at ALA Annual, Washington, DC, June 2019](#)]

**Allgood** discussed highlights from his report posted on the CC:DA website. A fuller report is available from the PCC web page at <https://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/>.

Highlights from the report included:

- PCC has formed the Task Group on Metadata Application Profiles.
- PCC held a Wikidata workshop in conjunction with the PCC Operations Committee meeting.
- Set up a formal relationship with the ALCTS SAC's Subcommittee on Faceted Vocabularies and the OCLC Fast Policy and Oversight Committee.
- 17 PCC libraries have joined 3 LD4P2 grant partner institutions for form a PCC LD4P2 cohort group.
- Standing Committee on Applications (SCA)
  - The work was entirely focused on matters relating to ISBD and other punctuation in MARC records. A set of initial guidelines was released in early April.
  - Has been developing a set of guidelines for minimally-punctuated records, which will be released if/when the PCC decides to move forward.
- Standing Committee on Standards (SCS)
  - Hoping to launch the NACO Consultation Board during summer 2019.
  - PCC Task Group on Supplements and Special Numbers to Serials revised policy statement for 2.12.
  - SCS is revising some of the explanatory text in the Provider-Neutral guidelines.
  - MARC discussion paper on dealing with subfield i for 6XX was submitted to MAC.



- SCS will be taking over some ongoing tasks handled off by the PCC Task Group on URIs in MARC.
- The Guidelines for Relationship Designators in Authority Records were recently released.
- SC
  - ISNI Training Task Group completed preliminary version of training documents for working with the web version of ISNI. Training for the LD4P2 cohort that is joining the ISNI project has just launched.
  - IFLA-LRM Training Task Group has completed a training outline.
  - Minimal Punctuation Training Task Group will not be formed until the Guidelines are complete and approved by the PCC Policy Committee.
  - SCT is working with the Linked Data Advisory Committee to form a joint task group.

**Morrison** asked to change “U.S. Government Printing Office” to “U.S. Government Publishing Office” on page 3 of the report.

**Bourassa** asked how many PCC members have decided to omit the ending punctuations. **Allgood** did not have the information.

**1465. Report of the CC:DA 3R Task Group Discussion: Maxwell** [[Report of the CC:DA 3R Project Task Force](#)]

**Maxwell** reported the following:

- 3R Project Task Force explored the beta version of RDA and sent comments to RSC. It is willing to continue to funnel comments to RSC if CC:DA would like the Task Force to.
- Major topics discussed or commented on by the Task Force that might lead to further work for CC:DA include:
  - Guidance for formation of access points, either for RDA or for an application profile.
  - Consideration aligning the objectives and principles language more closely with the principles listed in the IFLA Statement.
  - Offer to help RSC in the project to merge the so-called “pseudo-element” instructions with the main instructions.

**1466. Report from ALA Publishing Services and Presentation on RDA Toolkit changes: Hennelly**

**Hennelly** reported the following:

- The 3R project continues. Future work includes:
  - Translations and policy statements

- Release notes to report substantial and relevant changes to Toolkit, with recent differences readily available
- Toolkit is being evaluated for compliance with WCAG standards for accessibility at the AA level
- Next release in December or January, should include a translation and partial policy statement as a test of that architecture
- Orientation project
  - **Hennelly** and **Kathy Glennan** did a webinar in May, reviewing changes and updates. Webinar to be translated into Spanish.
  - Over the next two months, rolling out series of online orientation (11 webinars)
  - Upcoming webinar: Teaching RDA after 3R, in response to feedback from LIS instructors
  - Webinars will be supplemented with materials online, including transcripts

**Morrison** asked whether access to these videos would be available after three months. **Hennelly** said that the videos would remain available for as long as needed.

**Thurstan Young** asked whether accessibility testing would include user-contributed content, noting that the document editor allows text as small as 8pt, and that 12pt at a minimum would be more readable. **Hennelly** said the document editor was not part of the evaluation process, but that this change could still be made.

**McIntosh** asked why the visual browser was being tabled. **Hennelly** explained that the cost was too high, and that early tests resulted in a text-heavy display. This feature would need to be rethought, and would be a post-3R project. Development will continue on making Toolkit navigation more user-friendly.

## 1467. RSC Presentations and Discussions

**Glennan** introduced the set of presentations by discussing:

- 3R project timeframe
  - Currently in stabilization phase, no longer under continuous revision
  - Ready for translators, policy statement writers, application profile developers
  - During stabilization, changes without significant impact will still be made
- Getting to official
  - Three groups must agree: RDA Steering Committee, RDA Board, RDA copyright holders
  - Hoping this will happen in first half of 2020
  - Then one-year countdown clock starts on original Toolkit

**Hennelly** presented on translation:

- When the new Toolkit becomes official, there will likely be nine translations (compared to 7 in original Toolkit)

- Translation begins with RDA vocabularies and element set, followed by instructions
- Must also complete translation table (containing headers) and boilerplate file with repeated text used throughout the Toolkit
- Improved workflow with translation software Trados

**Hennelly** also presented on policy statements:

- Formed a small policy statement working group including **Hennelly**, the RSC secretary, and policy statement writers from LC, British Library, and the German national library.
- Statement writers work with a structure parallel to the structure of RDA, with a shell for each potential policy statement
- Policy statement group is currently working on determining how to evaluate when RDA is complete; determining baseline usability for a policy statement set

**Young** presented on the British Library's perspective on policy statement development:

- Working on creating a mapping between current policy statements and where they would go in the new Toolkit
- Currently have 208 statements, all brief statements related to options and alternative in current instructions
- Many new elements have no equivalent in the old Toolkit, and no place to record in MARC; this will inform the work of the MARC-RDA working group

**Young** also presented on the process of accommodating 3R changes in MARC:

- **Young** had previously presented on potential developments to MARC, and recommended establishing a new working group to look at these issues in a comprehensive way, and to be considered as part of one forum rather than individual institutions working independently
- RDA Board accepted the proposal, forming a group with the charge:
  - evaluate the scope and impact of the extensions to RDA arising from the RDA 2019 revision in relation to MARC21
  - identify and prioritize possible changes to MARC21 to support compatibility with the RDA extensions and ensure effective data exchange into the future
  - prepare discussion papers and proposals for the MARC Advisory Committee
- Meetings would start in September 2019, with work continuing through 2021

**Dousa** asked which elements are the most intractable. **Young** said the elements around data provenance would be the most challenging.

**James** asked whether the group would be doing all necessary proposals, and whether they would take suggestions for proposals, or would act as a mediator for such proposals to MAC. **Young** said that the membership roster had not been finalized, but seemed comprehensive. **Glennan**, a member of the original MARC RDA working group, said that that group identified the needs and wrote the proposals, but knew who to reach out to when they needed help.

**Gordon Dunsire** presented on customizing RDA for local applications:

- Application profiles
  - A specification of the metadata that is used in an application; may also include the preferred recording method
  - May be layered/nested or inherit other profiles
- VES
  - Provides controlled values for an element
  - Must be compatible with the semantics of the RDA element
- SES
  - Specifies how a string value of an element is constructed
  - Elements may be parsed out of a constructed string

**James** asked about the options in the current Toolkit that exist to preserve current practice, and whether they preclude you from applying other options. **Dunsire** confirmed that options not mutually exclusive, are not exhaustive, and that more options can be added into the Toolkit if this is desirable.

**Young** asked about the requirement that local VES be compatible with semantics of RDA in terms of scope and coverage, with local terms needing to be broader, narrower, or equivalent in terms of concepts, and whether the parallel vocabulary encoding schemes for content, media, and carrier type on id.loc.gov satisfy that requirement. **Dunsire** confirmed that they do. He mentioned that “other” was thought to be dangerous and had been eliminated entirely.

**Glennan** presented on proposing changes to RDA:

- Framework for proposals for changes to new RDA Toolkit is a work in progress (old process should not be used)
- RDA content covers:
  - RDA Reference
  - All RDA elements, definitions and related scope notes and all vocabulary terms and definitions
  - English-language text of RDA including all guidance and entity chapters
  - Former appendices of original Toolkit: Abbreviations and symbols, Additional instructions on names of persons, Capitalization, Initial articles, and Terms of rank
  - RDF linked data representation in RDA registry
- All full translations include all of official RDA content.
- Examples are not officially part of RDA content and will have a different process
- RSC still expects to be getting formal proposals and formal responses to proposals, formal discussion papers and formal responses to discussion papers, and fast track changes.
- Expect these from RSC members, RDA regional communities from regional representatives to RSC, from RSC working groups (via chair), or through wider community engagement officer when appropriate.

- Some proposals and discussion papers will be directed (with RSC asking particular groups to take on specific tasks), though they will accept undirected proposals as well
- For expediency, CC:DA will have to figure out ways of working and collecting feedback outside of regular face-to-face meetings
- Small changes such as typographical errors do not require RSC intervention; the feedback form is a great way to suggest these changes.
- CC:DA will have to decide on workflow for collecting feedback from constituencies.
- RSC procedures still under development, and will be adjusted as needed during testing.

**John Attig** asked whether consideration had been given to using the Toolkit itself to accept proposals. **Glennan** said no, and while she was not sure how that would work, it could be useful to extract something from the Toolkit to be the basis for a proposal. **Maxwell** said it would be parallel to how we make subject proposal, and useful to see proposals in the context of the Toolkit. **James** pointed out that putting proposals in the Toolkit would put them behind the paywall, and a subscription would be required to view them (as well as other issues).

**Bourassa** expressed concern that doing a proposal in a month was not possible (and that even two would be fast), and suggested that 3R Task Force do one now.

**Morrison** suggested that putting some elements in user-friendly language outside of the paywall to include them in the community, and encourage them to get a subscription to the Toolkit.

**Attig** pointed out that while there are things we need to know by the time we submit the proposal, we don't need to know them before starting proposals; this schedule should not stop us from getting started.

**Myers** reminded the group that CC:DA has a set of operating procedures that outlines its relationship to the former JSC and current RSC in the context of submitting and responding proposals; as a practical matter, once the guidelines for submitting proposals are in place, this committee will have to review its own operating procedures. **Bourassa** suggested that now would be a good time to start this process. **Chair** said this would be part of Monday's discussion.

**Hearn** asked whether RSC documentation would stipulate procedures for NARDAC and other groups. **Glennan** said it would not.

**Bourassa** said that to have proposals moving through quickly, we would have to be very active on our website. **Myers** recalled that before 3R development, this committee was quite nimble and kept an ambitious schedule. **Attig** confirmed that only a minority of work was done in face-to-face meetings, with some periods of daily interaction.

**Hearn** asked when directed proposals could be expected. **Glennan** said this would be soon, and that they would be considering highest priorities and who could take them on.

*Monday, June 24, 8:30-11:30 a.m.  
Marriott Marquis, Liberty BR Salons I-L*

#### **1468. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair**

The **Chair** called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., welcomed voting members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members, and invited committee members, liaisons, and representatives to initial a roster sheet and audience members to sign a separate attendance sheet.

#### **1469. Report of the MAC Representative: Myers**

**John Myers** reported the following:

- MAC met on Saturday, June 24 and Sunday, June 25 and took up three proposals and two discussion papers. The proposals (2019-04, 05, 06) passed with minor amendments. Discussion Paper 2019-DP04 was forwarded to the Steering Committee.
- Proposal 2019-01 progress: 856 field, subfield 7 approved.
- Working group to generate papers to support the new RDA elements in MARC will be formed.
- Next meetings: Saturday, January 25 and Sunday, January 26 at the 2020 ALA Midwinter
- A full written report will be submitted.

#### **1470. Non-Human Personages and New RDA: Considerations for the LC/NACO Authority File: James [[Slides](#)]**

Highlights from **James**' presentation included:

- NHP describes an individual that is not a human being. Examples are a fictitious character, real animal, spirit, deity, angel and other non-human, non-animal possibly real individuals. NHPs are included in Res.
- IFLA-LRM approach does not work for RDA since it did not implement Res. NHPs are not included in RDA Entity. NHPs do not have relationships to Nomen in RDA.
- Instructions for identifying subjects that are outside of scope of RDA is needed. NARs for NHPs cannot be coded "rda." NHPs cannot have Agent relationships to Works, Expressions, etc. Instructions for identification of NHPs cannot come from RDA or LC-PCC PSs.
- How to make it work
  - Keep existing NARs in LC/NAF and allow new NARs for individual NHPs as needed
  - Keep fictitious groups and places in LCSH

- New LC manual of instructions for constructing heading for constructing heading for NHPs
- New MARC description convention source code (e.g., lcnhps) for 040 subfield e and 075 subfield 2

#### 1471. Discussion

**Bourassa** asked how we discern a pseudonym from NHP. **James** said that there is neither a perfect solution in the real-world cataloging nor a simple answer to the question, and we are interested in the bibliographically significant relationships, not in the authority file describing every possible relationship.

**Myers** pointed out the flaw of RDA and IFLA-LRM, in terms of non-human entities, whereas he stated that James' presentation demonstrated a close approximation to the best solution for an impossible situation. He objected to the ground rule of accepting a model which does not accommodate an observed and important phenomenon. **James** appreciated his criticism and pointed out that it is not the only case where catalogers have to go outside RDA.

**Maxwell** objected to the idea that the new manual for constructing these headings would be provided by LC; it should be created by the community. **James** confirmed that the proposals on how to proceed in making things work in the new RDA have room for the community input.

**Dousa** commented that accommodating these entities did not seem to be a problem in the original RDA, so wondered why it was a problem now. **James** explained that it is not a problem now (we still have "work has subject" relationships), and that related content was never completed in original RDA; it was recognized to be a problem that FRSAD did not incorporate those anticipated entities.

**Adam Schiff** thought of 075-field implementation as interesting and suggested to look to the Germans, who have already developed the vocabulary and are using 075. **James** further explained the benefit of 075 field, which enables machines to figure out what type of entity it is. She was not sure how the Germans used 368 or 075 and pointed out that the same solution might not work for us.

**Hearn** asked if there is going to be any problem for a community-based value encoding scheme, including relationship elements like "work has animal performer", not as a part of RDA but as a community standard. **James** said it is not clear what future of the designators will be. **Hearn** asked about the distinction between a pseudonym and NHP, which is not always clear. **James** brought up examples of Mark Twain and Richard Castle to explain it although she also explained that the issue is beyond the scope of NHP.

**Kevin Randall** asked a question regarding the relationship designators in the examples. **James** reminded that the designators were left out since they are not the focus of the presentation.

**Randall** brought up the principle of representation in RDA and asked why we do not do what the model allows us to do, to avoid having the problem. **Myers** pointed out that the IFLA-LRM model specifically exclude these characters and it is the intersection of the different models that dictates the solution that has been proposed. **Randall** suggested that we can give them other relationships because the model allows for expansion. **Myers** explained that we cannot use the higher Res modeling to expand things in the direction because RDA has not included the Res entity. **Bourassa** asked about the possibility of a community exploring the possibility of expanding the model and adding these entities. **Thomas Brenndorfer** shared the decisions of Montreal meeting to have the non-RDA entity relationship elements point outside the model, which also frees up the possibility of working outside of the model to solve these problems. **James** also points out that they cannot expand outside the intention of the model, whose intention is that only agents can create works and contribute to expression.

**Bela Gupta** asked how she would know that Uggie is a dog without a qualifier. **James** clarified that Uggie is not a character in the movie, but is a real name of real dog. 368 field in the NAR should include “Jack Russell Terrier,” and there are many other ways that users find relevant information in the NAR.

#### 1472. Future work and plans for CC:DA: Chair

Discussion on the Virtual Participation Task Force:

- A new chair would need to be chosen; **Guajardo** has offered to be co-chair.
- **Maxwell** pointed out that being able to meet virtually would be a useful thing to do, even outside of meetings at ALA.
- **Myers** supported exploring our options for virtual participation, given the possibility of a quarterly cycle of RDA updates and also the possibility of changes to ALA Midwinter. **Chair** emphasized that she would advocate for CC:DA keeping this timeslot at ALA Midwinter.
- **Guajardo** is quite interested in this task force, but is hesitant to take on the primary role. He would prefer to focus on the technical side, with a co-chair organizing meetings and helping to get people together. Some kind of transitional plan is needed to ensure that this committee can continue to work despite circumstances beyond its control.

Discussion on a Task Force to review CC:DA procedures:

- **Bourassa** volunteered to be ex officio on this task force, being very familiar with CC:DA procedures. The chair will have to be from CC:DA, but people from the community can participate.
- **McIntosh** moved to form a CC:DA task force for revising CC:DA procedures. **Kiser** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.



Discussion on 3R Task Force:

- **Chair** appreciated the tremendous amount of work done by this task force, and the leadership of **Maxwell** and **Bourassa**.
- **Bourassa** suggested that the task force try a proposal if this falls under their charge, and specifically suggested “curator as creator of work” (suggestion from ARLIS/NA).
- **Hearn** deferred to the task force on whether this falls into its scope; **Maxwell** agreed to take this as an assignment for the task force.
- **Attig** questioned whether there was time to do even a very simple proposal. **Maxwell** was willing to try; even if nearest deadline was not met, there were chances in the future. **Myers** expressed concern about scope creep for the task force, but thought it might fall under their “feedback” responsibility.
- **Maxwell** shared topics identified by the task force that CC:DA could pursue:
  - Merging pseudo-elements into main elements
  - List of principles in RDA in line with IFLA statement?
  - Many new elements with access points do not have guidance for making access points

Discussion on training:

- **Dykas** had asked that CC:DA consider taking a more active role in training for the new RDA Toolkit. The current ALA training is priced out of reach for much of the community. This role could include investigating the needs for training, and investigating LC and PCC plans, possibly working alongside ALCTS Continuing Education Committee.
- **Adam Baron**, member of PCC Standing Committee on Training, reported that that committee had met yesterday and discussed the need for training related to 3R; he will be chair of a task group that will be developing that training. Waiting on PCC Standing Committee on Standards to develop policy statements before working more in depth.
- **Morrison** expressed interest in volunteering for such a group. She is a cataloging trainer and professor. She emphasized the importance of outreach to smaller communities that do not use the Toolkit; currently much time is spent cleaning up records from catalogers who do not understand the standards. She expressed concern that forming the group now might be pre-mature, unless the goal is just to start this investigation.
- **Maxwell** pointed out that PCC training would be perceived as for PCC community only; CC:DA represents all American libraries; it is appropriate for CC:DA to take the initiative especially for training geared toward non-PCC libraries. He encouraged doing this sooner, not waiting for policy.
- **Myers** cautioned overlapping work with the ALCTS Continuing Education Group. **Chair** clarified that **Dykas** is on that committee and that this would do a good job of bridging that gap.
- **Attig** recalled that for the original implementation, CC:DA did not have a training task force, and that the committee was busy with final revisions of the text. One approach would be to alert CaMMS of this need for training.

- **Bourassa** suggested that a task force could investigate who else is doing training, such as Music Library Association, so as not to duplicate effort.
- **Poehlmann** moved to create a task force to investigate RDA Toolkit training. **Wiley** seconded. **McIntosh** questioned the need, given that the Committee on Training was already working on this. **Chair** clarified that the task force would investigate what is being done in other communities to determine need. **Myers** pointed out that given **Dykas**'s role on both committees, we are uniquely positioned to provide expert input into broader ALCTS educational efforts. The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion on a working group to propose new MARC fields:

- **Myers** reported vague intentions to create a working group to propose MARC fields for RDA elements. This would largely take place between PCC and the Network Development and MARC Standards Office, but should we have some role in that? We deal with the content standard, but we convey that content through MARC.
- **Attig** suggested not getting involved directly, but making sure that people outside the group stay informed about what is going on, even before actual papers start coming out.
- **Bourassa** asked about the possibility of posting proposals to the website prior to the meeting to gather comments. **Myers** offered to share a brief agenda with links to papers and collect feedback directly.

**1473. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair**

No reports from the floor.

The **Chair** thanks **Heather McIntosh** for her service as a CC:DA intern and for two years of service as a voting member.

**Kathryn Lybarger** will be coming on as a new voting member.

**Kumiko Reichert** will be continuing as an intern; second intern yet to be determined.

The next meeting will be held in Philadelphia, PA at the 2020 ALA Midwinter Conference, on the following dates:

Saturday, January 25  
Monday, January 27

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 11:24am.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Lybarger, Intern  
Kumiko Reichert, Intern