

Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
(A division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Classification Section

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2008 ALA Annual Conference
in Anaheim, California
June 28 and 30, 2008**

Members present:

Cheri Folkner, Chair
Kathy Glennan
Elizabeth Mangan
Robert Maxwell
John Myers
Laura Smart [*absent 6/28*]
Patricia Thurston
Paul Weiss
Penny Welbourne

Alexandra Crosier, Intern
Daniel N. Joudrey, Intern
Patricia Hatch, CCDA Webmaster (non-voting)

Ex-officio representatives present:

John Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC [*represented by Jay Weitz 6/28*]

ALA Liaisons present:

Keiko Suzuki, ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
Patricia Ratkovich, ALCTS/CCS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
Kevin Randall, ALCTS/Serials Section
Manon Th eroux, ALA/Association of College & Research Libraries
Susan Pinckard, ALA/Government Documents Round Table
Shelby Harken, ALA/Library & Information Technology Association
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/Map & Geography Round Table
Ken Wade, ALA/Reference & User Services Association

Non ALA Liaisons present:

Kathy Winzer, American Association of Law Libraries
 Elizabeth Lilker, Art Libraries Society of North America
 Laurel Jizba, Association for Recorded Sound Collections [*represented by Glennan 6/30*]
 Thomas Duszak, Catholic Library Association [*absent 6/30*]
 Diane Hillmann, Dublin Core Metadata Initiative [*absent 6/28*]
 John Hostage, International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
 Chamyia Kincy, Medical Library Association
 Mark Scharff, Music Library Association
 Greta De Groat, Online Audiovisual Catalogers [*represented by Martha Yee*]
 Peter Fletcher, Program for Cooperative Cataloging
 Dorothy McGarry, Special Libraries Association

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 those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.

IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.

V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

AACR2 = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision

ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate

ALA = American Library Association

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

CC:AAM = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials

CC:DA = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

CCS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section

CDS = LC Cataloging Distribution Service

CIP = Cataloging in Publication

CoP = Committee of Principals for AACR

DC = Dublin Core

DCRM(S) = Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Serials)

FRAD = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Authority Data

FRBR = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records

FRSAR = IFLA’s Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records

HTML = Hypertext Mark-up Language

IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions

ILS = Integrated library system

ISBD = International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LCCN = Library of Congress Control Number
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
NAL = National Agricultural Library
NASIG = North American Serials Interest Group
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM = National Library of Medicine
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
RBMS = Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RDA = Resource Description and Access
SAC = Subject Analysis Committee
SKOS = Simple Knowledge Organization System
XML = Extensible Markup Language

Saturday, June 28, 2008, 1:30-5:30 p.m.
Crowne Plaza Resort, Mazatlan Ballroom B/C

1039. Welcome and opening remarks

Cheri Folkner, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:32 p.m. She welcomed visitors and committee members.

1040. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives

[CC:DA/Roster/2007/July/Rev.]

The **Chair** and members introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to sign in.

1041. Adoption of agenda

[CC:DA/Agenda/58]

The **Chair** mentioned two minor additions to the agenda: for item 15, a preliminary MARBI report; and for item 18, the Chair's report will be referred to again in the discussion of the Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication. She also noted that Shawne Miksa would not be attending, so the Chair will cover item 14: Report from the Chair of the RDA Implementation Task Force.

Mangan moved to adopt the agenda as amended; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously.

1042. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2008 Midwinter Meeting, January 11, 12, and 14, 2008

[CC:DA/M/1016-1038]

There was one correction from **Mangan**. No other corrections. Motion to approve the minutes by **Myers**; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously.

1043. Report from the Chair

Chair's report on CC:DA motions, January-June 2008

[CC:DA/Chair/2007-2008/5]

ALA procedures require confirmation of electronic votes that occur between Annual and Midwinter. There were four motions voted on by electronic ballot that are described in the Chair's report. Motion by **Thurston** to approve all four of the votes in the Chair's report; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously.

The **Chair** reviewed highlights from the report. The primary focus of the committee's work was the review of the draft of RDA, Sections 2-4, and 9. Public comments were collected on the ALCTS website, compiled into the CC:DA wiki for a one-week review, then passed to Attig for drafting a response. Due to the sheer volume of comments, a number of committee members assisted John Attig in this endeavor. The **Chair** thanked Paul Weiss, John Hostage, Dorothy McGarry, Everett Allgood, Kathy Glennan, Kathleen Winzer, Judy Knop, Manon Theroux, Robert Maxwell, Kevin Randall, John Myers, Elizabeth Mangan, Mark Scharff, and Greta De Groat for their assistance.

CC:DA's *Procedures* (approved by CC:DA at the 2008 Midwinter Meeting) were approved by the CCS Executive Committee on March 10, 2008.

The public, read-only email list was publicized on several listservs on March 18, 2008. The list is still not archiving. Options for archiving are listed in the report and will be addressed during discussion of the report of the Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication.

One item that is not in the report is that CC:DA voted to establish a task force to review the DCRM(S). The **Chair** thanked those serving on that task force. John Hostage is the chair and Jennifer Lang, Robert Maxwell, Helen Schmierer, and Elaine Shiner are on the task force. Review will be done by July 22nd. CC:DA's response is due to the RBMS Bibliographic Standards Committee by August 1st.

1044. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: John Attig

[Outcomes of the April 2008 JSC meeting]

[Executive Summary of the April 2008 JSC meeting]

Attig repeated thanks to the members who helped compile constituent responses to the RDA draft. In particular, he thanked Mark Scharff and Kathy Glennan for their work on the 5JSC/LC/12 music proposals. The JSC decided this document needed discussion by experts, so a one-day meeting at LC was organized. John Attig, Mark Scharff, and Kathy Glennan attended. It was a successful meeting; some proposals will be put forward to the JSC.

Attig also thanked Martha Yee, Greta De Groat, Kelley McGrath, and the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee for responding to audio-visual questions.

Part I: April JSC Meeting

The JSC met for eight and a half days. It was a grueling, but highly productive, meeting. The main issues relating to RDA have already been decided; the JSC is now focused on the details.

Decisions still to be made are based on the recommendations and comments submitted by the community, for all parts of the draft. The JSC is prioritizing these comments, attempting to make as many decisions as possible before the full draft is released.

Attig felt the most interesting issue tackled by the JSC was that of *required elements*. The editor, Tom Delsey, suggested a new approach: instead of labeling elements as required or optional, include a list of recommended *core elements* based on JSC's assessment of which elements are most significant for supporting the most significant FRBR user tasks. The JSC has scheduled a July 7th conference call to discuss details. In the text of RDA, only *core elements* would be labeled. The online product will not contain footnotes; so, there will be an instruction line below each *core element* explaining exactly what is required.

As for specific core elements, the JSC decided that *Statement of Responsibility* will be added to the *core elements* list, while *Place of Publication* will not. Once the rationale is written, this decision will be reexamined to assure it is still conceptually sound. The complete list of *core elements* has yet to be finalized.

Attig believes an online view that includes only the *core elements* could serve as a "Concise RDA". An actual concise RDA would need to be a derivative work, and someone would have to be contracted to write it. It would need to be written after the online product is released.

Separate lists of *core elements* will be provided for *Work*, *Expression*, *Manifestation*, and *Item* elements.

General Decisions

The JSC looked at ALA's reorganization proposals and decided to reject most of them. The current organization of the early chapters approximates a typical cataloging workflow. While RDA has taken major steps away from being a procedural manual towards becoming a data dictionary, the ALA proposals would have taken it all the way in that direction. It would have created the need for more navigational tools, and the JSC was unwilling to go that far. In the process of making this decision, the JSC confirmed the significance of the user tasks in the FRBR model and in the organization of RDA.

One ALA recommendation that was accepted was to make an explicit division, in the table of contents, between the sections on attributes and the sections on relationships.

The JSC rejected the ALA argument that certain attributes should be treated as relationships to other entities. ALA was specifically looking at *place* elements that turned up as attributes of other elements rather than as a relationship to the place entity. RDA will follow the FRBR and FRAD models, which treat these as attributes.

ALA had suggested a drastic reduction of the number of required elements for the Group 1 and Group 2 entities, reducing them to *preferred title* or *preferred name*. The JSC confirmed the need for elements that were collectively sufficient to identify the entity and distinguish it from other entities, whether these elements are recorded in an access point control record (scenario #2) or as attributes of the entity (scenario #1). These will be part of the core set of elements.

Regarding the chapters on access points, the JSC accepted the suggestion from ALA that instructions for the construction of access points be moved to the end of the chapters.

ALA had suggested removing all information about punctuation to the appendix on display. The Editor reminded the JSC that while punctuation between elements can be moved to the appendix, punctuation internal to data elements must remain in the instructions. That punctuation is part of the data content, so it cannot be moved to the appendix.

The JSC accepted ALA's suggestion that in sections that give elements for preferred and variant names or titles, RDA should treat *name* and *title* as the element and the preferred and variant names and titles as element sub-types.

Specific comments

The JSC gave its highest priority to comments focused on the element set, as well as elements that included controlled vocabularies, and issues related to the core data element set. More than half of the comments received were related to these three categories. In May, the JSC finalized the element set.

LC presented a document with several proposals. The first was to address the concept of *originating bodies*. They suggested that the concept of *emanating body* and the definition from AACR2 21.1B2 be reinstated in the definition of *creator* in RDA (Chapter 19). This recommendation was accepted, and the *originating body* concept will be removed.

A second proposal accepted was to reinstate the concept of *principal responsibility* when deciding which among multiple creators is to be included in the preferred access point.

LC also noted that there were missing instructions on how to deal with creating an access point when different identities of the creator appear in different manifestations of the work. Instructions on this will be added.

Chapter 6

After a long discussion, it was decided that incomplete expressions need to be identified in the access point. The first instruction will be to provide an access point for each expression present. But, an alternative instruction will be added to treat an aggregate as an expression, such that "Selections" could be added in the *version* element to identify that it is not a complete expression.

Regarding the definition of *part of a work*, the Editor and the JSC agreed it is not just a *part* as identified by the author or the producer of the resource, it would also include extracts prepared by a compiler or editor.

In its comments, CC:DA had been confused by the name of a part being presented on its own, rather than as a hierarchically-structured name beginning with the name of the work. The instructions, however, are for *Preferred Name of Part* (not the access point for the part). **John Attig** noted that, if this is difficult for us to understand, it will be an implementation and training issue.

The JSC simplified instructions on *Date of Work*, *Date of Creation*, *Date of First Publication*, etc. These will be included in the instructions, but not treated as sub-types. Ranges will be allowed, and earliest date will be used for referring to the work.

Chapter 7

Square brackets will not be allowed in scale statements that are calculated rather than transcribed, as information in the *scale* element may be taken from "any source". The JSC understands this denies a long-standing practice, but it is not justifiable within RDA.

Nature of Content, *Intended Audience*, and *Coverage of Content* will use uncontrolled terms.

Place and Date of Capture will be treated as a single element (with sub-elements).

Music Notation System will use a list of controlled terms, currently being established by the Music Library Association.

Medium of Performance will not use the list of controlled terms established for MARC field 048.

Coordinate, *Equinox*, and *Epoch* will not be in the core set of elements.

Illustrative Content is applicable to all types of resources and not confined to printed texts. The JSC agreed to add *graphs* as a possibility for this element.

A new element, *Accessibility Content* will address captioning, audio descriptions, and other features. Subtitles will be covered in *Language of Content*.

Section 3, chapters 8-11

The Editor will neutralize the language so it refers to differentiating the *person, family, or corporate body*, rather than to creating a distinctive access point.

In the list of additions to differentiate personal names, *dates of birth/death* will be distinguished from *dates of activity*. It will also be possible to record fuller form of name, even when dates are available.

Concerning the element *Gender*, the JSC declined to delete the element. They are, however, deleting *other* from the list of terms. An instruction will be given to use another (uncontrolled) term if neither *male* nor *female* applies.

Regarding abbreviations for eras, B.C. and A.D. will be used rather than B.C.E. and C.E.

All footnotes in the online product will appear as separate paragraphs, following the paragraph in which the reference appears. Some may be re-written to appear in the main text.

Chapter 16

Regarding Chapter 16 (*Places*), the JSC doesn't have time to add to RDA without specific proposals on how to expand this chapter. Identifier for the place (as opposed to the identifier for the jurisdiction) will be added to the list of elements "to be added in a later release".

Appendix I

Appendix I: The JSC discussed comments related to distinguishing between *works* and *expressions* for moving images. They agreed that while in many cases work and expression are indistinguishable, in others it is possible. The list of creators and contributors was revised, but all roles associated with performance remain at expression level.

Section 8, Chapters 24-28

The JSC agreed that the series relationship is a whole/part relationship, but once numbering is included, becomes a part-part, relationship. RDA doesn't support part-part relationships. They decided to add an element for *Numbering of issue or part* to accompany the series relationship and indicate the issue or part to which it applied.

Earlier Sections

In Chapter 2, *Production Statement* for unpublished resources will be separated from *Manufacture Statement* for published resources.

Sources of Information instructions for sound recordings were confirmed.

Alternative Title will remain part of title proper as there is no good way to deal with the "or". The alternative title is not, however, part of the *Preferred Title* of the work.

In Chapter 3, there will be no controlled vocabulary for the *Colour* element (which allows spelling variations).

Media type: for audio-visual carriers that can be played on a computer, recording more than one media type will be allowed. Appropriate examples will be provided.

The list of *Production Method for Manuscripts* will not be a closed list.

As a general policy, if an appropriate term is not included in a list, any appropriate term may be given. None of the lists are technically closed.

Based on an ALA recommendation, the *Colour* element was moved to the expression section of Chapter 7, except for hand-colouring which applies at the item-level.

Foliation was an incorrect term; it will be changed to *Book format*. The instructions on numbering of leaves will be moved to *Extent*.

Part of the specifications on *sound characteristics* will be moved to the expression section of Chapter 7, based on an ALA recommendation.

A specific sub-type was created for *regional encoding* for DVDs.

An example of streaming speed will be added to *Transmission speed*.

Outcomes of JSC teleconference to finalize the core element set

Agreed on separate elements for *manifestation identifier* and *item identifier*.

Confirmed the split between *Type of recording* (analog/digital) and *Recording medium* (magnetic/optical). *Type of recording* refers to playback, not original capture.

Aspect ratio is an attribute of the expression for films and videos. *Full-screen*, *wide-screen*, and *mixed* will be the terms used in this element.

Presentation format (for projectioned media) will be retained, but aspect ratio terms will be moved to the new element.

Meeting of music catalogers at LC

Glennan reported that agreement was reached about treatment of librettos, cadenzas, and chorus scores. Some progress was made regarding medium of performance issues. The group agreed on use of terminology for distinctive and non-distinctive titles versus the current terminology in AACR2. Everyone involved was pleased that *Selections* was reinstated.

Attig noted that the main area of disagreement involved the meaning and instructions for distinctive and non-distinctive titles. Treatment of arrangements remains a controversial issue.

Maxwell asked for a little more detail about what needed to be agreed upon.

Glennan replied there were instructions in the LC/12 proposal that advanced positions that not all music catalogers agreed upon, including how to name cadenzas and whether to treat them as separate works. They agreed to use name for the cadenza's creator, but the issue of dependence remains: is a cadenza a separate intellectual work? There is a similar situation with librettos. Are librettos textual works that are simply related to musical works?

Attig stated for those areas where there is no agreement, LC is dropping the LC/12 proposals. [Note: In the event, LC chose to issue an LC follow-up document.]

Other ongoing work

At the end of the Chicago meeting, LC presented a document on the concept *Changes over time* and their effect on access points. The JSC has commented on it and a final version is being compiled.

Work continues on Appendices J (Relationship designators: Relationships between *works*, *expressions*, *manifestations*, and *items*) and K (Relationship Designators: Relationships between

Persons, Families, and Corporate Bodies) which will be included in the full draft. Comments will be sought since these have not previously been seen outside the JSC.

The JSC has seen a demo of the online product. The workflow feature allows a specific set of information to be gathered for specific cataloging activities. Some workflows will be included in the first release, but catalogers and institutions can create their own. The JSC will spend time helping to develop this.

Mangan asked if there will be one set of core elements for all resources or multiple sets of core elements based on resource type. **Attig** replied that it is a single set, but some elements are listed as format specific.

Ratkovich asked if the changes John Attig just discussed would appear in the full draft. **Attig** replied that the changes will be in the online version available this fall. The JSC is no longer updating the text documents on the web site. All corrections will be made in the XML online files. **Ratkovich** noted that there is no place to find all the current drafts.

Attig reported that the JSC has accepted CC:DA's list of specialist cataloging manuals. He's not sure what's going to happen with the list.

The **Chair** advised that the Task Force on Specialist Cataloguing Manuals be discharged. She thanked Mark Scharff, Elizabeth Lilker, Betsy Mangan, and Adam Schiff for their work.

Part II - What's next?

Attig stated the full draft of RDA is delayed until October due to problems with the authoring system. The JSC will continue to work on content through the end of July, a deadline to which the CoP has confirmed the JSC must adhere. They believe that RDA is a good product even though not everyone is happy with all the decisions; sticking to the schedule is important for testing and implementation planning. Now it is up to ALA publishing to deliver the product on time. CC:DA's position, stated in the ALA responses, is that the schedule is less important than getting the content right.

At the RDA Update Forum, Don Chatham announced that the finalization of the online product will be delayed for two months. The full draft will be available in the beginning of October, with constituency review from October to January. The JSC will meet in mid-February and final content will be submitted at the end of April 2009. These dates are tentative.

CC:DA will need to establish a schedule for constituency review. The JSC is very busy with priority comments from earlier reviews and is thus calling only for limited comments on the full draft. The JSC is interested in how parts work together, internal consistency, and comments on new parts not previously reviewed (including appendices). The JSC will not entertain comments on content that has been previously reviewed.

Following the first release of RDA, the JSC will not carry forward any unresolved comments. These issues will have to be resubmitted by the constituencies.

Schmierer inquired about the status of application profiles.

Attig responded that the DC/RDA application profile is independent work and will not be included in the initial release. Workflows, while not a formal application profile, will provide similar functionality.

The **Chair** commented that when John Attig gave his report to the CCS Executive Committee there were some questions about the testing to be done by national libraries and others and how ALA might respond or participate. CCS Exec requested CC:DA compile a report on the final draft, pointing out the top 10 concerns, challenges, and issues in implementing RDA as identified in the final draft. They would like to have it two weeks before Midwinter.

1045. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Barbara Tillett

The full report is online at <http://www.loc.gov/ala/an-2008-update.html>. **Tillett** addressed only items of interest to this committee.

At the LC Booth this year, Deanna Marcum is discussing *On the Record*, the report of the LC Working Group on Bibliographic Control. Some webcasts are being shown at the LC booth theatre including one by Barbara Tillett on RDA. She is also providing an overview discussion at the PCC Discussion Group on Sunday afternoon at 4pm.

Some personnel changes listed in the report: Jeff Heynen, Chief of the History and Literature Cataloging Division, retired in February. Randall Barry is Acting Chief. LC is wrapping up the recruitment period for three chiefs in the ABA directorate: European and Latin American Acquisitions Division, History and Literature Cataloging Division, and Regional and Cooperative Cataloging Division. The deadline is June 30, 2008.

CDS Update

Classification & Shelving Manual is now available, combining the Subject Cataloging Manuals on those two topics.

DCRM(S) – Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials: Serials, 2008 Edition will be coming soon in collaboration with ACRL RBMS DCRM(S).

Library of Congress Subject Headings, 31st Edition has been delayed until spring 2009. There are new contractors publishing LCSH and they hope to distribute it in the spring from now on.

Reprints of “Library of Congress Controlled Vocabularies and Their Application to the Semantic Web,” a *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* article by Tillett and Corey Harper are available at the LC booth.

Cataloging-in-Publication Program

CIP will expand to include more university presses.

Cataloging Policy

Regarding RDA, LC is highly involved in its development and looks forward to testing the code in 2009. A joint statement from LC, NLM, and NAL about support and implementation of RDA was distributed in May 2008. Testing will involve 10-20 other institutions and will, hopefully, begin in the summer of 2009 and continue through the end of the year. Implementation is expected in 2010. If interested in joining, contact Beacher Wiggins at LC, Chris Cole at NAL, or Diane McCutcheon at NLM.

Non-Latin scripts: LC is now adding non-Latin scripts to existing name authority records and bibliographic records. They are working with OCLC software used in WorldCat Identities to populate data from bibliographic records into authority records as cross-references. They will assess for problems and inconsistencies over the next six months and will then develop a set of best practices. For bibliographic records, they are hoping to expand into Cyrillic and Greek, but must first resolve some technical issues.

LC Classification records: Terms in Chinese, Arabic, Greek, Hebrew, and Cyrillic have been added to captions. These are also searchable in ClassWeb.

LCSH: A report on pre-coordination vs. post-coordination was released. Management has agreed that LC will continue to use pre-coordinated strings for LCSH. In May 2007, CDS began distributing LCSH subject validation records for automatically validating commonly used subject heading strings. Approximately 29,000 have been distributed. They are part of the ClassWeb product, but they may be excluded if so desired.

A base set of subject headings (\$a of LCSH) is available in the SKOS format on the Web for open testing. LC hopes to expand to the full LCSH in the future and establish a permanent site.

Genre/form records: LC is continuing to make genre/form authority records available. They worked with folks involved with motion picture and radio program cataloging and are exploring other ways to expand the project. A report recommending expansion into music, law, cartography, literature, and religion headings is being reviewed by LC management and will be made public.

Tillett reviewed the statistics for the Bibliographic Access and Serial Record Divisions. The number of new classification numbers is down.

The Prints and Photographs Division is using Flickr to share their digitized image collections. The public can add tags, notes, and comments to the images, providing valuable metadata enhancement. In Flickr's social tagging, the tags being applied to the images often reflect LCSH.

Integrated Library System: Voyager 6.5.2, released in May 2008, extended access to authority records with keyword indexing. Keyword indexing has also been applied to 15 million holdings records. Additional improvements include: wildcard searching for left and internal truncation in keyword searching; 10-digit ISBN searches; improved serials check-in.

LCCN Permalink service: These are persistent identifiers that are established through the Library of Congress Control Numbers. They are being made available to those needing a machine-actionable tool for use on the Web.

Yee noted that Sara Shatford Layne at UCLA was responsible for Voyager's keyword searching in headings.

Myers commented that *On the Record* was challenging and LC's response, heartening. It was amazing to see the efforts LC is taking to position libraries to deal with the future. **Tillett** added that it was good to get the report out because it shows all that LC is doing and affirms the direction LC is taking.

Schmierer complimented LC on making their MARC 21 documentation available on their site. **Tillett** said that LC is discussing making authority file documentation freely available as well.

1046. Report of the ALA representative to NISO: Cindy Hepfer

The **Chair** stated that two ballots were outstanding. Comments on NCIP Revision, Z39.83 are due July 21 and comments on ISO/DIS 28500, WARC file format are due September 4.

Hepfer reported that there has been one NISO (circulation-related) and twelve ISO standards up for vote, only one of which was cataloging-related: ISO NWI Document management -- *Guidelines for the creation of a metadata crosswalk*. She received comments from Diane Hillmann and voted yes despite reservations.

NISO is conducting some educational events, including a NASIG pre-conference on metadata. She has been sending each new ballot to chairs of relevant ALA committees. She has also been getting more requests for ISO documentation, but it cannot be shared unless it is being distributed for comment due to copyright restrictions.

Hepfer asked why the NISO representative reports to CC:DA. **Weiss** replied that there was no formal reason. The **Chair** said that she always invites the NISO rep, but if there is nothing related to cataloging, she need not attend.

Weiss inquired whether NISO's new management would stay committed to the library community. **Hepfer** replied that they absolutely would.

1047. Report from the Chair of the ALCTS Task Group on the LC Working Group Report: David Miller

[On the Record: Report of The Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of
Bibliographic Control]

[ALCTS Task Group on the LC Working Group Report ... Recommendations for Action]

[Ten Actions for ALCTS]

Miller stated that in January 2008, a task group was created to review *On the Record* for ALCTS. They asked committee chairs which recommendations they felt ALCTS needs to address in next 1-3 years. Most responses were from individuals, rather than from committees. An analysis of these comments resulted in the report *ALCTS Task Group on the LC Working Group Report ... Recommendations for Action*. This report is too long, so another report, *Ten Actions for ALCTS*, was created. It, too, is fairly substantial. Another group, chaired by Kate Harcourt, is examining these ten action items to determine how they could be implemented. Their findings will go the ALCTS board, and will eventually come back to individual committees for action. Digesting these down into actionable items is a complicated process.

Attig asked if CC:DA would become involved. **Miller** replied that it was possible, but as yet unknown.

1048. Report of the Task Force to Review the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles: Everett Allgood

[CC:DA/TF/Statement of International Cataloguing Principles/4]

[Invitation to worldwide review]

[Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, April 10, 2008 version]

The **Chair** reminded everyone that an IFLA vote is needed. Three categories of votes are available: *Agree*, *Agree with comments*, and *Do not agree*.

Allgood stated that the task force unanimously recommended *Agree with comments*. He thanked all members of the task force for their work: John Attig, Laurel Jizba, Ed Jones, Dorothy McGarry, Bob Maxwell, Hideyuki Morimoto, and Keiko Suzuki.

General Concerns- Language, terminology, etc.

Use of the term *Bibliographic*: Some members were concerned that the use of the terms *bibliographic record* and *bibliographic description* reflected a print bias.

Weiss likes the term *resource description*. **Mangan** contended that the term *bibliographic* doesn't imply print, but is fine with changing it to *resource*. **Maxwell** noted that in some contexts, the term *resource* won't work and the **Chair** pointed out that *bibliographic* cannot simply be removed from some phrases. **Schmierer** noted that CC:DA doesn't need to solve the problem; just comment on it. IFLA wants a formal ALA response and she asked whether this report constituted that response. The **Chair** stated that there are other bodies within ALA that are considering responding. **Weiss** agreed that we can comment without solving the problem. **Attig** felt that we should go through all issues in the report to determine if CC:DA agrees with the comments. **Weiss** disagreed.

Authorized, Controlled, Preferred: The task force was unanimous in their response. **Glennan** expressed concern about the use of *preferred title* in this statement. She understands how it is used in RDA, but not necessarily how it is used in the context of this statement. **Maxwell** noted that anyone can send in comments. He agreed that the term *preferred title* was applied inconsistently: sometimes it refers to titles; sometimes it refers to names of works. **Attig** pointed out that the last version used *uniform title*. **Weiss** said that in an international document that will be translated, it is very important to define terms. **Yee** concurred. **Maxwell** suggested that they should use *name of work*, not *title*. **Allgood** proposed that we strengthen our call for consistent language. **Maxwell** agreed.

0.1 Convenience of the users of the catalogue

The task force felt more was needed and suggested some replacement text. The passage is acceptable to Paul Weiss, but he agreed it should be fleshed out.

Subject thesauri

The task force was concerned that the objective on subject thesauri was not completely met. The CC:DA Chair and Everett Allgood corresponded with Barbara Tillett, who replied that this section will be added later; it is waiting on the FRSAR project for more information. Several people on the task force had concerns about a bracketed statement that refers to “other directives” without indicating what these are. **Maxwell** was concerned about having subjects only partially addressed in a final report. **Weiss** approved of the placeholder approach. **Schmierer** stated that, absent any information about these other directives, it is hard to comprehend the direction of the document, and to accept it and agree to it. **Attig** thought the phrase was intended as “other objectives may apply”. **Weiss** assumed it is referring to other documents, other committees, and other work being done. **Jizba** asked for feedback on the task force’s response paragraph. **Myers** said he took the bracketed statement to acknowledge bifurcation of *description* and *subject analysis*. **Weiss** disagreed. **McGarry** noted that they are waiting for FRSAR before addressing this; she thinks it is a placeholder. **Yee** noted that other relevant objectives aren’t mentioned, such as *specificity* and *direct entry*. **Jizba** wondered why the document narrows subject cataloging to LC subject authority records since it purports to be international in scope. **Attig** suggested we ask for clarification. **McGarry** added that CC:DA should ask if they considered the IFLA document on principles related to subject cataloging, written in the mid-90s, *Principles Underlying Subject Heading Languages*.

Form/Genre

No mention of form and genre. More explicit references are needed. **Myers** agreed with the task force. **Weiss** was concerned that this would fall through the cracks. **Attig** concurred that it needs to be addressed, but noted that it can’t happen immediately.

Entities in Bibliographic and Authority records

Some members of the task force felt these principles are tied too closely to today’s practices. **Weiss** was concerned with the focus on *records*, as well as *manifestation* level. **Myers** objected to a code tied to past practice or tied to a future as yet unknown. **Yee** stated that the *Paris Principles* meet that objective; 3.1.2 in current practice is not tied to a specific cataloging technology. **Weiss** agreed that principles should be technology-independent and argued for use of the term *entity descriptions*, rather than *bibliographic* or *authority records*. **Schmierer** stated that we should indicate that the term *record* is the problem. **Myers** responded positively to *entity description*. **Attig** argued that we should lead with the concern about the term *record*. **Glennan** was struck by the lack of references to FRBR and FRAD. **Weiss** felt it was unclear how this document relates to FRBR and FRAD. **Maxwell** was concerned about locking in the present structure in a principles document.

Statement 4.1

Principle too closely aligned with today’s cataloging environment. **Weiss** agreed with the task force and would like 4.1 removed entirely. **Myers** countered that you can’t catalog a work until you have a manifestation to catalog. **Weiss** disagreed. **Maxwell** noted that statements 4.1 and 4.2 indicate that catalogers make MARC records for *Manifestations*, but that these are not principles. **Weiss** argued that these statements limit people’s thinking. **Attig** stated that 4.2 addresses the separate record issue. He thought CC:DA should recommend removing 4.1 and changing 4.2 to “each entity gets described.” **Weiss** agreed with this solution. **Allgood** noted that IFLA said, from the beginning, that description would be based on *Manifestations*.

Authority record

Glennan noted that despite railing against authority records, we are now suggesting changes for the sections on authority records. **Weiss** replied that the response should be interpreted as: “if you don’t agree with our earlier comments, then the following should be considered ...”

Weiss was concerned about the use of the phrase *the catalogue* as in “users of the catalogue.” Something more generic is needed. **Schmierer** suggested “users of the data we create”.

Clarke pointed out that SAC should be involved in any discussions relating to subject access and form/genre.

MOTION: Schmierer moved that the vote to IFLA should be, “Agree with comments,” and it should include the comments discussed here. **Glennan** seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Attig stated that the JSC is also looking at the *Statement of International Cataloguing Principles* and will be making comments. Tom Delsey analyzed RDA’s compliance with IFLA principles and found that they were being followed less than half of the time. John Attig argued that Tom Delsey’s analysis was perhaps overly literal, that the principles are flexible, and that RDA fits more or less under them.

The **Chair** recessed the meeting until Monday at 8 am.

*Monday, June 30, 2008, 8:00 a. m.-12:30 p.m.
Crowne Plaza Resort, Mazatlan Ballroom B/C*

1049. Welcome and opening remarks

The **Chair** called the meeting to order at 8:02 a.m. She welcomed visitors and committee members.

1050. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director

Chatham provided an overview of the current thinking on RDA and specifically addressed the delay in the release of the online product. He stated that ALA publishing and its co-publishers need more time to complete the functional specifications for phase one of the product delivery system that is to transmit the full draft of RDA to the constituencies in 2008. The prospect of major cost overruns looms large and if the functional specifications are insufficient or incomplete, revisiting them later would increase costs. There are some quality assurance benefits in the delay. The delay will also allow more time for content development. The delay is essentially to control costs, maximize functionality, and arrive at a solid framework for collaboration.

With regard to a print version, RDA was designed as and expected to be an online product. It was written and designed as such. Print isn’t an adequate substitute. In a print version, many of the tools and functionalities won’t be available. Print derivatives were always, Don Chatham recalled, the promised outcome in prior discussions.

[Below is a near-verbatim transcription of the discussion that followed.]

Bowen: As one of the people who presented RDA at various forums, there are slides that have been distributed that said RDA is an online product, but there will be a print version. For two years, we have been telling the cataloging community that there will be a print format.

Ratkovich: The JSC website *still* states there will be a print version. We are now getting mixed messages. We've reviewed the drafts in print form, so I don't buy the argument that print won't work. Yes, it may be better online, but we've made sense of the print drafts.

Chatham: I stand corrected, but the content has changed a great deal. We've learned a lot more; we know more about the product. The product has evolved. At that time, we were new to the implications of designing an online product. It's just not going to work as a print product. It was not designed to be linear. Even if we continue with this objective, the print will have to wait. Redesign of the whole content will be necessary. Online must get done first. The size of the material in RDA is much larger and unsure of the need for print. Will there be a market for the print product? The price of a print product would be high. And, once people see the online product, they might not want the print because of the quality of the online product.

Ratkovich: What is the time line for a print product? One year after? Can we get an estimate?

Hillmann: Would it be possible to use this time for market research to see what is needed? What is the demand? Is it for a full product or a subsection? A concise version? There are people who will be shut out economically from RDA. I understand your issues, but the demand for print is there. We should be figuring out whether that demand is for the full product or some derivative.

Chatham: That's where our idea of print derivatives came from. We thought there would be a need, but not for the full version. We thought of an educational version or concise version or some print offshoot would be desirable for some segments of the cataloging community. I think the problem is semantics.

Mangan: If the cost is in the printing and storage, what about an e-Book or PDF files for sale? That wouldn't cost ALA much to store. Would that work for some libraries? We need to do some market research.

Hillmann: There are some people who won't be able to see this product after the formal launch. Some constituencies may not have access to the product. They may not be in institutions or have tenuous relationships with institutions that won't allow them access to it on a regular basis. There are some constituencies, like the Dublin Core community, that may not have access to it.

Chatham: Do they have the technology?

Hillmann: Yes.

Chatham: Then they can still purchase it as a stand-alone.

Hillmann: This is not a community who are used to purchasing standards. It depends on the cost, but this is not a community friendly to the idea of purchasing standards.

Thurston: Libraries in former British colonies don't always have reliable Internet connections or power supplies. But, they do not have the funding for purchasing an expensive online product. Full-implementation makes an affordable product necessary. These are AACR2 libraries. An e-book or some other form is needed. They are getting ILSs and are online more. We have to think about them.

Chatham: We should and we will, but first things first.

Maxwell: This is an e-book. It has links to itself, but it's self-contained. An e-book does not just mean online. This is not a huge book given the way books go. Why couldn't it be available on a DVD? You need a *purchase* model as well as a *rental* model.

Chatham: It's meant to be a browser based product. Nanette Naught is the expert on this.

Naught: It can be an e-book, but it's not one now. RDA online is not an e-book. It links outside and has social bookmarking tools.

Thurston: It needs to be accessible to everyone.

Attig: We don't have specific implementation dates. There will be a point, however, where RDA will become the standard within the Anglo-American cataloging community for creating sharable cataloging records. At the implementation date, *all* catalogers will need to have access to these instructions. That doesn't mean that all of this will need to be dealt with by the release date, but by the implementation date (a year or two from now), they must be addressed. The JSC felt that the core view, while good, is not a standalone product. It is just a selection from a larger product. May need another concise product that is a derivative product; this is a separate task that may need to be done.

Myers: We are facing a transition with respect to the digital divide. Some people are comfortable with hyperlinks; others are very linear. Financial resources are tight all around. ALA publishing must be sensitive to these issues. It may be a disadvantage to focus only on the online product. There is a market out there for print product. With XML, a print product shouldn't be too difficult to produce, and shouldn't be significantly delayed from the online release.

Randall: RDA is one product. It seems that the cost of production and printing costs should be part of the overall product pricing, not recovered through the print version. Those needing print are less likely to be able to afford the costs. The basic text of RDA is an e-book. The features and tools are not the core of RDA.

Lilker: Will RDA be available as part of Cataloger's Desktop?

Chatham: We are discussing this with LC. We will be looking at LC's platform and LC's plans and processes before we can make that decision; but it is not planned at the moment.

Hillmann: Would a survey of the DCMI community be helpful? If you want this survey, I would need more information about pricing.

Chatham: More information is better about the market, users, customers, etc. Pricing is always difficult for any commercial operation. If it's priced too high, they won't buy it; if it's priced too low, you cannot support operations. Until we know more about the product, we cannot price it.

Attig: Regarding Cataloger's Desktop, as a user of cataloging tools (not as JSC rep), the co-publishers need to take seriously licensing with LC for inclusion in Cataloger's Desktop. I would think that most large institutions would probably prefer an integrated product in Cataloger's Desktop rather than an ALA standalone product. This needs to be an important factor in your business models.

Glennan: I am concerned about overall pricing structure. If it's too high, if it's not in Cataloger's Desktop, if it's not in print—people aren't going to switch from AACR2.

Weiss: Many are viewing the instructions/content as the product; ALA Publishing seems to think of the whole thing with the bells and whistles as the product. As long as people see the content as the product, they are going to lean toward the print product. Some people still don't use Cataloger's Desktop.

Chatham: RDA as a product has functionality similar to or better than Cataloger's Desktop. It can link to other tools, but the other content needs to be available. Content is part of the product; other content can be added if the work is done.

Allgood: The JSC and CC:DA have put in a tremendous amount of effort in RDA. The last thing we need is access to the standard being another hurdle to implementation. This looks like it is going to be available only to a few just from some of these discussions. Print and online were to be available simultaneously.

Chatham: The product has not even been seen yet. It is still being developed. A demonstration will be ready for IFLA. Our goal is to price it as low as possible.

Maxwell: At this point in the process, it is not unreasonable for us to want to know the price. The publication date is soon. We don't have a clue as to the price. We expected to pay a higher price than AACR2, but not on a yearly basis; that makes it significantly higher. We cannot have an outrageously priced product. We want the \$100 product, not the \$2000 product.

Chatham: We still don't know our costs. The delay is to nail down the functional specification; without the functional specification we don't know what the programming will cost. We need to know our costs, before we can price the product.

Thurston: For the former British colonies, it cannot be an annual fee. It has to be a reasonable price. \$100 is too much for them. If we want this code implemented, we have to make it accessible. Otherwise, they will remain on AACR2 because they can afford that. They don't even buy the updates.

Bowen: Regarding functionality, to link outward is going to need more work. Are you looking more at that? That's great, because we like Cataloger's Desktop at our institutions. We would love it as part of Cataloger's Desktop, but not necessarily as a competing product.

Welbourne: Public libraries want a print version of RDA. While it seemed surprising, over 100 people raised their hand in the RDA Forum. Public libraries are not going to be in the financial position to afford this product.

Winzer: It's not just public libraries; it is firm libraries, law schools, and small academic libraries that don't have money to spend on tools. The e-book idea is great because some cannot afford a yearly licensing fee.

Chatham: We have to identify market sectors. Some institutions are already paying subscription fees for Cataloger's Desktop. They are used to that model. There are other segments that bought AACR2 once, and that was it. There are some institutions that will pay that cost.

Weiss: Some here are saying that ALA should subsidize the costs. Should some of the comments go to Mary Ghikas at CoP? While I am excited about the functionality, I am hearing some concern about not being consulted about the functionality, especially because it affects price. Some don't want to pay for functionality they won't use.

Chatham: One advantage of having an online product is that there can be levels of access with different price points. There seems to be a market for a Cataloger's Desktop type version. There are some institutions that will pay that cost. Lots of things are going on. We need to parse that market, identify the layers and segments, and to price accordingly. ALA Online Resources, the new imprint for online products, will be publishing RDA. As an association, we have expenses and revenues. The publishing part of the association is to make revenue. Publishing, vendor fees, etc., help make up the costs and to make dues and registration fees lower. That's handled at a higher level in the organization.

Myers: Why wasn't this market analysis done long ago? It looks like ALA Publishing has been caught with its pants down. We are this far into the process and we are still trying to figure out what people want.

Chatham: We will be able to meet the needs of all the customers. We are aware of all the customer needs. When we started we had some assumptions, but it has evolved over time. As this moves on, we are learning more about the product. Plan has always been to have a variety of ways to meet the needs. The online product will do that, because everyone won't be paying the same price.

Schmierer: How long is ALA going to keep AACR2 available? There will still be a market for it. ALA should give some consideration to keeping it available.

Chatham: I appreciate the input. We appreciate the hard questions. We want to continue to hear from you. Keep coming at us with this stuff. It's a good product. We are confident that it's going in the right direction, but it's a change. There may be an inference that the cost of RDA is being determined by the

functionality of the product, the bells and whistles if you will. The costs involve a transition from a word document through an XML conversion process to a tagging process in a database. The costs involve the creation of an authoring system for the JSC to edit the XML documents to see how it will display in the end product. So there are costs going into the development and conversion process from AACR2 to RDA; those costs are probably equal to or more than the cost of the bells and whistles. So, the emphasis on cost requires a broad perspective. I think the pricing mechanism will fall in the spectrum of our customer base. It's more than just the bells and whistles; it's the cost of converting to XML and the process of developing the authoring system to help the JSC. The bells and whistles are relatively simple from a programming point of view; the hard part is converting to the XML document and putting in the appropriate tags in order to activate the functionalities.

Attig: I would like to emphasize that a large part of your market thinks that what they are getting and what they want is the content. While you are correct that the product is a lot more than that, I don't think at this point the major part of your market thinks that is what they want to buy. That will change as the product comes out, but to what extent it will change is uncertain. The main thing that people need is the content; that remains true. Don't assume too much about where your market is.

Chatham: We'll get a better sense of that once the demo is up.

Pinckard: Was there any market research done before this online product was developed? A survey of the catalogers of the world-print vs. electronic?

Weiss: There was some.

Chair: Don Chatham has reported on that before at CC:DA.

1051. Report from the Chair of the RDA Implementation Task Force: Cheri Folkner

The **Chair** reported on the RDA Implementation Task Force in place of Shawne Miksa. There was a meeting of the task force on Sunday, June 29, 2008. The task force has taken on the role of organizing the RDA Update Forum. There was a program on Saturday afternoon, called *Getting Ready for RDA*, with Barbara Tillett, Glenn Patton, and Barbara Bushman. Barbara Bushman spoke about the testing aspect. There were very few questions at the program, but the session was well attended. **Hillmann** stated that approximately 400 people attended but there were no questions. She had the impression that the audience was expecting more practical information from the presentations. **Johnston** (U. of Cincinnati) concurred, stating that he had hoped for nuts-and-bolts information about preparation and implementation. Instead, it focused on FRBR which was not helpful. **Weiss** agreed that more implementation-specific information needs to be shared.

Continuing her report, the **Chair** said that at the task force meeting, the bulk of the time was spent discussing how to gather training materials and formats. They will use the ALCTS and task force web sites as clearinghouses for materials. The task force may also create sample work flows in RDA. The other major item of discussion was the 2009 pre-conference program.

Weiss thinks a clearinghouse is a great idea. **Myers** reported that there is interest and excitement about RDA out there, but people want practical training. **Hillmann** asked if the task force had considered coordinating materials that would allow for local introductory sessions once the product is available. The **Chair** replied that an audio-video presentation was discussed but that the task force wasn't terribly focused on the time-line.

Bloss stated that the clearinghouse is a pilot project where each person on the task force contributes something to the store (i.e., PowerPoint slides, bibliographies, etc.). For the pre-conference, the task force will have much more information about the testing phase at the three national libraries. There will be one minimal workflow, at least, that people can use as a template.

Maxwell expressed concern that we haven't heard anything about developing content for training materials: lesson plans, outlines, etc. He noted that it took years to develop the NACO training materials. **Myers** argued that moving from a content *and* display standard to a content-only standard is a huge leap. This will be a hurdle for the community; in order to draw data out of a resource and encode it in record, catalogers will need a better crosswalk between RDA and MARC than what we currently have. **Attig** stated that some of this is difficult because decisions are still being made. In the beginning, we will focus on MARC/ISBD implementations. We need to start focusing on schedules, i.e., when people need to know things. He hopes this will start falling into place. **Hillmann** reminded the group that there is an effort underway to build tools that would allow you put RDA data into non-MARC packages. The problem is that no one has been engaged in building the tools. **Weiss** stated that he thinks it's easier to work with a content-only standard, especially for training. **Thurston** said she was willing to work on getting the task force into the national libraries' testing group.

Allgood asked Attig about a projected release date. **Attig** stated that the JSC can't be too specific at the moment. The delay for the online product is two months, so maybe it will be ready for ALA Annual 2009. **Altschuler** asked that law firms and other libraries that collect materials RDA doesn't cover not be forgotten. **Hillmann** will be running a session on RDA at the DC Conference in Berlin in September. She stated that there is a lot of interest in Europe and other international locations and hopes the product will be available for demonstration by then.

1052. Report from the MARBI Representative: Everett Allgood

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2008/2 [preliminary]]

Allgood presented highlights from MARBI's meetings related to the fifteen proposals and discussion papers listed below:

1. **Proposal No. 2008-06:** *Adding information associated with the Series Added Entry fields (800-830)*
Approved as written.
2. **Proposal No. 2008-07:** *Making field 440 (Series Statement/Added Entry--Title) obsolete in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format*
Approved. MARBI considered this in two separate parts: first, to make the 440 obsolete; second, to redefine the meaning of the first indicator value "1" in the 490. Both were approved.
3. **Proposal No. 2008-04:** *Changes to Nature of entire work and Nature of content codes in field 008 of the MARC bibliographic format*
Approved with minor editorial revisions.
4. **Proposal No. 2008-10:** *Definition of a subfield for Other standard number in field 534 of the MARC 21 bibliographic format*
Approved. The phrase *Other standard number* was changed to *Other resource identifier*. In cases of ambiguity, there will be a prefix or contextual device to indicate the nature of the number.
5. **Proposal No. 2008-08:** *Definition of subfield \$z in field 017 of the MARC 21 Bibliographic and addition of the field to the MARC 21 Holdings formats*
Approved.
6. **Proposal No. 2008-09:** *Definition of Videorecording format codes in field 007/04 of the MARC 21 bibliographic format*
Approved a code for Blu-ray Discs, but not HD DVDs (use "z" for other).

- 7. Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP06:** *Coding deposit programs as methods of acquisitions in field 008/07 of the MARC 21 holdings format*
This proposal will be re-considered at Midwinter 2009. Definitions needed to encode the differences between different countries must be examined.
- 8. Proposal No. 2008-05/1:** *Encoding RDA: Introduction and Principles*
No action was taken at this time because this was primarily a background document. Some concepts were raised, including, the concepts of *records*, completeness of records, and the parsing of data. MARBI must further consider content designation.
- 9. Proposal No. 2008-05/2:** *Identifying work and expression records in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority formats*
MARBI is taking a wait-and-see approach to determine how this should be implemented.
- 10. Proposal No. 2008-05/3:** *New content designation for RDA elements: Content type, Media Type, Carrier Type*
The JSC established a domain name and is finalizing the list and code values. These will be available via persistent URIs and a place in MARC will be required to encode them. The proposal will be revised for Midwinter 2009.
- 11. Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/3:** *Treatment of controlled lists of terms and coded data in RDA and MARC 21*
Other and *Unspecified* considered as valid terms in code lists. This will come back at Midwinter 2009.
- 12. Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/1:** *Using RDA relators between names and resources with MARC 21 records*
This will come back at Midwinter 2009.
- 13. Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/2:** *New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format*
This will come back at Midwinter 2009.
- 14. Proposal No. 2008-05/4:** *Enhancing field 502 (Dissertation note) of the MARC 21 Bibliographic format*
Approved. Will not include indicator number and *dissertation number* will be renamed *dissertation identifier*.
- 15. Discussion Paper No. 2008-DP05/4:** *Items not requiring MARC 21 format changes for RDA*
This will come back at Midwinter 2009 or some other time in the future.

In the LC report, Sally McCallum indicated that LC is attempting to be responsive to RDA development. Any proposals or discussion papers will be fast-tracked for Midwinter 2009.

Maxwell asked when the 440 would be made obsolete. **Attig** replied that many people have already stopped using it. PCC has to make decisions, too. Typically, there is a commitment not to implement before 90 days after the publication of the specification which will be published at the end of the year. Therefore, it would be the 2nd quarter of 2009 before it became obsolete. **Allgood** stated that OCLC would be working to making the change from 440s to 490s. The **Chair** asked what plans PCC has regarding this. **Fletcher** responded that there are no particular plans. **Randall** said that there was a great deal of interest at the BIBCO/CONSER meetings for implementing this as soon as July 1. **Clarke** mentioned that many communities have ILSs that may not support this change.

1053. Report on status of review of PCC's *Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets*: Peter Fletcher

The **Chair** reminded the committee why this was on the agenda: Recommendation 3 in the report from the Task Force on Non-English Access charged CC:DA and CC:AAM to work with PCC to review and update the core-level supplements for *Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets*.

Fletcher reported that the task force met on Sunday to finalize the edits of the document. It has been updated to indicate the new authority environment allowing for inclusion of non-Roman scripts. There is a larger issue which involves updating, revising, and creating PCC documentation for non-Roman cataloging. They have identified nine PCC and six non-PCC documents that could be added to the discussion. All of this is done with the aim to have a PCC task group charged to undertake the revision and creation of non-Roman cataloging documentation. They have approval for the task group and the charge is being written. They need language experts to serve.

The **Chair** reiterated that they have finalized the updates and need to clean up the final draft. **Fletcher** is not sure when it will be posted. It might go up through PCC for approvals. Peter Fletcher will find out approval times and publication dates and will write this up in a report for the Chair to be forwarded to CC:AAM and Magda El-Sherbini.

1054. Report from the Task Force on CC:DA's Internal and External Communication: Laura Smart and Cheri Folkner

[[CC:DA/TF/Communication/5](#)]

Smart reported that the task force had only two items remaining: 1) To work with Webmaster to migrate the website, and 2) To continue working on the external contacts list and to integrate it in the website.

Work with Webmaster

Patricia Hatch, the new Webmaster, has been trained in Collage, the ALA Content Management System. She has been working with Christine Taylor to inventory the existing PSU site and to compile a list of key web pages to be moved to the ALA site. Some information (mostly historical documents) will remain at PSU for the time being. The migration will happen over time. The task force recommends that they continue working with the Webmaster, and the Webmaster continue to work with ALA on the development of a project plan for migration. Once the plan is in place, the Webmaster should request the creation of a new task force that will oversee the conversion process. Once the new site is up to specifications, the remaining documents can migrate.

External communications list

One authorized individual should do the maintenance and upgrades. There is no ALA mechanism to do batch emails. The task force recommended that CC:DA "approve" the contacts list and that it should be reviewed annually. She thanked the task force for all their hard work.

Glennan asked if there were guidelines for types of organizations that should be on the list. **Smart** replied that they should just let the task force know who should be included. Any group that has something to do with cataloging is appropriate. **Attig** added that all the liaisons' organizations should be included.

Weiss moved to accept all of the recommendations. **Glennan** seconded. The motion carried unanimously.

The **Chair** thanked the task force for its work and formally discharged it.

The **Chair** addressed options for archiving the public email list, for both the committee and for the public. **Weiss** was in favor of following the easiest option; the goal is to have the archive online and searchable as soon as possible. The **Chair** said she believed Option 2 to be the easiest. **Thurston** agreed with Option 2. The **Chair** said she would inform Charles Wilt of this decision.

Schmierer asked, "If we believe this is important for CC:DA, then maybe it should be important to ALA. Should this be added to the ALA Archives in University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign? What is Urbana-Champaign's plan to archive these electronic materials? This is all pretty new." The **Chair** offered to bring the issue up with the ALCTS board.

Th  roux commented that ACRL is happy with the open list and some members asked that the CC:DA wiki on RDA be opened up. The **Chair** was not in favor of this idea. **Weiss** replied that he was in favor of read-only access. **Myers** will follow up on a read-only wiki.

1055. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Patricia Hatch

[[CC:DA/Webmaster/2008/1](#)]

Hatch discussed some highlights from the report. She is continuing to update the existing CC:DA website at PSU. She attended virtual trainings on Collage, the ALA Content Management system, and learned that 300+ CC:DA HTML pages must be converted to XML in order to be migrated to ALA's site. There is no batch process developed at this time; she is waiting for ALA recommendations on how to handle this.

Weiss advised that ALA may not have a process; we need a back-up plan. **Hatch** agreed, noting that ALA mentioned a batch process for something else that might work for our process.

She is trying to get the CC:DA homepage/portal (mini-site) migrated onto the ALA site, leaving many historical documents at PSU for now. Current list of documents slated for mini-site are available for people to see. ALA will allow CC:DA-specific left-hand navigation. Once the mini-site is set up, the full migration will begin. When it is time to do this, she will request a task force be formed to assist. She worked with the Task Force on Internal/External Communication, the details of which Smart covered in her report.

Weiss moved to accept the recommendations in her report; **Smart** seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

1056. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

The CCS Executive Committee wants an evaluation from CC:DA about RDA once it is released for review.

The Chair received a request from the Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee to co-sponsor a program on open access cataloging for Annual 2009. **Randall** stated that, after further discussion, the members of the Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee decided that they were not going to sponsor a program.

Weiss asserted that CC:DA should formally communicate with Mary Ghikas of CoP to address the price of RDA. He asked that a CoP representative be invited to a committee meeting. **Attig** did not know if that would be feasible. The **Chair** responded that the request should go through CCS Executive Board and up through the hierarchy. **Weiss** said it would be interesting to hear CCS' reaction. Members of this committee would be interested, and would want to pass information on to their constituencies.

Schmierer agreed that this should go through the hierarchy. She went on to note that there were some interesting principles advanced during earlier discussions about how we are approaching this product. There is tension between ALA as an organization with a social mission and ALA as a business. CCS

should make this issue clear to ALCTS. This is an important social concern for the Association and decisions must be made at a much higher level. **Randall** noted that these issues are related to the LC Working Group report. It would be good to talk to the CoP about these tensions. These issues about RDA can be tied to the recommendations in response to the LC report.

The **Chair** discussed timelines:

- July 21 deadline for comments on NISO/ISO ballot
- July 22 chair will receive report from DCRM(S) Task Force; response to be sent to Bibliographic Standards Committee by August 1
- Sept. 4 deadlines for comments on NISO/ISO ballot
- Two weeks before Midwinter 2009 – CCS Exec needs RDA evaluation document

Attig stated that the JSC has not given specific dates for the review of the full draft. Responses will be due before Midwinter, so the draft will not be on the agenda for Midwinter. It's unlikely that CC:DA will need a Friday meeting. **Weiss** reminded the committee that the demo will be out before Midwinter, so CC:DA could add a discussion about that to the agenda.

There are several outgoing members from CC:DA: Elizabeth Mangan will no longer be a voting member, but will stay on as MAGERT liaison; Patricia Thurston is cycling off the committee; Laura Smart is resigning from CC:DA due to job considerations; Daniel Joudrey, our intern, is going on SAC; Cheri Folkner is finishing her term. She stated that it has been an honor to be committee chair. John Myers will be the new chair of CC:DA. Incoming voting members to CC:DA include: Lori Robare, Kathy Winzer, Sylvia Hall-Ellis; Kevin Randall will fill out Laura Smart's term. Nancy Poehlmann is the new intern.

1057. Announcement of next meeting

The next meeting will be held in Denver, Colorado at the ALA Midwinter Meeting. The following times were requested:

- Saturday, January 24, 2009
- Monday, January 26, 2009

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 10:54 A.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Alexandra Crosier, Intern
Daniel N. Joudrey, Intern