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
2010 Midwinter ALA conference in Boston, Massachusetts
January 16 and 18, 2010

Members present:
John Myers, Chair
Kathy Glennan
Sylvia Hall-Ellis [absent 1/18]
Kevin Randall
Lori Robare
Penny Welbourne
Kathy Winzer
Bob Wolverton
Martha Yee

K.R. Roberto, Intern
Peter Rolla, Intern
Patricia Hatch, CC:DA Webmaster

Ex-officio representatives present:
John Attig, ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC

ALA Liaisons present:
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, ALCTS/CRS (represented by Jennifer Young on 1/16 and by
            Steve Shadle on 1/18)
Everett Allgood, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA/MARBI
Steven J. Miller, ALCTS/NRMIG
Helen Schmierer, ALCTS/PARS
Laurence S. Creider, ALA/ACRL
Susan H. Pinckard, ALA/GODORT
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT (represented by Dorothy McGarry)
Bob Hall, ALA/PLA
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA

Non-ALA Liaisons:

John Hostage, AALL & IFLA
Elizabeth Lilker, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC (represented by Martha Yee)
Diane Hillmann, DCMI
Chamya P. Kincy, MedLA
Mark Scharff, MusLA
Kelley McGrath, OLAC (represented by Martha Yee)
Peter Fletcher, PCC
Dorothy McGarry, SLA

Notes:

I.   The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have been rearranged in order to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.

II.   While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the process of transcription is laborious. Only in some cases are exact quotes included.

III.   In CC:DA minutes, a "vote of the Committee" indicates a poll of the actual voting members rather than of representatives/liaisons of a particular agencies or groups. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term "straw vote" indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives/liaisons to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.

IV.   In CC:DA minutes, the term "members" is used to apply to both voting and 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., 2005 revision
AALL = American Association of Law Libraries
AASL = American Association of School Librarians
ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate
ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries
ALA = American Library Association
ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America
ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections
ATLA = American Theological Libraries Association
CC:AAM = ALCTS/CCS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials

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

SLA = Special Libraries Association
XML = Extensible Markup Language

Saturday, January 16, 2010, 1:30-5:30 p.m.
Boston Convention & Exhibition Center, Room 205 A/B

1088. Welcome and opening remarks

John Myers, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:34 pm and welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors.

1089. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives
[CC:DA/Roster/2009 July]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The Chair routed the roster for members to sign in.

1090. Adoption of agenda
[CC:DA/A/61]

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. **Hall-Ellis** moved to adopt the agenda; seconded by **Glennan**. The motion carried unanimously and the agenda was adopted

1091. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2009 Annual Conference, July 13 and 15, 2009
[CC:DA/M/1076-1087]

Several corrections to the minutes had been received via e-mail. These corrections are:

§1081, end of 3rd paragraph:
The identification of Nannette Naught as RDA program manager should be corrected …
"Nannette Naught the RDA program manager was attending the Linked Records panel which discussed this scenario." Nannette Naught is a contractor to ALA Publishing, not the "program manager" (which was Marjorie Bloss until her contract ended last June).

§1084, 4th paragraph, regarding the VIAF:
Virtual International Authority File should be capitalized

§1084, 6th paragraph, regarding the ICP:
The sentence addressing publication of the ICP by Saur should read: "The published text will be available this month from Saur and includes translations of the statement into 20 languages."

§1084, 8th paragraph, regarding RDA testing:

References to LC in this paragraph should be changed to the RDA Test Coordinating Committee, with the first reference noting the membership of LC, NAL, and NLM.

§1084, 9th paragraph:
Strike the extraneous apostrophe from the beginning of the 4th sentence, Data can be captured…

Motion to approve the minutes as corrected by **Robare**; seconded by **Glennan**. Motion carried unanimously and the minutes were approved as corrected.

1092. Report from the Chair

Normally the activities of the committee performed electronically between meetings need to be confirmed, but there are no motions to confirm from the previous six months. The last six months have been an extraordinarily quiet period, between the finalization of the RDA text and the release of the online product.

The only item in the Chair's formal report is the Task Force to Review FRSAD, which was authorized at the close of the July meeting. Due to the nature of the topic, and following conversation with SAC and CCS Exec, the Task Force was elevated to the status of a CCS task force with oversight of the committee and its report and actions were submitted to CCS. Lori Robare is the chair of the task force, which did its work in remarkable time, given the timeline and the amount of coordination required in very short order.

Attig asked about the status of FRSAD within IFLA, and **Hostage** answered that he thought they were still working on a draft. McGarry clarified that the working group responsible met in November or December and are indeed working on a draft but it has not been sent out yet.

In another piece of business, the **Chair** reported he will be meeting with CCS Exec tomorrow, as it is looking at restructuring the leadership arrangements for this committee. Normally CC:DA has a one-year, renewable appointment to the chair, but CCS Exec is presently considering realigning CC:DA with the leadership arrangement for other parts of the division, that is, a three-year commitment as vice-chair, chair, and immediate past chair. The **Chair** therefore seeks input from the Committee's members and liaisons regarding their thoughts and impressions of the current arrangement and the possibility of new arrangements.

Winzer asked if, based on the Chair's experience, having three people: pre-chair, chair, and past-chair, would be helpful and less stressful. The **Chair** replied that he does not have a good answer to that question, and that is why he brought this issue to the rest of the Committee. He is of two minds: on the plus side would be the opportunity to have a testing ground for someone and a more gradual process for bringing him/her into leadership positions for the Committee. On the flip side, CC:DA chairs have been remarkably supportive of incoming chairs, even when the off-going individuals are rotating off both the chairship and the committee. He has had very good relations with both of his predecessors and they have both been very available for guidance and insight. He does not then see the need to address the turnover issue. Another aspect of the proposed arrangement is that it would lock us into continual turnover, with the chair changing

every year. Historically the committee has preferred more continuity within the chair position itself, where someone is chair for multiple years.

Attig agreed that the proposed structure would make it difficult to serve more than one year as chair. Also, one of the more problematic aspects is the third year, since presumably the past-chair would still have to be a voting member of the Committee during that year. This restriction would narrow the choices for chair and chair-elect even further. We need internal leadership arrangements, like smaller groups to set the agenda as the committee gets busier, but that can be done informally and does not have to be done structurally. An arrangement that spans three years is problematic and we should not write into rules something we know is going to be difficult to do. Also, it is not clear what the distinct roles and separate functions of the three different people would be. CCS Exec seems to be trying to address the annual frantic search for someone willing and eligible to be chair, but this proposal does not really solve that problem. The **Chair** responded that the last issue is in fact the crux of the matter, that is, trying to address the recruitment issues for the chair of this committee.

Randall agreed with Attig that the three year arrangement doesn't fit with the Committee's two-year appointment process. Also, he does not see need for the past chair. The first year as chair-trainee would prepare someone and she/he wouldn't need to have the past-chair backing her/him up the following year as chair.

Bruce **Johnson**, from the audience, shared that he is hard pressed to see the advantages of such an arrangement. The only advantage would be leadership development, and ALCTS already has leadership training available for its committee and section chairs. In terms of continuity, he mentioned his first experience as a committee chair, when his immediate predecessor was Martha Yee. That particular hand-off of leadership was the gold standard for him, and Yee did an outstanding job of getting him up to speed with what the committee was doing and what was involved in taking the chair. The proposed arrangement will not replace that sort of coaching and collaboration.

Creider remarked that the Committee already has interns who perform some of the administrative duties that a vice-chair might take on, so he questions whether such a position is necessary. Also the proposed arrangement would not solve the occasional crisis of continuity, when people get elected but then move to a new position or new institution. He also asked if the Committee generated this issue or whether ALCTS is trying to have more conformity. The **Chair** replied that the issue was brought up by CCS Exec to try and solve the difficulty in finding chairs for the Committee.

Wolverton expressed concern that such arrangement would wind up putting more pressure on the Chair, because he or she will have one or two additional people to find things to do and to coordinate activities with. In his experience, having a co-chair is worse, because they have to divide and coordinate territory; such an arrangement adds to the responsibility of the Chair.

Speaking somewhat in favor of the proposed arrangement, **Winzer** pointed out that this year has been exceptionally light, but in other years the Chair has had a huge workload, with an enormous

number of reports and task forces to guide. Perhaps the pre-chair could be assigned some of this work to help the Chair. In some years the workload has been overwhelming and even though the committee members have tried to pitch in, ultimately the Chair is responsible. So a vice-chair could be helpful, but she also felt that a past-chair position would not fit with the maximum four years that someone can serve on the committee as a voting member.

A problem that **Robare** sees with the three-year commitment is that it would be harder to recruit people to commit for a full three years. She also feels that there is a learning curve once you actually step into the chairship, no matter how much preparation you have had. It seems like a waste of leadership development and preparation to make people move out of the position after one year if they are willing to serve for two.

The **Chair** asked for a straw poll to find out people's opinion of the new structure versus the old. **Allgood** asked, for clarification before the poll, for a description of the current process. The **Chair** replied that the chairship of the Committee is a one-year appointment, eligible for re-appointment subject to the term restraints on a voting member. **Attig** added that the Chair must be voting member at the time of appointment. The **Chair** clarified that one can be tapped to be Chair and voting member at the same time, which has happened, although normally a person serves as a voting member for at least a year, to see the workings of the Committee, and then becomes Chair. We have had chairs who served for just one year and some who have served three years. **Allgood** remarked that there have certainly been times when we have wanted the Chair to stay on longer than one year, so the flexibility is important. The **Chair** asked for a show of hands: the results indicated that the Committee feels the current arrangement best serves our needs and is most appropriate.

1093. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett
[LC Representative Report, January 2010]
[IFLA Names of Persons - United States]

Tillett presented a concise version of the full Library of Congress report for the Committee, and encouraged those in attendance to take a look at the full report online to see what is happening in areas other than cataloging. She mentioned that LC has various webcasts and presentations related to cataloging at their exhibit booth, number 2238. The booth also has information and URLs for specific webcasts that are available to view at any time. They are posting more and more of their training information on YouTube University.

She reported that there will be temporary staffing assignments to the Copyright Office to address a large backlog there, with the expectation that 130,000 items will be processed by mid-March. She reported on various other permanent personnel changes and new appointments.

She reported on developments concerning the national test of RDA, which arose in response to the Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control's recommendation. LC is collaborating with NAL and NLM and the plans for the test are well under way. Yesterday, she and Judith Kuhagen presented an all day train-the-trainer session for test participants. There will be some additional sessions tomorrow for test participants and a vendor meeting Sunday

morning, and also a general interest meeting for participants. Also, the RDA Forum on Sunday afternoon at 1:30 will have a demo and information about pricing.

An on-going project to automate the harvesting of ONIX data from publishers in order to build MARC 21 records has been very successful. It started first with two publishers, Cambridge University Press and Wiley, and later included Harper Collins imprints. LC looked at the availability of ONIX data coming in through the CIP stream, and also looked at the usefulness of that data and the problems or unexpected results of converting it to MARC. It looked at changes that needed to be made in the CIP workflow and if there was any additional information in the ONIX data that was not currently being provided in MARC records. The initial results are mixed but in general the test has been useful. The publishers do not always provide consistent information, and some elements are missing or incorrect. The records received from publishers are basically accurate however, and the conversion process from ONIX to MARC is twice as fast as the former process of extracting data from CIP galleys, although in some cases the missing elements made processing longer. The pilot is being expanded to include imprints from Palgrave, Macmillan, and Oxford University Press. If it continues to have successful results they hope to take it out of project mode and implement it more broadly in electronic CIP processing.

The Policy and Standards Division has performed some outreach activities to Spanish-speaking librarians, not only in the United States but also in Latin America and with the National Library of Spain. In August 2009, at the request of the Biblioteca Nacional de Chile and working with the State Department in Santiago, Chile, they had a video conference in Spanish and made a webcast of it. It is now available and has been used in Chile and throughout Latin America. Thanks are due to Ana Cristan, who made the initial connections and who has been lead person in dealing with Spanish-speaking communities. LC continues to focus on outreach to those communities. It has also been translating some basic IFLA conceptual documents and the background information related to cataloging principles as well as some of the preliminary frequently asked questions relating to RDA.

Tillett also spoke about a review of the Library of Congress Rule Interpretations. There are approximately 525 existing LCRIs. LC received a report from a Program for Cooperative Cataloging's task force that looked at recommendations for PCC related to the LCRIs in the context of RDA. LC took into account that report and did its own review in the Policy and Standards Division. They decided to retain about 125, or one-fourth, of the LCRIs. These will be used as annotations to the RDA instructions and in the RDA test. The preliminary title for these annotations is Library of Congress Policy Statements (LCPS), and LC is hoping to come up with a "PS" icon to use within RDA. LC has had some preliminary discussions with ALA Publishing on how to visualize that and make it work in the tool.

The main categories of LCRIs that were retained include: specific guidance on pre-cataloging decisions; instructions related to CIP practices that LC and its CIP partners will need; instructions for names of places, because RDA Chapter 16 for places is not yet complete; instructions for musical works and legal works, because not all needed revisions have been incorporated into RDA yet; and instructions developed with other constituencies (e.g., named works of art, American Indian tribes, manuscript repositories). Many LCRIs were incorporated

into RDA through LC's proposals and will therefore be cancelled. Others will be cancelled because they were just historical information. This information will be archived so people who are interested will be able to know LC's past practices. Other cancelled instructions deal with LC's previous online system, as well AACR2 and pre-AACR2 instructions. LC is looking forward to having these policy statements in the RDA tool and to getting feedback from the PCC and other partners in the RDA test on additional useful documentation that would be important to add to that particular series.

In a series of further updates, **Tillett** announced that the pre-population project of authority records for non-Latin materials was continuing with OCLC. More work will be done on this in 2010. Also, LC has begun working with OCLC to add geographic coordinates to the data in authority records. NACO participants have been able to supply coordinates in the 034 field. OCLC will harvest coordinate data and add it to the main authority records. Once this is done, OCLC will explore adding this data to subject authority records. The Virtual International Authority File (VIAF) is now in beta and can be cited in NACO authority records. LC is encouraging NACO catalogers to use this resource, and also to give feedback on VIAF – there is an ability to comment within the tool itself, at viaf.org. Also, in 2009, since the last ALA meeting, Cataloger's Desktop 3.0 has been released. **Tillett** thanked everyone who helped develop and test the new version. In a new feature, all the back issues of the Cataloging Service Bulletin, in scanned PDF versions, have been added to Cataloger's Desktop and to LC's website. Finally, the "Statement of Cataloging Principles" from IFLA is in print. It was published in August, in time for the IFLA conference in Milan. This important publication is definitely the foundation of RDA, as well as the foundation of a new cataloging code developed in Italy and for others being considered.

Tillett presented the statistics for production within Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access (ABA). Since last year was a year of major reorganization, production went down a bit, as expected. In authority work, however, production went up, due to the work of LC's NACO partners. The Collections and Services Directorate also contains cataloging units. For example, the Geography and Map Division has a special project to catalog 125,000 sheet maps of Africa, which will include providing geographic coordinates in the bibliographic records.

The Prints and Photographs Division is working with ACRL's RBMS to develop the next unit of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials,* for graphics and image materials. They will have a meeting here at ALA to continue working on the process.

The Integrated Library Systems Program Office has expanded and improved the performance of LC's ILS. They have increased the number of simultaneous users, and have had no denials of service for the OPAC. There have still been a small number of denials of service for the authorities catalog, but the Office is working on expanding access to it this coming year. Also, LC is providing persistent identifiers for bibliographic records and is hoping that these Permalinks will soon be available for authority information.

Lastly, **Tillett** provided information on the XML Data Store, a project to provide seamless access to all the metadata that describe LC's collections. They have loaded all of the ILS data, their

EADs for archival descriptions and finding aids, and serial records from the electronic resources management system. All will be searchable through the XML Data Store, which should make access to special collections at LC even better.

Attig commented that those involved in the development of Cataloger's Desktop 3.0 really want to thank **Tillett** for providing a significant and enhanced service. The new features are very exciting and response time is much better. **Tillett** replied that it is really all thanks to Bruce Johnson.

Yee asked about RDA testing, and whether LC will decide on which options in RDA to use before the testing, as part of the test, or after. **Tillett** replied that the US RDA Steering Group had a discussion about this: their basic premise is to leave a lot to catalogers judgment since that is one of the foundations of RDA and they want to test the results of doing that. Part of the test is to come up with what elements are required in a core record, and then LC will be making decisions internally concerning what to include in what they are calling "core plus". They will be testing these decisions and whether these elements will be kept. They have also done a preliminary pass through on alternatives, optional additions, optional omissions, and on decisions that are listed as up to the cataloging agency. They have made some preliminary decisions on these options for LC. These options are still being discussed with their management team, and once decided will be used in the test. Through the test they will be able to see the results of those preliminary policy decisions. The testing does give them a nice opportunity to try out different options. They have even considered letting some catalogers try one way and other catalogers another, to be able to compare, but they are not certain if they will go in that direction or not. They are hoping to have the LC preliminary decisions for the test as part of the public release of RDA. The review has been a huge amount of work and is still ongoing.

After finishing the LC report, **Tillett** moved on to the proposed revisions to the IFLA *Names of Persons*. LC has had a request for feedback from Judith Kuhagen, the LC representative to the Standing Committee of the IFLA Cataloguing Section and the key person for IFLA in updating the *Names of Persons.*. The draft of the section of the *Names of Persons* for the United States of America was shared with CC:DA. LC has already given feedback and suggested modifications to the document. Many of the examples in the document are historic and some are quite old names, and so Kuhagen would welcome any additional, more current examples that CC:DA could suggest. **Tillett** then opened up the discussion for ALA comments, questions, or additions and changes to this document. The document begins with a section on the elements that normally form part of the name. For the U.S. this is tricky because people come here from all over the world. We do have conventions for telephone books and other lists of names, which include special treatment for foreign names. The IFLA document tries to reflect these conventions.

Schmierer asked if the specifications have ever been sent to publishers. When doing NACO work, you find that publishers have their own ideas about how names are supposed be represented. If publishers could be given this information it might inform their practices in ways that would be helpful. They might also have useful ideas on how names should be presented. **Tillett** remarked that this was a good suggestion, and that LC has a good way to communicate with publishers through the CIP program.

Robare commented that there were no examples of compound hyphenated names. **Tillett** agreed that this situation is more and more common, and asked for examples to be sent to LC. **Scharff** asked whether names like "Little Richard" or for musicians would be useful. **Tillett**, after conferring with Judith **Kuhagen** in the audience, again agreed that that would be helpful.

Hostage opined that there should be a section for suffixes after names, like junior, senior, and numbers. **Tillett** remarked that now in RDA these suffixes are considered part of the name and not additions, but agreed that the IFLA document should consider them. **Hostage** stated it was unclear on whether the U.S. section was considered to be a supplement to the section on the United Kingdom, and **Tillett** replied that it is supposed to be a separate section. The top of the document does refer to the United Kingdom section for name usage in English, but many U.S. names are not English in origin so a separate section is justified.

Per **Tillett**, examples and suggestions can be sent to the Chair or directly to Judith Kuhagen at jkuh@loc.gov.

Creider remarked that with the increasing ethnic diversity of U.S. populations there are people here from countries that do not use family names or surnames, and felt that the document should perhaps address this. **Tillett** asked him to suggest something and then run it through CC:DA.

Judith **Kuhagen**, from the audience, remarked that the Cataloguing Section of IFLA, along with the Classification and Indexing Section, are considering having a survey of IFLA members, and anyone else willing to answer, posted on IFLANET about many of the cataloging standards used by libraries around the world. The *Names of Persons* has a section, under each country, titled "National cataloguing code," but the Cataloguing Section is thinking of taking this information out and putting it with the survey on the website, where it can be more easily updated. **Kuhagen** had anticipated questions from the Committee about this section of the document, which currently lists AACR2 as the code. This section appears in the draft sent to the Committee, but it might not be in the final document, especially since Saur plans to publish the document only as a printed text, at least for the first 6-12 months. After that the Section hopes to have an online version.

Replying to **Hostage's** previous question about suffixes, **Kuhagen** clarified that the U.K. document does address this issue and the U.S. document refers back to the U.K., but she does not see a problem with repeating the information in the U.S. section. She added that the U.S. is not alone in having residents from other cultures, so that documents are starting to contain more and more cross-references back to other nations and languages for usage rules. It is not possible to reproduce in every country's section the rules for every other potential language, especially because the publication is already quite lengthy.

Tillett pointed out that the document has a section on sources and recommended references. CC:DA came up with a huge list like this for RDA, with different sources for standards and different resources. She asked the Committee to recommend any other major useful tools or resources they could think of to add to the list. **Attig** pointed out particularly the section of the

bibliography called "Numerous free on-line databases." He feels that there are others not listed that may be more significant than those listed and encouraged people to make suggestions.

Robert **Maxwell** from the audience remarked that the large categories of Native American and Hawaiian names appear to be missing. **Tillett** replied that in the last revision of "Names of persons" LC did specifically send in information on indigenous people's names, so she needs to look into that.

1094. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig
         [5JSC/Sec/6/Rev]

During the report of the ALA Representative to the JSC, the committee discussed at length the JSC document listing the deferred issues for RDA. The committee focused on those issues that had arisen from its responses to the various drafts. Of these comments, a number were felt to be more properly under the purview of the various CC:DA constituencies. These were referred back to the appropriate liaisons for action by the organizations they represent. Several other specific issues entail consideration of larger issues that warrant resolution by the JSC. Once the JSC sets the overall direction in those cases, CC:DA will revisit the specifics to determine if proposals can be generated. The remaining issues were few in number and were prioritized. The committee determined that there are three issues, somewhat interconnected, that it would like to address in the immediate time frame surrounding release of RDA and establishment of a revision process. Those issues are (with page references to 5JSC/Sec/6/Rev): the separate instructions for Government bodies and Other Corporate Bodies (p.22); instructions for Ruling executive bodies (p.25); and instructions for Heads of State and Heads of Government (p.26).

[The ALA Representative to the JSC subsequently prepared a full report on the outcome of the Committee's discussions, available at:
http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/jsc1004.pdf]

Monday, January 18, 2010, 8:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.
Boston Convention & Exhibition Center, Room 205 A/B

1095. Welcome and opening remarks

John Myers, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 8:05 am and welcomed Committee members, liaisons, representatives and visitors.

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The Chair routed the roster for members to sign in.

1096. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director, and **Troy Linker**, Technology Publishing Director.

Chatham and **Linker** presented a slightly abridged reprise of the presentation they had given at the RDA Update Forum the day before. This presentation included a live demonstration of the

beta version of the RDA Toolkit product along with some other details including pricing and licensing information. The pricing information is: $325 for a single concurrent user; $55 additional for each extra concurrent user in the 2-9 users range; $50 additional for each extra concurrent user in the 10-19 users range; and $45 additional for each concurrent user in the 20+ users range. There was some follow-on discussion about what would constitute a licensing body with respect to participants in large academic systems and library networks. The committee also raised its ongoing concern regarding a print product for the benefit of agencies that might lack either the financial or infrastructure to support subscription or access to the online product. Arrangements are being made for access to the RDA toolkit through Catalogers' Desktop, although separate contracts/licenses for each product will be required.

Allgood asked about pricing. **Chatham** stated that pricing is competitive with other cataloging databases that ALA Publishing has investigated. **Linker** commented that there will probably be special consortial and institutional pricing; consortial pricing is usually determined on a case-by-case basis, so it cannot be addressed at this time. **Allgood** asked about the possibility of perpetual access. **Linker** replied that ALA Publishing hopes to research this issue further; however, perpetual access for databases, unlike journal packages, is difficult to provide for stand-alone databases. **Pinckard** requested clarification about issues for larger academic libraries; for example, how will ALA address licensing for universities with multiple libraries and campuses? **Linker** stated that ALA plans to be flexible and reasonable and is currently investigating institutional pricing. **Hall** asked about consortial usage, and **Linker** said that ALA will try to keep it equitable. Workflows provide ways to annotate and personalize the Toolkit's content, and are affiliated with institutional logins. These workflows will remain on the server for a brief period after an institution's license lapses. The Toolkit allows individual RDA chapters to be printed, though dissemination and usage of these printouts is limited. **Welbourne** wondered if the only way to get a print copy is to print it out chapter by chapter. **Linker** confirmed this to be the case, noting that there has been substantial discussion on how to address this concern. ALA Publishing feels that RDA is not very navigable in print form. **Randall** did not agree, stating that he sees no reason for this not to be issued in print. However, the CoP is very interested in RDA being issued as an online-only product.

1097. Presentation on Application Profiles: Hillmann

Diane **Hillmann** was joined by her colleagues, Jon **Phipps** and Karen **Coyle**, in delivering a presentation on Application Profiles (APs). The presentation featured three sections. The first was an introduction focusing on some technical vocabulary and description of the semantic web, the second discussed briefly how semantic web concepts find parallelism and applicability in the structures provided by the FRBR conceptual model, and the last placed application profiles in context by addressing the potential benefits to libraries generally and the cataloging community specifically as records are both deconstructed and opened up to machine processing. [They have mounted the slides online and made them available at this url: http://www.slideshare.net/smartbroad/introduction-to-application-profiles.]

Attig asked about institutional context for Application Profiles, "Are they utilized in settings beyond Dublin Core?" **Hillmann** stated that APs are found all over the Internet, but Dublin

Core provides the only portion that is machine-manageable. The necessary tools are still being created, and tools for change management are especially important. **Coyle** suggested distributing the link to the Scholarly Works Application Profile, which is located at http://www.ukoln.ac.uk/repositories/digirep/index/SWAP. **Yee** asked how different URIs for the same entity—for example, a Social Security Administration record for an individual and an authority record for the same person—can be linked in machine-readable form. **Phipps** stated that humans either have to explain this to the machines or create a way for machines for discover this information; a person, a script, or a person-created thing can solve this. As an example, he mentioned how the New York Times database provides data about individuals and also links to people's Wikipedia entries when applicable. **Yee** inquired about display and indexing issues, with **Phipps** replying that this process will involve creating a layer of indirection and a section of indexing; communities outside of the library world often think of display and indexing as discrete items from the actual raw data. From the audience, Paul **Weiss** spoke to the human level of APs; creating these profiles causes creators to think about what they are doing and what that means.

1098. Report from the MARBI Representative: Allgood

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2010/1 (preliminary)]

Allgood presented highlights from MARBI's Saturday and Sunday meetings:

Proposal No. 2010-01: Defining codes for online and direct access electronic resources in 008/23 and 008/29 (Form of item).
Approved with revisions. This proposal defined new codes for Form of Item. Code *q* approved for direct access, code *o* for online (remote) access. Code *s* (Electronic) will continue to be used as/when necessary.

Proposal No. 2010-02 Addition of subfield $5 (Institution to which field applies) in the 80X-830 Series Added Entry Fields of the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format.
Approved. $5 approved for addition to the Series Added Entry fields in order to identify local or project specific series designations within the context of provider-neutral guidelines.

Proposal No. 2010-03: Recording Place and Date of Capture in the MARC21 Bibliographic Format.
Approved with revisions. The initial proposal offered changes to either tag 033 or 518 to address granularity issues for recording place and date of capture. After extensive discussion, the 033 and 518 fields will be modified to incorporate $0 for Control number, and $o for Other capture information.

Proposal No. 2010-04: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority and Bibliographic Format for works and expressions.
These fields support recording of RDA elements.
- Field 046, Date of work/Date of expression: Approved. Add $k and $l to the Authority Format for Beginning Date and Ending Date of creation.

- Field 380, Form of work: Approved with revision. Field is now repeatable, includes $0 for Control number, along with proposed $a Form of work, $2 Source of term, $6 Linkage, and $8 Field link and sequence number.
- Field 381, Other distinguishing characteristics of work/expression: Approved with revision. Add $0 for Control number, along with proposed $a Other distinguishing characteristic, $u URI, $v Source of information, $2 Source of term, $6 Linkage, and $8 Field link and sequence number.
- Field 382, Medium of performance: Approved with revision. Add $0 for Control number, along with proposed $a Medium of performance, $2 Source of term, $6 Linkage, and $8 Field link and sequence number.
- Field 383, Numerical designation of musical work: Approved with revisions. Delete subfield $2 from proposal, retain proposed $a Serial number, $b Opus number, $c Thematic index number, $6 Linkage, and $8 Field link and sequence number.
- Field 384, Key: Option 2 approved with revisions. Delete $b, add $0 for record control number, retain proposed indicator values 1 and 2, as well as $a Key name $2 Source of term, $6 Linkage, and $8 Field link and sequence number.

Proposal No.: 2010-05: Adding subfield $3 (Materials specified) to field 034 (Coded Cartographic Mathematical Data) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. Approved. $3 approved for addition to field 034 in both formats, following the convention across the MARC21 standard that it addresses "Materials specified", which in a geographic context means a specific feature of the geographic entity described, e.g. Mouth or Source for the coded data associated with a river.

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP01: ISBD punctuation in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format
The German and Austrian MARC communities have not included explicit ISBD punctuation in their records. In migrating to the MARC21 standard, they prefer to maintain this practice except in instances where the MARC21 subfield coding is insufficiently granular to identify data elements uniquely (e.g. the 245$b which encodes additional titles, other title information, or parallel titles) and then recording it at the beginning of the applicable subfield rather than the end of the preceding subfield. They would like a mechanism for indicating that ISBD conventions are being followed with respect to content but punctuation conforms to their practice of relying on the MARC coding or placement at the beginning of the subfield. Discussion led to favoring a new code in Leader/18, although not *n* as this conventionally indicates "not applicable." Further discussion brought to light the necessity of making field 040 $e repeatable, as multiple conventions may apply to a record.

Discussion Paper No.: 2010-DP02: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format
This paper suggests recording URIs for controlled values in the subfield appropriate to the value itself, distinguished by angle brackets around the URI, which is a standard way of representing them. Not all members are comfortable with using URIs in MARC records, due to the amount of necessary system support. There is interest in experimenting with a set of test records. Some preliminary documents will be prepared to offer guidelines and examples. This is not finalized.

Discussion Paper No. 2010-DP03: Encoding the International Standard Name Identifier (ISNI) and the International Standard Text Code (ISTC) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Format.

This paper explores the possibility of encoding the ISNI and ISTC in the MARC record. The ISTC will be addressed further in a subsequent discussion paper. The ISNI will be addressed in a subsequent proposal. Discussion covered a number of possible solutions and solutions to be avoided.

The **Chair** commended **Glennan** for working on a number of these proposals.

1099. Report from the RDA Programming Task Force: Kincy

Kincy, on behalf of June Abbas, reported that the TF presented numerous programs during 2009, including: a pre-conference at Annual 2009 about conceptual foundations arising from FRBR and FRAD, which was attended by 150 people; and a program at Annual 2009 about MARC and FRBR, which was attended by 250 people. Additionally, programs were sponsored at the AASL, Canadian Library Association, Virginia Library Association, and PLA conferences. Over 200 people attended the RDA Update Forum on Sunday, January 17. Annual 2010 will have a pre-conference focusing less on conceptual foundations and more on best practices for applying RDA rules; there will also be another RDA Update Forum. The TF had planned to offer a vendor planning program for this [Midwinter 2010] conference, but it was canceled due to a lack of participants. The TF is tentatively scheduling a program about RDA testing for Midwinter 2011.

1100. Report of PCC Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets: Fletcher

[PCC Guidelines for Multiple Character Sets Task Force Report]

Fletcher reported on the PCC guidelines for multiple character sets, which currently are limited to CJK, Arabic, Greek, Cyrillic, Hebrew, and Yiddish. In addition to PCC's work, other communities are also developing best practices.

In the discussion of the report, **Glennan** requested an example of a contents note following these guidelines due to transcription and Romanization issues. **Attig** mentioned his experience consulting with Hebraica catalogers on best ways to create dates in personal name entries and not finding a consensus: best practices and examples would be a very helpful addition to this document. **Schmierer** suggested using the phrase "systematic Romanization" in the document, raising the point that non-PCC participants may not have experience distinguishing between found Romanization (i.e., the rendering found on the item in hand) and systematic Romanization, and would like to see more clarification on this issue. **Attig** noted that treating non-Latin alphabet headings as variant headings can be problematic, as they cannot be controlled in OCLC, and suggested the creation of separate authority records for the Romanized form and the vernacular form. There are libraries that have not converted to UNICODE, making it difficult to

work with authority records lacking 880 fields. **Fletcher** said that the authority records issue is a thorny one and setting guidelines will not happen at first, but it will happen.

1101. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Chair

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2010/1]

The **Chair**, on behalf of **Hatch**, reported that the webmaster is still waiting to hear about when to migrate CC:DA content from the psu.edu server to the ALA server. The ALA Connect page for the Committee has been updated to include current event calendar information. **Hatch's** term expires after Annual 2010, and she is not seeking reappointment but is willing to remain webmaster until a replacement is found.

1102. Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment

The **Chair** gave a brief report. ALA Council passed a resolution deeming 2010 as the year of cataloging research. **Winzer** requested an update on the chair/vice-chair/immediate past chair proposal discussed at the Saturday, January 16th meeting. The **Chair** noted that CCS Executive Committee did address the proposal, leading to a good amount of discussion. **Schmierer** mentioned that one of the most significant issues for this proposal had to do with how to proceed if the Chair is not in attendance at a meeting. The **Chair** reported that the bylaws said the voting members can elect a temporary chair; **Attig** clarified that this information is in the CC:DA procedures. The Chair asked that people interested in serving as chair email him, fill out the ALCTS volunteer form on the website, and contact Shelby Harken, incoming CCS chair.

The **Chair** announced the next meetings at Annual in Washington, DC, which should take place at their normal times: Saturday, June 26, from 1:30-5:30, and Monday, June 28, from 8-12.

There was no further business, and the **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 11:58 am.