Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
(A Division of the American Library Association)
Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

COMMITTEE ON CATALOGING: DESCRIPTION AND ACCESS

MINUTES
Minutes of the meeting held at the
2012 Annual Conference in Anaheim, California

June 23 and June 25, 2012

Members present:
Lori P. Robare, Chair
Dominique Bourassa
John DeSantis (Saturday, June 23 only)
Patricia M. Dragon
Kevin M. Randall
Robert Rendall
Peter J. Rolla
Kathy Winzer
Bob Wolverton

Jennifer D. MiIler, Intern
Gayle Porter, Intern
Melanie Polutta, 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:

Elizabeth Marie German, ALA/ACRL
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:CCM
Francis Lapka, ACRL/RBMS
Robert L. Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA/MARBI
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CaMMS /CC:AAM
Nancy Mitchell Poehlmann, ALCTS/CRS
Nathan B. Putnam, ALCTS/MIG
Randy Roeder, ALCTS/PARS

Adolfo Tarango ALCTS/CRS
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT (Saturday, June 23 only)

Non-ALA Liaisons present:
Kathy Glennan, PCC
John Hostage, AALL
Diane Hillmann, DCMI (Saturday, June 23 only)
Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA
Dorothy McGarry, SLA
Kelley McGrath, OLAC
Tracey Snyder, MusLA
Amanda Sprochi, MedLA
Jay Weitz, IFLA

Notes:

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

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

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
AALL   American Association of Law Libraries
ACRL   Association of College and Research Libraries
AJL   Association of Jewish Libraries
ALA   American Library Association
ALCTS   Association for Library Collections & Technical Services
ARLIS/NA   Art Libraries Society of North America

ATLA American Theological Libraries Association
CC:AAM ALCTS/ CaMMS /Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:CCM ALCTS/ CaMMS /Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
CC:DA ALCTS/ CaMMS /Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CaMMS ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
CIP Cataloging in Publication
CLA Catholic Library Association
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*
IEEE LTSC IEEE Learning Technology Standards Committee
IFLA International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ILS Integrated library system
ISBD *International Standard Bibliographic Description*
JSC Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC Library of Congress
LITA Library & Information Technology Association
MAGIRT Maps and Geospatial Information 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
NISO National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM National Library of Medicine
OLAC Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PARS ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PLA Public Library Association
PSD Policy and Standards Division
RBMS Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RUSA Reference and User Services Association
SAC ALCTS/ CaMMS /Subject Analysis Committee
XML Extensible Markup Language

Saturday, June 23, 2012, 1:30-5:30 p.m.
Hyatt Regency, Grand Ballroom A

1180. Welcome and opening remarks

Lori Robare, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1181.   Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives
[CC:DA/Roster/2012]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves. The **Chair** routed the roster for members to initial and correct, if necessary, and an attendance sheet for visitors.

1182.   Adoption of agenda
[CC:DA/A/66]

There were no additions or corrections to the agenda. **Wolverton** moved to adopt the agenda, with **Winzer** seconding. The motion carried unanimously.

1183.   Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2012 Midwinter Conference, January 21 and 23, 2012: Chair
[CC:DA/M/ 1158-1179]

The **Chair** noted corrections to the minutes as follows: on page 7, Rendall asked if the intention is to make the Persian in non-Arabic scripts table publicly available. On page 8, the spelling of Deutsche Nationalbibliothek will be corrected. On page 12, "whomever" will be changed to "whoever" (with whoever proposes the idea…). On page 16, the spelling of Guadeloupe will be corrected; on page 18, "Eastern Orthodoxy" will be capitalized. On page 34, "with logging in" will be corrected to "without logging in."

Wolverton moved to approve the minutes as corrected; seconded by **Rendall.** The motion carried.

1184.   Report from the Chair
[CC:DA/Chair/2011-2012/3]

The **Chair** stated that members had a list of the votes that were conducted electronically between Midwinter and June 12. In addition, after June 12, CC:DA approved revisions to the Bulgarian and Russian Romanization tables and voted on five of the six MLA proposals. The results of the MLA votes were not announced on the list, but there was a majority of yes votes, and the **Chair** stated that those were approved. All of these votes needed to be confirmed. The Chair summarized the list of votes as follows:

- two RDA revision proposals from the PCC (recording associated institution and recording ISSNs)
- five revision proposals from MLA (recording inclusion of key, copyright dates, medium of performance, librettos and lyrics for musical works, arrangements and adaptations of musical works)
- one revision proposal from Adam Schiff (initial articles in place names)

- one revision proposal from OCLC (recording edition statements)
- new Romanization table for Cherokee, and revisions to the Romanization tables for Bulgarian and Russian
- revision of the CC:DA Procedures document

The **Chair** asked for a motion to confirm approval of these votes that were conducted electronically. Moved by **Wolverton;** seconded by **Rolla**. The motion carried.

The **Chair** noted that CC:DA was co-sponsoring the program "RDA Worldwide" Sunday at 1:30, with speakers Christine Frodl, Ageo Garcia, Chris Todd, and Lee Kai.

The **Chair** reported that documents to be submitted for the JSC's fall meeting would be due to the JSC by August 8. The **Chair** set a tentative deadline of July 25 for all CC:DA proposals to be finalized. Following the August 8 deadline, CC:DA would need to comment on proposals from other constituencies. The **Chair** acknowledged that the CC:DA wiki had been out of service for the past week and that it might be necessary to use the discussion list to finalize proposals if the wiki remained out of service.

While most membership changes would be announced at the conclusion of the Monday meeting, the Chair announced that Peter **Rolla** would be the new Chair after Annual.

1185.   Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett
            [LC Report, June 2012]

Tillett gave an abbreviated version of her LC report; a more thorough version is available on the LC website. **Tillett** pointed out information about the LC Exhibit Booth, personnel changes, and the National Book Festival.

The Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative is discussed on page 3, and **Tillett** noted that Eric Miller from Zepheira would be speaking at the update session on Sunday. Zepheira was contracted to provide a model to kick off discussion. Though Miller is focusing on the Semantic Web, **Tillett** emphasized that this was not the only model being explored, and said that there definitely will be a lot of participation throughout the initiative with partners around the world. The report includes the URL for the initiative as well as information about the discussion list.

Tillett highlighted information about the "Priorities for Innovative Investments" initiative, launched by Roberta Shaffer. Experts in the field, including Tim Berners-Lee, will be invited to give fast tracks to innovation in organizations and provide their perspective on directions for libraries and specifically for LC.

Tillett also highlighted news about the ECIP e-books pilot with four publishers. The project focuses on cataloging e-books published simultaneously with print; more publishers will be invited to participate.

On page six is information from the Policy and Standards Division. Cataloger's Desktop will be moving to a new server, including new mechanisms for keeping things updated, so some things will be updated on a monthly basis. Comments and suggestions may be sent to Bruce Johnson (bjoh@loc.gov)

Regarding RDA training, **Tillett** noted that a report was given at the RDA Update Forum and pointed out that Spanish language training materials are available, thanks to Ageo Garcia, Ana Cristán, and others from the Biblioteca Nacional in Columbia and from the Biblioteca Nacional in Spain.

LC is looking at its Policy Statements in light of the decision made by the PCC to use them as the venue for decisions for both LC and the PCC. The name will be changed to LC-PCC Policy Statements during the summer.

Tillett mentioned Romanization tables. Much work has been accomplished in both development of tables and conversion from print. **Tillett** thanked Bruce Johnson and noted that all tables are now available as PDF files and the source DOC files will be available soon. She also pointed out information about Taiwanese place names. The Board of Geographic Names has adopted pinyin, and LC is moving ahead to revise its policy so that name and subject headings for places in Taiwan will be established in pinyin. More libraries in Taiwan are shifting to pinyin.

VIAF has a new governance model in place: all contributors now form a VIAF Council, under the general administration of OCLC, which has taken responsibility for technical and administrative support functions. The first launch of this council will be at the meeting in Helsinki before IFLA. The first agenda item is to have an election for a new chair and chair-elect. More participants are eager to join.

Tillett highlighted statistics on pages 9-10 of the report. LC is still making great progress, even with retirements and RDA training. There will be some slight downturn for the total year.

The Geography and Map Division has been working with PSD to help think through the cartographic terms and definitions needed in the Registry and Toolkit.

Tillett noted that LC has launched a public version of the new Voyager OPAC ("Tomcat"), which has some nice improvements. Feedback is welcome on choices for design and indexing; there are links on the OPAC webpage.

Finally, **Tillett** highlight the expanded offerings of what is available as linked data at id.loc.gov. There are changes underway constantly for the web interface and capabilities for those in the RDF world to use the data more seamlessly. Suggestions and ideas for improvements are welcome.

Educational Outreach, an effort from the Office of Strategic Initiatives, may be of interest to those who deal with public and school libraries. LC offers a program to help support teachers in

using primary source materials to enrich classroom instruction, including training for teachers in using these materials.

Tarango asked about the work with ECIP: in loading titles from aggregations, is LC working with OCLC or tagging the records to allow other institutions to grab records as sets, or working with OCLC to create WorldCat Collection Sets? **Tillett** responded that it is not part of the ECIP program to do that. **Tarango** commented that it would be a service to the community to get lists of record sets so that we could grab collection sets. **Tillett**'s understanding is that LC is taking records from vendors, not creating them so this would be beyond LC's distribution of records. She suggested contacting Ann Della Porta for more information.

1186.   Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

Attig noted that much of his report would duplicate his remarks at the RDA Update Forum. The JSC has continued to work via email and irregular conference calls. **Attig** highlighted four areas of activity.

First, the rewording project of RDA continues. The JSC has been reviewing draft reworded chapters prepared by the copyeditor, Chris Oliver, and comments on those chapters from the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee. The process is almost complete for the first round of chapters. **Attig** thinks there have been some significant improvements and some techniques that will be applied throughout RDA.

The chapters originally selected to be reworded first were 9, 10, 11, 6, and 17. Chapter 17, however, deals with primary relationships and the only part of this chapter that can be applied in MARC is the creation of composite descriptions, so we are not actually using most of it as it was intended. The JSC then removed it from the rewording process. Rather than do major rewording for this chapter, there will be an expanded introductory section that includes more explanation of what primary relationships are and the various techniques for indicating primary relationships, one of which is the composite description. This will be published in the next available publication cycle, with a definition of composite description in the glossary.

Chris Oliver has already delivered chapter 2 to the JSC for review. Next will be chapters 3 and 7, and then the rest. More details will be available in Linker's report, but **Attig** believes that plans are to release reworded chapters that are ready this Fall.

The second area of activity is the RDA vocabularies and element sets in the Open Metadata Registry. The JSC is working on completing and publishing the RDA controlled vocabularies. The main requirement is for definitions of terms; most of those under consideration have been received and others have been promised. The JSC hopes to approve and publish the terms that are ready in July. Definitions will be added to the RDA Glossary and will appear in one of the monthly releases this Fall. The JSC has identified some issues with some of the vocabularies that will require more discussion, perhaps revisiting the list of terms in some cases and possible revision proposals in others. The JSC is trying to get this done as soon as possible. The JSC has not yet taken on the element sets.

The third area of activity is correcting the text of RDA. The JSC has been using the fast track process described at Midwinter. Some revisions came out of the US RDA test; those changes have appeared in the Toolkit. Currently there is not as much activity but the JSC is still getting fast track proposals and any release of the Toolkit may include some. Categories are somewhat limited: typos, incorrect wording, changes to examples, new relationship designators. Most are not included in the "Update History" section but they are documented in a Secretary document in the JSC documentation series.

The fourth item is revision proposals for the JSC meeting to be held in Chicago, November 6-9, 2012. The JSC has already received proposals from the British Library and the Library of Congress. Further proposals are expected from other constituencies and from others outside the JSC, including EURIG, the European RDA Interest Group, which includes participants from national libraries in Europe. There may also be proposals from the ISBD Review Group and the ISSN International Centre, and perhaps one from Denmark on additional relationship designators.

There is a page on the JSC website with a list of possible agenda items. The deadline for proposals to be considered at the November meeting is August 8. Since the agenda for ALA's meeting is full, **Attig** noted that he would not yet discuss the proposals already received from the British Library and LC since ALA does not have to respond to these until October 8.

ALA proposals will be discussed during the remainder of the agenda for this conference. **Attig** noted that only proposals approved by the JSC this fall will be in place before March so ALA may wish to focus on issues important for implementation. **Attig** highlighted the work of the Task Force on Sources of Information, but noted that this question should apply to all of the proposals. Though the Task Force still has a lot of work to do in general, there are two or three issues that **Attig** would really like to resolve before implementation. If CC:DA agrees that these issues are a priority, Attig is willing to argue that these revisions should be approved even though there is more work to be done on these areas of the instructions.

There were no questions.

1187. Report from the TF on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Rolla
[CC:DA/TF/Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3/3]

Rolla stated that the Task Force report had been posted to the wiki but there was not yet a lot of response and feedback was desired. He emphasized that this is a discussion paper. The Task Force is not yet looking at RDA instructions to be changed, but wants to get input from the JSC and the wider community and eventually make changes to RDA. The question is, does CC:DA agree with what the Task Force has done or not; should this go forward to the JSC for discussion?

Looking at the example at top of page 7 (3rd example), **Lipcan** commented that under the aspect-unit-quantity model the term "plates" should be used as a unit and not as an aspect.

McGrath commented that from the perspective of moving images it would be helpful to have the duration in machine-actionable form. She noted one concern, which is not within the scope of the Task Force's work but has the potential for undermining usefulness of this because of RDA's

approach to units of extent which allows terms in common usage. During the US RDA test, there was a lot of disagreement within OLAC about this; some were strongly in favor of the standard terminology "videodisc"; others wanted something like "DVD video." These terms are not aligned and are at different levels of specificity, but this is not part of what the Task Force is trying to do.

Attig commented that in a sense, it is. These statements will probably be in addition to rather than in place of textual statements. In the machine-actionable statements, it will be much more important that the vocabularies be controlled. **McGrath** said that it is probably clear that people are more interested in specific terms. Regarding three-dimensional objects, the list of potential terms is probably infinite. Could there be some organized way to reduce that to a smaller number of terms?

Maxwell stated that he didn't think this was in addition to what we were already doing but rather in place of it. **Attig** said that was an unresolved issue. **Maxwell** said that you don't have to add additional complexity. **Rolla** noted that this was a point of contention among the members of the Task Force and the report reflects the disagreement. Some on the Task Force did envision that display would be generated from machine-actionable elements. This adds a layer of complexity that the Task Force did not deal with in the paper. **Hillmann** said that it isn't either/or. We will have to deal with legacy data. Decisions will have to be made by the community, by the PCC, by individual institutions, even according to format of material, but they are going to have to be separated in practice. The machine will have to understand whether it will have to parse something according to some instructions or whether it will just display a text string. **Hillmann** thinks the either/or is a false dichotomy, or we will have to do text strings forever. **Maxwell** said that originally the thinking was that all formats would be the same, and now they are all the same except for text. He had hoped this proposal would tell us to do all the same again and not treat text separately. **Rolla** said that they could add an example; at least implicitly this could address the concern.

The **Chair** summarized suggested changes to the discussion paper and invited a motion to approve the discussion paper with those changes. Moved by **Randall**; seconded by **Winzer.**

Winzer asked for clarification of what approval would mean. The **Chair** explained that the paper would go forward to the JSC as an ALA discussion paper, not as a revision proposal. Other constituencies would comment and the JSC would discuss and provide feedback to ALA. The **Chair** called for a vote; the motion carried.

Tillett encouraged the addition of specific questions about the kind of direction ALA would wish to get from the JSC. **Attig** noted that there was an attempt to do this in the summary and recommendations but it could be expanded. The real core is the A-U-Q model and a desire to get feedback on that as a concept before doing the hard work of integrating with the existing element set and instructions. **Attig** agreed that it would be helpful to rewrite the summary and recommendations to bring in some discussion on options. **Rolla** asked whether CC:DA would need to reapprove that. **Attig** commented that as usual, he would look at the results and consult with the Chair to see if the result was substantially different and would require CC:DA action.

1188.   Report from the TF to Revise *Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards*: Rendall

[CC:DA/TF/Revise Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards/3]

Rendall explained the purpose of the document that the Task Force was charged to revise. The Task Force reorganized the introductory text, replaced references to AACR2 with RDA, and updated the description of the composition of the committee. Descriptions are given in general terms so the document won't have to be updated so frequently. The roles of CC:DA in the document are taken directly from the CC:DA charge. Information on how to participate or interact with CC:DA has been expanded to include information about the wiki and the list, as well as other options.

According to the Task Force charge, the revised document should be in PDF; it is currently in HTML, which enables links to other websites. **Rendall** asked whether it should be reformatted. The **Chair** explained that PDF was specified in the charge as a result of an email exchange with Charles Wilt confirming that the document would be online only and PDF was suggested as the format. She could take this question forward to the CaMMS Executive Committee if CC:DA agrees that the document would function better as HTML. **Myers** noted that embedded links used to be functional only in HTML, but text linking is now supported in PDFs, and maintenance is easier with the PDF format. **Attig** agreed that linking can be done easily in PDF and suggested that PDF is more flexible in terms of usage. This document originally came out of a Task Force on Outreach and the intended audience was the wider community. **Attig** would like to see something that is not only consulted online but could also be printed out by whoever wanted to use it. He suggested getting someone to do some graphic design so that it could be printed out for a handout. The **Chair** remarked that the ALCTS office could help with design. **Maxwell** said that if it is PDF, URLs should be written out and not just given as a link.

Hostage spoke in favor of HTML documents, which are easier for reading online. It is possible to have a link to the PDF version as well, and also to print with CSS and have it look nice. **Randall** agreed that PDFs can be less friendly to web users, with one more step to go through.

Polutta noted that it would be easy to do both formats; the issue is to ensure version control. **Hillmann** supported that approach, as it would accommodate various browsers, platforms, and uses. The **Chair** noted that CC:DA has moved away from posting all CC:DA documents in both Word and PDF. She suggested a straw poll about the proposal to produce this document in both HTML and PDF but noted that the decision might be up to CaMMS Executive. **Maxwell** commented that this document might be something we'd hand out to represent us and it should look good. A straw poll indicated that the majority favored having both formats.

Tillett asked whether the description of CC:DA's work should be expanded to include non-RDA standards such as the LC/ALA Romanization tables. **Rendall** did think about this but since Romanization tables are not mentioned in CC:DA's own charge, there was no mention in this document. **Rolla** was not opposed to adding this but commented that it seems to be a small percentage of the work that CC:DA does and suggested that the statement could be made more general. **Rendall** noted that the third sentence in the third paragraph addresses how CC:DA

works with LC; that statement could actually cover Romanization, or Romanization could be added there as an example. **Attig** said the issue may go beyond this document, since mention of Romanization tables is missing from CC:DA's charge; this would be worth raising with CaMMS Executive. **Glennan** suggested that the 6th bullet under "Roles of CC:DA" might mention Romanization tables. **Rendall** noted that this language was directly from the charge and shouldn't be edited. The consensus was to add Romanization tables as an example in the third paragraph.

The **Chair** noted that for contacts in the ALCTS office, only the phone number is listed and it would be helpful to add an email or website address. **Glennan** suggested striking the word "descriptive" in the description of RDA (2nd paragraph, 3rd line). **Rendall** commented that our charge deals with descriptive cataloging only. **Maxwell** said that he was not opposed to striking it but our definition of "descriptive" may be changing. After discussion, including the suggestion to change it to "description and access," it was agreed instead to strike the phrase "for descriptive cataloging."

The **Chair** invited a motion to approve the report of the Task Force with the changes discussed. Moved by **Winzer,** seconded by **Rolla**. There was no further discussion and the motion was approved. The Task Force was disbanded with thanks.

1189. Report from the TF on RDA Instructions for Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies: Randall (3:50, 40 min.)

[CC:DA/TF/Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies/4]

CC:DA generally had few comments on this proposal, which seeks to combine instructions for government bodies and other corporate bodies in order to reduce redundancy and complexity in RDA.

Maxwell recommended regrouping instructions. **Rendall** stated that elsewhere in RDA there are instructions for entering heads of government and similar names and wondered why there was a separate section with examples, but refers the reader to more information in other places. He asked **Randall**: Do you want to move the whole section of instructions on heads of government —or leave those instructions here? It doesn't make sense. **Attig** stated: This is actually a reference to a list of sub-rules under this rule; so it functions as a table of contents to what follows, and some of us found this frustrating. **Maxwell** stated: If the committee wants us to suggest that the restriction be removed, this could be removed. The **Chair** preferred to deal with the recommendation as written: "Where there are any instructions, the restriction applies to all levels." She stated: We have discussed Robert's concern, and he seems OK with the explanation.

Randall read from the top of page 7: "Recommendation to revise instructions of subcommittees subordinately entered under name of parent committee regardless of country." He stated: Here the United States government is treated differently than other countries. Here's where it starts getting weird. The recommendation is to remove the general instructions of subordinate religious bodies but not the specific instructions… so add a whole to the 14 reference types and a phrase to their beginning to indicate that the instructions apply, unless the instructions are already there

(OR not even there??). We are at a stand-still on the number of reference specific types. **Attig** stated: I think it works; we will need to review it to see if we like the results.

Randall stated: On page 9, the recommendation to move the instructions for Catholic diocese, etc. and regular diocese as an exception; do we want to save the issues for a later time? He did not plan to incorporate these into the proposal at this stage

The **Chair** acknowledged support for each recommendation that the TF proposed, and invited discussion of the proposed revisions and examples, including examples that cause specific concerns. She appreciated seeing where all the examples were placed in the document despite its length, as they facilitated consideration of the impact of the changes. She asked if we approve the proposal, and whether we want to retain all of the examples in it.

Attig stated: We were just discussing a reduced number of pages. The TF wants to do a clean copy with annotation to show sources of information, excluding examples but adding placeholders for them. Then we will do a separate document listing all the rules that correspond with the examples. **Attig** will mainly do editorial work.

Randall stated: Some examples have been changed; Attig will review that section. **Maxwell** stated: We want to point out which examples are changed. We could send it forward with all the examples and suggestions of which ones to remove. **Attig** replied: I think your first point is not that we need to make the decisions; although I think the examples are there to help the JSC do that; I think you would decide font size and how much we ask JSC to read; I take your point that where there are changes to examples that is something we could include but the majority of the point is to have merged lists, which I suggest we handle separately.

Hostage asked about a particular example: Why is the American Battle Monuments Commission a type 1? He thought it wouldn't be in the list of examples if it weren't a subordinate body. **Randall** thought it was on the list and labeled it as an instance of several inconsistent examples. **Attig** suggested discussion of specific issues about the examples.

The **Chair** asked if the group would be ready after this discussion to act and vote on this proposal or vote after this conference, because more work might be done on it in the meantime. **Rolla** moved that CC:DA approve this proposal subject to the editorial changes suggested by John Attig to make it a more friendly document, and submit it to the JSC. **Attig** suggested that we add a discussion of examples on the wiki, as some people would like to read them. **Rolla** thought that Attig had made an editorial suggestion to get rid of all of the examples. **Attig** replied that his intention was to take the examples out of the proposal but they still need to be part of the document, as an appendix. **Rendall** seconded the motion.

The **Chair** stated: We are discussing the motion to approve the proposal, subject to the editorial suggestions that Attig has described to make it more manageable for the JSC, and pending discussion of individual examples on the wiki. **Maxwell** complimented Randall's work in using RDA examples and discussing whether they are entered subordinately and whether they would be justified or not and stressed that this was the point of the proposal. **Randall** expressed concern

about discussing examples in relation to the substance of the instruction and how that affects understanding of and agreement with the instruction.

Tarango agreed with Maxwell and Randall about the recommendations and whether problems exist with specific examples that have nothing to do with the recommendations. He added: Those need to be corrected if they're wrong; the specific examples can be discussed separately from the proposal.

Hostage would like to see the proposal discussed more in terms of the substance of the changes, not just editorial changes, and to gather from different categories. He stated: There will be some real changes in headings and categories of headings, such as in type 1, 2, and 6.

Attig asked if we can work with the introduction section. **Rendall** felt that it would help if the examples that have just been moved to new positions in the text were singled out so that we can see how they have changed. **Randall** replied: They weren't moved; were they officially changed? **Attig** suggested expanding some of the descriptive text and move it to the introductory paragraph that needs complete examples to illustrate the changes that will occur. **Rendall** agreed with the suggestions that Hostage recommended on the list.

The **Chair** acknowledged the good discussion about improving the document proposal, explaining its impact, and illustrating it more clearly. She called for a vote on the motion that CC:DA approve the proposal subject to the editorial revisions discussed, and pending discussion of individual examples on the wiki. The motion carried, and the proposal was approved. The **Chair** thanked Randall and all TF members. She wants to keep the TF intact and disband it after the editorial work is done.

1190.   Report from the TF on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K: Winzer

[CC:DA/TF/Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K/3]

Winzer thanked TF members for their work. CC:DA discussed several of the questions raised in this report . The major questions include:

1. Are the proposed additional terms too narrow? Getty terms are limited because they are focused on art; **Winzer** wondered if other communities wanted to include some terms.

 2. Is it appropriate to use prepositions? The Task Force started with the original document that used the noun form but some terms won't work with just this. For example: "Cousin of."

3. Should the list include gender-neutral or gender-specific terms, such as "parent" vs. "father"? Use of gender-specific terms resulted in some complications; for example: "Nephew" or "Brother-in-law;" "Sister-in Law;" when using terms such as "Husband" and "wife;" where you might not be sure which people were involved. Gender-inclusive terms like "spouse" seemed to be better. **Winzer** will ask TF members to add the gender-specific terms if people prefer them.

4. Can the same term be used in different sections, such as "member" in both personal and corporate relationships? Should we change it to a specific term? Do we need different definitions in each section? The terms also formed a basis for occupations in RDA 9.16.

5. Names for geographic places? Appendix L hasn't been developed yet.

Lipcan explained which cases would need prepositions (relational). **Rolla** asked about: "cousin of." **Winzer** stated: Section K1 gives relationships that are reciprocal. **Rolla** asked: Why wouldn't they all have alternate definitions? He thought perhaps the preposition wasn't needed. **Winzer** stated: It depends on how you define the two; I took off the prepositions, as they made no sense. **Glennan** stated: PCC has struggled with "this group" and "member of;" other times the preposition does make a difference. **Sprochi** referred to the Whitney Houston example; and asked: If it's all on the same record; how do you distinguish? **Maxwell** stated: We need to carefully review and decide which ones need to be changed; i.e. "child of" would mean in some cases it will be necessary. **Lipcan** suggested: "Daughter of Cissy Houston" instead of "Whitney Houston."

Rolla asked about deciding who gets the designator. **Winzer** said that it doesn't matter, it's how you present it in the record. The Appendix K list doesn't need to make those distinctions. **Maxwell** stated that we will find cases where we need to avoid designators and **Attig** stressed caution when using them. He added that it was vital to have someone check Appendix K who did not write it.

The **Chair** felt that the TF needed feedback on including or omitting prepositions from designators. She called for a straw poll, which indicated more support for including prepositions where needed.

Myers asked: If we choose to use "child," once we decide on corrections to these relationships, is "child of" the relationship to the parent term? **Attig** wants to see the reciprocals explicitly labeled, the way it's done in Appendix K, and added that most of the gender neutral designators occur in person-to-person relationships. We need to agree on whether family relationships are bibliographically significant, because sometimes they are not.

Maxwell stated that in distinguishing between family names by using a phrase "descendent of" or "ancestor of" we are clarifying there that they are significant. If we incorporate families into the RDA structure then family relationships are important. **Winzer** stated: We have person-to-person within a family but not person-to-family. To **Maxwell**, it seems illogical to say that person-to-person is bibliographically significant but not person-to-family. The **Chair** wanted to discuss the gender neutral issue. CC:DA will continue its deliberations on the wiki. This proposal might not be ready to go to the JSC for its November meeting.

1191.   Report from the TF to Investigate Changes Affecting RDA in the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition: Dragon

> [CC:DA/TF/Investigate Changes Affecting RDA in the Chicago Manual of
> Style, 16th edition/3]

Dragon thanked the CC:DA Chair and all TF members and presented a report on their work. A few things remain that need CC:DA comment. The TF plans to submit some changes through the fast track procedure, which John Attig agreed was appropriate.

The TF was established to investigate changes that should be considered in RDA and the RDA Editor's Guide that are associated with the Chicago Manual of Style's new 16th edition compared to the¬ 15th edition. The changes may impact two different aspects of RDA: the format of the instructions (such as capitalization practice in instruction headings), and changes in recording data under RDA (such as hyphenating compound colors).

Many changes had to do with capitalization. One issue was the capitalization of the abbreviation "etc." Chicago Manual of Style says that capitalization of headline style is governed mainly by emphasis of grammar; it implies that you lower case insignificant words but it also says to capitalize the first and last words of titles. For example, capitalize "Etc." when it is the final element of a heading. Thus, those two instructions sometimes work against each other. A section title in the editor's guide states that "more than one person, Etc." The TF recommended that "Etc." should not be capitalized and should be consistent throughout RDA.

The TF hopes to find all occurrences of the phrase "Web Site" which currently appears as capitalized in many places in RDA, but should be changed to "Website" as one word. Other changes are for hyphenated numbers. The Chicago Manual now says that the word "five" should also be capitalized, as in "Twenty-Five." Although hyphenated numbers spelled out do occur in RDA, it's difficult to find each one. The TF was unsure of the section with popes' names, e.g. Pope John XXIII. The Chicago Manual has no example of pope spelled out like that. But following the instructions for capitalizing hyphenated numbers, the TF should have completed most of the third (III) and twenty-third headings (XXIII).

The Chicago Manual now instructs writers to capitalize the full generic term, whether it precedes or follows the distinctive nouns. Whereas before "Industry and Training Conference" would have a small "d" on "department," it should now be a capital "D," i.e. "Dept." not "dept." Many similar situations exist. The TF had a long discussion about the term "Phono-viewer." RDA 3.20.1.3 reads: "Filmstrip mounted in rigid format for use with Phono-viewer." The TF debated whether "Phono-viewer" was a trademark. It seems that in the Chicago Manual, "viewer" should also be capitalized, unless it is a trademark or something similar.

The report includes a review of punctuation changes in RDA itself. For example, the Chicago Manual new edition says that the phrase "black-and-white" is now hyphenated (compound term). However, you need to distinguish when you use "Black and white" as a controlled term vs. "black-and-white" as a compound term (in a text paragraph for example).

Another example from RDA Appendix A indicates that "yellow-stained" should be hyphenated. The TF was unsure of its meaning and whether it was a trademark. "Yellow-Stained fabric" denotes a specific type of fabric; whether it should be hyphenated is debatable. One of the potentially larger changes is that the Chicago Manual says that the abbreviation of "United States" (U.S.) should not have periods. The Manual also says that in publications using

traditional state abbreviations, which RDA does, you can use periods to abbreviate "United States."

In RDA, the term "email" appears as one word, non-hyphenated, but should be "e-mail." Also, "B.C." and "A.D." in dates now appear in RDA with periods but in the Chicago Manual they lack periods, i.e. "BC" and "AD."

A citation in RDA Appendix A specifically cites the 15th edition of the Chicago Manual. The TF favored removing reference to a specific edition in the RDA text, as updating the text is intensive. In contrast, the TF preferred to leave the edition number in the RDA Editor's Guide, which says that RDA followed the Chicago Manual of Style, 15th edition. The TF also preferred to leave in the edition number and change it to the 16th edition. It would be a way to mark that it was the updated completed edition; the TF wants comments on that. Some references to specific rules in the Chicago Manual of Style have incorrect numbers. The TF also reported few typos that do not concern changes in the Chicago Manual per se. Dragon invited comments on any and all issues.

It wasn't clear to **Attig** whether the intention was to continue to produce or revise editions rather than to issue the Chicago Manual as an integrating resource. He asked Dragon her opinion based on the documentation whether the concept of an edition would apply to future changes to the Manual. **Dragon** didn't know, but they have labeled the current one as the 16th edition.

Attig agreed with Dragon on the need for neutral language in RDA text and agreed about the Editor's Guide. He felt that indicating in the Editor's Guide which edition we have used so far is a good idea.

The **Chair** suggested reviewing each issue one at a time, where the TF has asked for comments. She invited further comment from **Randall** on the first question about the Editor's Guide. He stated that the report indicated it is important to include the edition. He added: We realized the need to keep it up-to-date, but without specifying each edition in the Editor's Guide and RDA, it won't be readily apparent.

Dragon stressed that there are two separate issues: whether to specify the edition in the Editor's Guide and whether to specify it in the RDA text. **Randall** confirmed that the Editor's Guide tells what is to be used in creating RDA, and the RDA text tells the people using RDA what is being used. The **Chair** acknowledged support for retaining the edition number in the Editor's Guide.

The **Chair** asked Dragon if she wanted to talk about "the Etc. issue." **Attig** expressed surprise when Dragon and Maxwell found that the Chicago Manual of Style said to capitalize "Etc." He told Dragon: Although this is not a major matter, the additional information that you have found gives us a good excuse to do what we thought made sense in the first place and is worth including in your report. The JSC's decision in writing RDA was to capitalize "etc." when it was the final element in a heading, so any inconsistencies you found are errors. But we found it strange. **Dragon** said: So you would reject your suggested change to un-capitalize it. **Attig** replied: No, I'm saying, tell us it's OK to un-capitalize it. The **Chair** stated: We have support for changing "etc." to lower case.

Randall stressed the importance of consistency, and added: But if the heading is essentially a kind of title, that's why it follows the rule from the Chicago Manual; the "etc." is part of that— that whole string is the section title so it's separate from the title as the last word. It's not like the statement naming more than one person and other titles like this. The Chair stated: So you see a reason to retain the capitalization. **Hostage** said: "Etc." is part of the title but is an insignificant word and can be left in lower case in the title.

Myers argued for both sides of the position; he said: Stylistically, I like the lower case "etc." but structurally, the "etc." stands as an abbreviation for a list of other significant items, and as such, it makes sense that it would be similarly capitalized. He was unsure whether the headings are capitalized or lower case, as his RDA print version has changed a lot.

According to **Attig**, RDA says to capitalize "etc." when it's the final word, but not if it is the first or last word. To **Randall**, the reason for always capitalizing the last word is partly to indicate where the title ends. He added: It's to help you understand the string of characters when there's no other formatting, when you're not using underlining, italics, bold, etc. That's why it's in plain point text.

The **Chair** stated: This is not a final proposal at this point; we're just getting feedback. After discussion, we'll take a straw poll. **Maxwell** stated he did not care if it was upper or lower case and added: The Chicago Manual says, "Capitalize the first and last words," and it's the last word, so if we want to say we're following the Chicago Manual…

The **Chair** called for a straw poll on the options: To capitalize or to lower case "etc." where it is the last word. As indicated, there are ways to see a reason in the Chicago Manual to go the other way. The straw poll showed more support for having "Etc." in upper case. **Attig** asked Dragon if she listed the exceptions that were lower case; if not, he asked her to send them to him and he will add them as corrections.

The **Chair** asked for comments on the "Yellow Stained cotton" question. **Winzer** asked: Why is "Yellow Stained cotton" capitalized? **Sprochi** replied that it's in the report because of the hyphen. **Hostage** stated: "Yellow-Stained" is the proper name for a grade of cotton, according to the Board of Federal Regulations. Because it's a proper name it should be capitalized and have a hyphen.

Winzer asked about the change to "black and white." The rules are to hyphenate common colors, so doesn't that mean "yellow-and-green?" but not "red and blue" or "black and white?" So would we need to hyphenate black and white but not "yellow and green?" Winzer did not know whether "black-and-white" was used as an example in this case.

Attig stated: This is an example of the general issue. We need to be clear when we're talking about changes in the instructions vs. changes in examples, headings, and text; the results apply in the instructions. Those need to be treated separately. It doesn't mean you shouldn't include both, but let's be very clear which is which to help make decisions, because "black and white" is a controlled term in another context. It is not hyphenated, and unless we are prepared to change

that controlled vocabulary, it is that specification of "this is the term that you record" that overrides anything that is in the Chicago Manual of Style.

Maxwell stated: It's not a question of whether "black and white" is a compound color, they are two colors. In any case, even if we use the term as is, and hyphenate it, then people might think "That is the way I should do it," and then describe the color element, which is not how we want to do it. I'm concerned about making such a change in the instruction.

Hostage said: "Black-and-white" is a standard term, and you use hyphens like that in such a case. Whether it affects defined terms is another problem. The **Chair** asked for TF recommendation about "U.S.;" she implied that that change could be significant, and asked if anyone wanted to advocate for such a change. **Attig** stated that changing "website" conforms to what he sensed was current practice. **Lipcan** stated that the Art & Architecture Thesaurus uses "web site" as two words and cites the 15th edition of the Chicago Manual of Style. Perhaps it's been changed in the 16th edition, and maybe the AAT will eventually catch up. It's something to keep in mind.

Putnam asked: Does capitalization apply to other words such as Internet and Email? Email is capitalized all the time; e-mail was written with a hyphen. **Sprochi** stated: "World Wide Web" is capitalized; as is "Internet." They're considered to be proper nouns; email is lower case; "website" or "websites" are lower case because they are considered generic, according to the Chicago Manual of Style.

The **Chair** thanked Dragon for the report, stated that the TF did a lot of work on the wiki, and that the final report is due at Midwinter 2013. She referred interested parties to the wiki for more information on the TF deliberations, and encouraged the TF to ask questions on the discussion list if they needed more feedback.

1192.   Report from the RDA Conference Forums and Programs TF: June Abbas

Abbas reported on the TF updates since the last Midwinter meeting. The programs presented at ALA Annual were well attended, including: a one-day pre-conference on Friday entitled "Changing Authority: Authority Work in the RDA Environment" presented by two NACO trainers, Ana Lupe Cristán and Paul Frank from LC. They provided hands-on exercises and training in creating authority records using RDA. There were 90 pre-registered and four onsite registrations. The TF would like feedback on the conference. The sessions were very engaging. People asked great questions, and the exercises and quizzes were very well done. They used Library of Congress training materials, which provided them another way to test the effectiveness of those materials. Feedback on the training materials would be appreciated. The RDA Update Forum attracted an audience of more than 240 people at the beginning, plus 15-20 more after the session started. Everyone stayed except for presenters John Attig and Glenn Patton. Other presenters included Beecher Wiggins, Linda Barker from PCC, Sally McCallum, and Troy Linker. It was very well received, but attendees asked few questions of the presenters. The TF had tried to bring representatives from all the different related communities that are part of this effort. Abbas invited suggestions for other representatives to include.

The session "Transformation: Revenge of a 'Fallen' Code" had 180 people in attendance. It was a type of non-MARC forum where Glenn Patton talked about OCLC's work with linked data and some of John Givey's work. They also talked about moving forward, and gave some real world examples they developed for the APA that is now being used. They trained on Monday and Tuesday this week and started creating records on Wednesday. Two more sessions will be held Sunday. One at 8:00 a.m. called "Lessons learned," and in the afternoon "How Will RDA Affect Your System?" presented by six different vendors. Abbas will add final head counts to the report. The TF members continue involvement in non-ALA communities such as state organizations to advertise additional training. One example of note was that Chamya Kincy presented a 6-hour pre-conference workshop entitled "Cataloging With RDA" during the Medical Library Association annual conference, trying to reach other communities and specialized environments. Abbas invited those interested to attend a planning meeting Sunday night and provide the TF with feedback. The Program Planning Committee tentatively approved a one-day preconference workshop on "RDA, Back to the Basics" for ALA Annual 2013. After national libraries and larger libraries begin implementing RDA in March 2013, other libraries will realize that they need to get on board with RDA. The TF wants to have another back-to-the-basics workshop with hands-on exercises for bibliographic records. They will work out details later. Abbas invited suggestions for speakers. The TF is also planning forums such as the RDA Update Forum at Midwinter and Annual next year; possibly another vendor update forum again in a year; and a forum on implementation stories and strategies from people who implemented RDA in their libraries. The TF has reviewed all the activities and various groups formed to develop training or some other aspect of advertising RDA. As of 2009, the TF has presented 29 programs, pre-conferences, and forums on RDA. People are probably saturated. The usefulness of the TF will probably end in 2013, so CaMMS Exec voted to disband the TF after ALA Annual 2013. Abbas will continue as chair till the TF ends. Abbas said that RDA training efforts have already moved out to other communities, special interest groups and specialized divisions. **Myers** expressed the opinion that the RDA training seems more distributed and ad-hoc. **Abbas** offered to forward concerns to CaMMS Exec.

The **Chair** invited questions for Abbas. **Maxwell** said that it seems bad to disband the task force. He asked if both of the task forces were being disbanded, or just the Programs Task Force. **Abbas** believes the other TF still exists, as CaMMS has discussed appointing a sub-committee within that TF to help with the training gap and other materials related to RDA. **Myers** asked if it was reasonable to disband the TF three months after implementing RDA, as he suspects people will be unprepared and need to play catch up. **Abbas** replied that they had considered that. Mary Mastraccio, the outgoing Chair of CaMMS Exec, listed the different committees that did work related to RDA or programming. A great deal of overlap exists among many committees, sub-groups, and sub-committees working on RDA. Mastraccio's work is to help people collaborate to avoid overlap and have more concerted efforts. People have asked CaMMS Exec for at least a year if they could do RDA stuff, as they were told before that they could not. Abbas believes people are ready for RDA, and added: According to CaMMS Executive, we need to focus on the Bibliographic Framework issues and updates, and start a TF that does the update forums on that.

The **Chair** invited concerns be shared with herself or Abbas, but stressed that CaMMS Exec has already acted. The Chair thanked Abbas for her report.

1193.   Report from the RDA Planning and Training TF

[CC:DA/RDATrainingTF/2012/2 to come]

The **Chair** (an ex-officio member of the TF) gave highlights from co-chairs Harcourt's and Woodley's report in their absence. The TF will continue, as the Chair had no news that it would be disbanded. The TF has continued to focus on the RDA series webinars, which have been very well attended. A list of past and upcoming webinars and attendance statistics are in the report. The upcoming fall webinars will be presented in September and October. Ana Cristán will present on "RDA Elements in MARC21"and Paul Frank will present on "RDA Naming Elements." On October 31, the Chair will present a session on "RDA for Technical Services Staff: What's In It For You?" This talk will be a very general introduction to RDA that does not require a cataloging background, so public services staff and administrators could attend as well. It grew out of a talk that the Chair had given for public services librarians and administrators at her state library association and was well-attended. Thomas Brenndorfer will present "RDA in 10 Easy Steps," which will enable people to catalog with RDA at a basic level. The webinars are all freely available after 6 months. The **Chair** was pleased to report that this information is now more visible on the home page for the ALCTS website, where there's a link to "free web casts." It's a full list of webinars, but it does clearly indicate which ones are free. All of the webinars through John Hostage's November webinar on legal materials are free. The spring webinars are not yet free, but contain a lot of very good content.

The **Chair** announced that the next meeting will be at 8:00 a.m. on Monday, and recessed the meeting at 5:25 p.m.

Monday, June 25, 2012 - 8:00 a.m. -12:00 p.m.
Hyatt Regency, Grand Ballroom A

1194.   Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The **Chair** welcomed members and visitors and circulated an attendance sheet. The agenda was amended to add a discussion of MLA proposal 4 (regarding instructions on librettos) as number four on the agenda, before the OLAC proposal.

1195.   Report from the MARBI Representative: Myers
            [CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2012/2 (preliminary)]

Myers reported on highlights from and actions taken during the MARBI meetings on Saturday and Sunday.

Proposal 2012-02: Identifying Titles Related to the Entity Represented by the Authority Record in the MARC 21 Authority Format. This proposal was tabled and will return for consideration at Midwinter 2013.

Proposal 2012-03: Data Provenance in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. There were two options in the proposal; it passed with option 2, the creation of a new field which could be linked to other fields through the use of subfield $8.

Proposal 2012-04: New data elements in the MARC 21 Authority Format for *Other Designation Associated with the Person* and *Title of the Person*. This passed with option 2 and added subfields for starting and ending dates and sources of information.

Proposal 2012-05: Making the 250 Field Repeatable in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. This proposal was rejected and sent back for further consultation.

Proposal 2012-06: Defining Subfield $c (Qualifying information) in Field 028 (Publisher Number) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. Subfield $q was considered a better mnemonic than subfield $c. The proposal passed as amended.

Proposal 2012-07: Defining New Code for Vocal Score in Field 008/20 (Format of music) in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format. The proposal passed.

Discussion Paper 2012-DP02: Authority Records for Medium of Performance Vocabulary for Music in the MARC 21 Authority Format. The discussion went well and this will come back as a proposal. MARBI preferred to use field 162 and open a new block of 16X tags, rather than to use a tag in the 15X block.

Discussion Paper 2012-DP03: Chronological Aspects in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. This discussion paper is one of several that came out of the SAC Genre/Form

Subcommittee. MARBI's preference was to leave options option for chronological aspects. There is already the 648 field for chronological terms.

Discussion Paper 2012-DP04: Recording Audience Characteristics of Works and Expressions in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. MARBI discussed whether to use 3XX or 6XX for audience characteristics, and eventually preferred 3XX. This would make the 008/22 byte redundant.

Discussion Paper 2011-DP05: Recording Creator/Contributor Group Categorizations of Works, Expressions, and Persons in the MARC 21 Bibliographic and Authority Formats. MARBI again preferred to use the 3XX block. There was a larger discussion about the connection between geographic, nationality, and linguistic aspects associated with a creator or contributor.

MARC updates are now issued on a semi-annual cycle. Classification schedules B, M, N, and Z were added to id.loc.gov.

Myers received notice from the ALCTS Board that MARBI would be disbanded after Annual 2013. A new Metadata Standards Committee will be formed; this will be a joint ALCTS/LITA committee with a liaison from RUSA. The charge is essentially the same as MARBI's, with the substitution of the word "metadata" for "machine-actionable bibliographic information." LC will continue to maintain MARC and will be meeting with partners to work out new processes for moving forward. **Myers** suggested that it might be useful to discuss CC:DA's role in the new committee if time allows.

1196.   Revision proposals from AALL and CEAL: Chair
        [CC:DA/AALL/2010/1]
        [CC:DA/CEAL/2012/1]

The **Chair** provided background on the two revision proposals: one from AALL on Places in Certain Federation and a new proposal on Chinese place names that originated from the Council on East Asian Libraries. These are distinct proposals but touch on the same rules. CC:DA will act on them separately but if both are approved, they would be formulated into a single proposal to forward to the JSC.

Regarding the AALL proposal, at Midwinter there appeared to be consensus on three main questions: the inclusion of historical jurisdictions such as the former USSR; the inclusion of Ireland in the instruction at 16.2.2.10; and whether overseas islands of the US, Australia, and Canada would be treated under special instructions for islands. We did not finish discussing the terminology for overseas territories and insular groups. **Attig** asked for clarification on the second point; were we proposing to raise the issue by changing the instruction, or leaving it as it is? The **Chair** said that her understanding was that we would leave it in but raise it as a discussion point, but it was not clear that there was a strong consensus on that point and it could be discussed further. **Hostage** said that the reason that Ireland was in the general rule for the British Isles was that all of those places were originally qualified by county, and when that

practice was changed to country, Ireland was just retained in the rule. He felt we shouldn't be shy about taking Ireland out of this particular rule.

The **Chair** explained that a proposal was received from CEAL on recording Chinese place names that adds a new section for places in China after the section on places in the British Isles. The **Chair** summarized comments from the discussion list. There was a comment from **Rendall** about the combined effect of these two proposals on which countries get special treatment and which don't, raising an alternative to the current instructions to treat federations differently. This idea was discussed briefly at Midwinter, but was not pursued. **Hostage** also had commented that the root of many problems with place names is that 16.2. calls for recording the name of the larger place as part of the preferred name; he had offered a suggestion to record the name of the place as the preferred name and have an instruction for creating access points that allows each cataloging agency to add a larger place as it sees fit.

Representatives from CEAL introduced themselves: Shi Deng, Chair of the Committee on Technical Processing, and Sarah Elman, Coordinator for the CJK NACO project and Chair of the committee that worked on this proposal.

Sarah Elman commented that she had talked with librarians from non-English speaking countries and several questioned why some countries are treated differently, for example some get qualifiers. China is very large and it can be very difficult to identify places. This justification was included in the proposal. CEAL was first thinking of submitting a general rule change to treat every country the same way, but the scope was too large, so the proposal is focused on China. Shi Deng noted that RDA is an international content standard and we need to change our mindset.

Rolla said that he liked the proposal and how it was introduced and he also liked Hostage's comments on the list. The proposal fixes some things that need to be fixed, but highlights the larger issue that we're still not treating every country the same. We're still thinking in terms of AACR2 headings, but these need to be elements relating to a place. The access point and the preferred name need to be different things. **Myers** said that these proposals highlight the difference between the interests of individual cataloging communities and the share-ability of records. He was not sure if this could be resolved in a "heading" environment. It seems more appropriate in a linked data structure. **Tarango** had raised the similar issue of Mexico at Midwinter. CC:DA has an interest in specifying at a lower level, but the rules clearly have an Anglo-American bias. This needs to go away.

Maxwell appreciated the point about the preferred name vs. the access point. This is an issue throughout RDA, where it says to record the preferred name, which is not the same thing as the access point. The preferred name should be the name of the place without the qualifiers.

Attig commented that the frustration of dealing with this situation has opened him to **Hostage**'s suggestion that we need to break this up. **Attig**'s sense is that chapter 16 is a strange one within the structure of RDA. It is not really about place names, it is a chapter about place names that are needed for use as jurisdictions to establish corporate body names. The decision was made not to include a set of instructions for creating authorized access points for places and this may be part

of the reason why place names and qualifiers were combined into a single element. **Attig** wants to explore the possibility of breaking these up into separate elements. A rule for authorized access points might say to use the preferred name and qualify with one or more larger places. This would allow different practices for different agencies. It opens the door to inconsistency, but this is an area where consistency is virtually impossible to achieve. If we're talking about internationalization, you have to start with the convention for selecting the preferred name. Selecting the preferred name for non-English-language countries in English is a barrier to internationalization, but there are good reasons for it. The other principle that is involved in internationalization is the convenience of the user. Respecting the needs of different users does lead to different results. Place names are the primary example of where there is no consensus about how to name things. An approach that lets each community decide how to name the things on which they have a particular point of view is in keeping with RDA's approach to internationalization: not that everyone follows the same rules, but that there is a set of rules that everyone is expected to apply. All of those things come together to support Hostage's idea of taking the qualifier out of the name of place, and trying to develop some instructions for creating access points that include the preferred name plus qualifiers as needed or desired.

Maxwell commented that the CEAL proposal seems to be a completely new way of doing qualifiers. Why do province and then country name? We would not do this for a place name in California, for example – we would not add U.S. Sarah **Elman** responded that not everyone knows where California is and it seems better for the international community to include the country at the end for all place names. **Attig** preferred that the instructions for the authorized access point be somewhat flexible. Shi **Deng** mentioned the difficulties with pinyin. Many characters have the same pinyin form and it can be very difficult to understand where a place is.

Hostage said that even if there was consensus on separating the preferred name from the qualifier, a proposal would take time to develop. In the meantime, we need to decide whether to move forward on these proposals for tweaking the rules. **Maxwell** thought that we should move forward to fix what is possible at this point, and then work on the larger problem.

Sarah **Elman** asked if there was a desire to solicit opinion from the cataloging community about whether it is desirable to establish a general guideline or a requirement to include the second level jurisdiction for other countries.

Rendall understood why people working with Chinese materials in the current environment want to do what is proposed. Still he did not think the current proposal should be approved, but should be turned into a generalized proposal. **Tarango** concurred.

Attig considered the idea of forwarding in this revision cycle the AALL proposal and a generalized version of the CEAL proposal, and stated that it might not actually be that difficult, Looking at where it might go, he said that now there are the exceptions, and following that, Places in Other Jurisdictions. We could make a more generalized statement to add the name of the country as an optional addition or alternative if desired. **Rendall** agreed that this would be preferable to adding exceptions for a specific country.

Myers wondered if the CEAL proposal was generalized, would the revisions to the entire set of rules regarding places in Australia, Canada, the United States, or any federation become a specific community application of the alternative? **Attig** said that his thought was to limit it to Places in Other Jurisdictions. **Myers** summarized: a local place is generally qualified by the larger jurisdiction, with an option to add an intermediate jurisdiction. There is an exception to the general rule for exceptional countries, which exclude the larger jurisdiction and only use state, for example. **Rolla** did not like this approach, calling it a Band-aid. **Myers** replied that we had already agreed this is a Band-aid situation.

Attig asked if any of this is critical to resolve in this revision cycle. **Maxwell** thought the CEAL proposal was reasonable, and it is reasonable to generalize it, but did not think it was reasonable to change all US names, for example. We should keep the exceptions we already have, and allow this procedure for other countries that desire it, by making it an option. **Rolla** suggested reversing it, to make the CEAL proposal the general instruction and have exceptions for Anglo-American countries. The **Chair** noted the potential effect on the examples throughout the text of RDA, as we discovered when exploring an earlier version of the AALL proposal.

Myers suggested moving forward with the AALL proposal, as the best solution for the environment we have. In addition, the issues raised by CEAL are important. **Attig** asked if we want to do a short term solution, since we are considering a long term solution. A straw poll indicated a preference to move forward with a short term solution. **Attig** asked whether we should include a generalized version of the CEAL proposal. A straw poll indicated a desire to include this.

Attig noted two issues to be resolved on the wiki: there are still some issues with the language used for overseas territories; and he needs examples from outside of China. Anyone working with other countries with intermediate jurisdictions is asked to contribute examples to the wiki. Shi **Deng** said that her group could provide examples for Korean place names.

Hostage raised the outstanding question about Ireland. The **Chair** conducted a straw poll on the question, should we remove Ireland from the instruction? The result was yes, remove Ireland from the British Isles instruction in the AALL proposal. **Dragon** asked if we would then need to change the name of the instructions from British Isles. **Attig** said yes.

1197.   Revision proposal from MLA #4: Snyder

The **Chair** introduced the discussion by summarizing the discussion on the list to date and the question from the MLA liaison regarding whether the alternative in the proposal was the preferred course of action from CC:DA. **Snyder** mentioned that there was not consensus within MLA about this question. With AACR2, there was an LCRI that allowed catalogers to enter a separately published text such as the libretto of an opera under the composer of the music with the word "Libretto" appended to it. For a Mozart opera with the libretto by Da Ponte, the separately published libretto is entered under Mozart. In RDA, the situation is reversed, so catalogers will enter a separately published libretto by Da Ponte under Da Ponte, with a variant access point under Mozart. In Wagner operas, however, the composer and the librettist are the

same person. RDA needs at least a revision to the instruction that requires catalogers to add a variant access point because in the case of the Wagner opera, the authorized access point and the variant access point would be the same. The larger question is: what type of work do we consider this to be? The MLA proposal advances the idea that it is one unified work, where the music and lyrics were developed together at the same time by the same person. This allows us to keep treating those works the same way and just add a qualifier if the libretto is published separately. **Maxwell** had commented on the list that if he wrote a poem and later set it to music, those are two separate works. **Snyder** noted that the burden shouldn't be on the cataloger to know how the song developed. MLA is looking for a pragmatic solution to allow catalogers to treat those two different extremes and everything along the continuum in the same way. Do we want a solution that allows catalogers to keep treating these works the same as in the past, or do we want to go with a minimal amount of revision that allows for avoidance of duplication?

Glennan commented that librettos fall into both systemic and segmental works in FRBR. They are really a strange hybrid. They are systemic because they extend across and are interwoven with the rest of the content of the work, but because librettos can be removed from the opera and still have the music, they exhibit characteristics of segmental parts. She couldn't think of anything else that does both. If an opera is published without the words, it's still the opera. It's just an expression of the opera that lacks the words.

Maxwell said that variant access points aren't required anywhere in RDA, so it's not necessary to make an exception. We could say "do not make the variant access point if it duplicates." He described an example of a book in which the illustrations were integral to the text. The simplest way to deal with these is to say that they are separate works and we'll deal with them as separate works, even though we know that in some cases they are really the same work.

Glennan said that we are trying to find a way to appropriately deal with three possibilities: the complete opera, with music and text; the libretto alone; and the opera without the text; and all are by the same person. Probably a performance of the opera without the text is the least likely. The real problem, tied into the fact that punctuation is important in this part of RDA, is whether you have a parenthetical qualifier or a period. We are looking for a solution that is easy enough for catalogers to apply and for patrons to understand.

Tarango commented that popular music often has the music published with and without words, and the lyrics published separately. **Scharff** noted as a reminder that if you take words away from an opera you need to distinguish between taking the words away without taking the voice away and taking the voice away. An example of taking the voice away is the Liebestod from the Wagner opera Tristan and Isolde, orchestral only version. **Glennan** commented that this is still an expression of the opera rather than a new work.

Rolla asked for clarification: is the issue that two different types of resources would have the same access point? **Attig** said no, but rather there may be a variant access point that is identical to an authorized access point. **Rolla** commented that the variant access point is optional. **Glennan** said that variant access points may be optional but they are very important to MLA, and it is very important to provide this particular variant access point, because it is a very common way to access librettos within music collections.

Attig asked about MLA's position; is MLA satisfied with the alternative? **Glennan** said that the issue needs resolution, and MLA just needs to know which way to proceed. The **Chair** stated that a straw poll would be conducted online shortly after the conference, so that everyone would have a chance to review the proposal. **Attig** mentioned that the alternative text is not in the proposal, so would need to be drafted if that is the preferred course of action.

1198. Revision proposal from OLAC on video encoding formats: McGrath

[CC:DA/OLAC/2012/1]

McGrath noted that there are three parts to the proposal. The first part deals with some problems with capitalization and clarification. For example, RDA uses the term "Blu-Ray," but this is a trademarked term that is spelled "Blu-ray." The proposal also adds information to clarify that what is meant by this element is the encoding of video content on the Blu-ray disc in such a way that it plays on a Blu-ray player.

The second part adds the term "flash video" to the list; this is a common format for video on the Internet.

The third part is slightly more complicated. DVD-R is not a video encoding format. DVD-R is a physical type of DVD disc, so it can't be in that list. We do want to retain the term somewhere; it is important for circulation or public services staff who might need to assist patrons in understanding why a disc might not play in their player. OLAC is proposing two new elements under a new instruction called Optical Disc Characteristic. OLAC agreed on the content of the elements, but struggled with what to name them:

Optical Disc Storage Format: this refers to the general physical type of disc, such as DVD, Blu-ray, or CD. This tells users what type of equipment they need.

Optical Disc Recording Type: this has two values, replicated disc and recordable disc. OLAC decided against distinguishing recordable vs. re-recordable. Because there is no commonly agreed upon terminology for these, the proposal includes a glossary with alternate terms. There is an additional instruction to record the specific type of recordable disc, if desired (e.g., DVD-R, DVD+R).

Attig noted that the terms for specific types are all types of recordable discs and inquired whether these would be recorded in addition to "recordable disc" or instead of that term. **McGrath** said these would be in addition to "recordable disc." The recordable element would be the baseline, but more specific details could be given if desired. **Attig** noted a technical editorial problem with the proposal: details of rules are Tom Delsey's way of having a note on a rule in chapter 3. There are no cases where vocabularies are defined for details on rules, but it would be very easy to make this an optional addition. **Attig** also noted that at some point he will need definitions of terms and it would be nice to include them in the proposal. **McGrath** thought this would not be difficult.

McGrath commented that there are no details for replicated discs because these only come in one format, so no additional information is needed. The other issue is that terms like CD-ROM and DVD-ROM have two meanings: they are replicated discs; and they are also commonly used for content that needs a computer for access. Libraries have tended to use the term in this latter sense.

Maxwell commented that the instructions still need to be parallel with other sections that are nearby. **Attig** agreed. He also noted that there are terms in Optical Disc Storage Format that are also in Video Encoding Format and asked for an explanation. **McGrath** said they do two different things; that was one reason for qualifying the terms in Video Encoding Formats by "video". Encoding Format refers to the way the data is encoded on the disc; Optical Disc Storage Format refers to the physical structure of the disc.

Motion to approve with editorial revisions by **Rolla**; seconded by Winzer. There was no discussion, and the motion carried.

Attig noted that we still need to determine what the "X" should be in the numbering (3.X). Discussion will continue on the wiki.

1199.   Report from the PCC liaison: Glennan

Glennan summarized the last six months of PCC activities, which were focused on reports from the current RDA Task Groups. More detailed information is available on the PCC website, under RDA Task Groups: http://www.loc.gov/aba/pcc/rda/RDA%20Task%20Groups.html.

Beyond the written report, Glennan mentioned that the PCC Standing Committee on Standards will develop Provider-Neutral Record guidelines that will encompass all formats. In addition, PCC is working with LC and ALA Publishing to rebrand the policy statements from LCPS to LC-PCC PS in the RDA Toolkit; policy statements exclusive to LC will be indicated as such. The SCT RDA Training Materials Task Group issued a full listing of freely available resources for RDA training; they plan to vet these resources and make them available on the Catalogers Learning Workshop website. PCC also has recently appointed the Access Points for Expressions Task Group to provide guidance to PCC catalogers about constructing access points for expressions; their report is due this fall.

For more information, consult the published report at
http://www.libraries.psu.edu/tas/jca/ccda/docs/pcc201206.pdf

1200.   Report from ALA Publishing Services: Linker

Linker announced that some of his remarks would repeat those he made during the RDA Update Forum held during this conference. He provided a Toolkit Sales Update also and confided that in order to break even on the Toolkit, ALA needs to triple or quadruple the number of users, which is why he is hesitant to extend the double-user offer. ALA needs to stop losing money on this product. The renewal rates (at mid-60%) are not at the preferred level. In comparison, the digital products are in the mid-90% range.

Linker reminded everyone that the double-user offer expires in August. The intention of this offer was to provide six users the first year (for each order of a user license) so that everyone can be in, or opt in. Anyone who renews by the end of August opts in for one more year. ALA felt that that option was very important during the training period.

Linker reported that the rewording project is moving forward. He believes that almost everyone involved is pleased with the process and the results. The U.S. Test Committee, the JSC, and Chris Oliver have worked very well together. They have reviewed chapters 9, 10, and 11. **Linker** expressed thanks to all of them. RDA is very difficult to edit and clarify without changing meaning. The U.S. Test Committee is reviewing chapter 6 to get an idea of the process, and will most likely not be expected to review another chapter after that. Oliver rewords the chapter, submits it to the JSC for comments, which are integrated into the chapter. The U.S. Test Committee then reviews the chapter and returns it to the JSC with comments that are worked into the document.

ALA Publishing will work toward having as many of the completed revised chapters (9, 11, 6, 2, plus a few more) as possible into the Toolkit by December. After December, as the chapters are approved by the JSC they can be rolled into the Toolkit. Ideally they will have all the chapters reworded and in the Toolkit by mid-2013.

The RDA print product has not been updated since publication (November 2010). Given the nature and scope of the changes made to date, which affected 90% of the pages, it is impractical to do an update packet. Instead, ALA Publishing will issue a new cumulated print version in December, which will include the reworded chapters and the April 2012 update. This will help to avoid updating chapters twice (for the April update and the reworded chapters). This news will be announced and broadcast. The remaining updates related to the rewording should be available as updates in mid-2013. After that time, the print product should have annual (June) updates.

Some changes were made to the RDA Toolkit, including a preference to load a whole chapter instead of the smaller sections. To enable chapters to load faster, paging was added as an option and a user preference. Also added was an update history (included in navigation); a logon button (due to pressure from John Attig); core element basic instruction filters; links to the JSC full record examples; a search thesaurus; and a router, i.e. browser, heartbeat to enable timeout by default if no activity occurs for 60 minutes, as an institutional preference. The Toolkit will close if the browser closes. Timeout can be set to 30 minutes or 15 minutes. Also added were metadata about workflows and the Creative Commons licenses. The searchability and findability will be improved based on that metadata.

ALA Publishing continues to offer two types of ongoing webinars: 1. The RDA Toolkit Essentials, an introduction and guide to using the Toolkit (announced to new subscribers, led by James Hennally and offered every other month, with the next offering on July 18). 2. The RDA Virtual User Group, an online interactive webinar focused on development planning for the RDA Toolkit. Viewers are taught to login, to search, and to find rule numbers, as well as user preferences and how to set them. The goal of these meetings is to obtain user feedback. Mockups are put out about two weeks in advance and posted on the development blog regarding

discussion topics for the meeting. Linker encouraged the audience and their staff to participate in said meetings.

Development priorities include:

1. Translations. Nearly all of the French and German translations have been submitted to ALA, and will be added into a development version of the Toolkit for experimenting and proofreading.

2. Better integration with the RDA registry to ensure that its contents will be added to the Toolkit, and vice versa. Those two processes have been separate, but are now brought together so that each is an export of the other. A new option enables new additions to the Registry to also be added to the Toolkit also.

3. Improve the RDA Toolkit training availability of how to use the Toolkit.

4. Improve display on mobile devices, which Linker plans to discuss with the Virtual User Group, as he needs input regarding use cases.

5. Integrate the new combined LC-PCC Policy Statements (including a new icon). Users will be able to toggle to one or several policy statements of interest. ALA has started talking to other institutions who want policy statements, like other national libraries.

6. Work on the RDA data model. For example, the ERD needs updating. If RDA truly wants to be encoding-neutral, we need to give people an idea of the data model, and let others interpret the coding from it. Those working with linked data say they need a full application profile. More work is needed to determine whether the code is required, repeatable, and so on.

7. Opportunities to publish related schema in the Toolkit. These would be freely available in the Toolkit, kept outside the subscription so that the community can see them. Linker is trying to work with the vendors so that this information can be formatted in useful ways.

8. Add an option for auto sync TOC.

9. Option to set the preference for auto sync every time you follow a link.

10. Add a signal location for a synchronized authentication process that automatically logs users into the system with their user name, password, and profile. Linker ended his report and invited questions.

Linker was asked if knew how many people are using the electronic booster workflows. He stated that he did talk about making changes to the workflow editor. It is a third party program that ALA just bought and implemented, so there's a limit on how much ALA can do on it. Several groups, including the British Library and LC are working towards this. James Hennally will create training support for people who are creating workflows. Although Linker does not have statistics, he sensed that many people want to ensure their work is right before it is publicized. Linker and other ALA staff think it will be one of the most powerful features in the

Toolkit, so they want to encourage and support it if possible. Linker committed to try to find better data by accessing some of the logs.

Attig mentioned that in his report he had explained that ALA was doing the update history for substantive updates, if not for the fast-track proposals in most cases, and asked: Will you include the update history for the rewording project or not? **Linker** replied: No, it would require a lot of work, a lot of tracking that would really delay the schedule. We track it, but it is very difficult to track and to expose the traffic, and plus it is not intended to change cataloging practice. He added that whether they will include it in the update history or not is for JSC to decide. When they report to ALA, they tell us whether they consider it.

Maxwell stated that he understood the problem, and added: We've written training materials quoting RDA. **Linker** was not sure how they would do it and stated that if you think it would track changes virtually, most of it will be all red, as a lot has changed. **Attig** stressed that the substance hasn't changed, and added: If you care about the exact words that you quote, you will need to rewrite them. It will require thorough rewrites. **Linker** invited questions later in person or by email.

1201.   Report from the TF on Sources of Information: Scharff (10:00, 45 min.)

> [CC:DA/TF/Sources of Information/3]

This report included five appendices addressing particular issues identified by the task force. The committee agreed to consider the first four and to eliminate the fifth (Appendix E), which was created as an alternate approach to one of the issues.

Scharff thanked the TF members and co-presenters Kathy Glennan and Kelly McGrath for their work. He announced he would discuss two appendices from the report and Glennan and McGrath would each discuss one of them. They will also discuss workflow.

Scharff stated that Appendix A was drafted as a proposal, with background information and summary recommendations. The TF judged this appendix to be the most straightforward of the issues under consideration. The proposal clarifies that a container issued by a publisher is considered part of a resource when you prepare a comprehensive description. The proposal also required editorial work to clean up some grammatical construction. He invited questions about the proposal.

Maxwell suggested changing the proposed wording to: "publishing entities" instead of "publishing body," as more than corporate bodies can be publishers. **Attig** suggested using "publisher," as the phrase "publishing body" does not occur in RDA. **Scharff** stated that that was the only place where that occurred.

Attig asked: Is there a short version of the explanation of why the use of accompanying material is confined to analytical descriptions? **McGrath** replied: The problem with that is in comprehensive descriptions, accompanying material is already covered in the regular preferred

sources. The point is that if you read and remember it you would already know that, but it's important to clarify for those who read it in isolation.

Scharff asked Attig if more text here was needed. **Attig** replied that the TF still needs to review these rules in general. These are specific cases they would rather handle quickly. He suggested that Scharff do each one as a separate ALA proposal.

The **Chair** acknowledged a suggestion for a minor change in wording. She invited a motion to approve the revision proposal to clarify the status of a container as resource. It was moved by **Winzer** and seconded by **Bourassa**. The proposal was approved as amended, changing "issued by the publishing body" to "issued by the publisher."

Scharff stated that Appendix D cannot be considered as a proposal today, as it did not include a background and rational, then asked: Are we on the right track in what we're trying to do with it?

McGrath stated that Appendix D concerned the place of embedded metadata in the priority order in the preferred sources. The task force proposal (for revision of RDA 2.2.2.2–2.2.2.4) emphasizes a preference for eye-readable metadata over machine-readable metadata and lowers the priority for choosing embedded metadata as an information source. McGrath surmised that this proposal was not thought through during the fall-out when the rules were written and suggested reviewing rules for moving images and other resources. She added: What we propose is generally the same for both of these. They included embedded metadata as the next alternative after either the title frames for moving images or after the label for other resources. This did not work well, for two reasons.

1. For physical resources, the embedded metadata then comes before titles on the accompanying material and the container that would be much more obvious to a user or someone trying to identify the material, whereas the embedded metadata on a CD or DVD requires you to work harder to access it.

2. It's also a major problem for cataloging online resources. The embedded metadata for a web page has the title in the title tag in the html (which displays across the banner top). But catalogers of such resources want the title that displays on the homepage, which is what users will identify as the title of the resource. The goal is to reorder placement of embedded metadata so that it's allowed, but as a source of last resort in most cases. In the process of trying to figure out why embedded metadata was so prominent in RDA, the TF tried to develop use cases for embedded metadata. The main case that **McGrath** conceived was when catalogers want to auto-generate records from the embedded metadata of a number of resources instead of manually viewing the resources for data on the title frames of each. For that reason, people proposed an alternative for those who prefer to use embedded metadata. For catalogers who are examining and cataloging individual items, embedded metadata is still an allowable source, but much lower down in the priority list. At times there will be items to catalog that have nothing but embedded metadata. The goal is also to prefer eye-readable information, because eye-readable titles are more accessible to users and are more likely to be used to identify a resource. For example, information on the home page can be more eye-readable than on the title tag, but embedded

metadata on a disk menu on a physical format has not traditionally been considered as eye-readable.

McGrath continued: The last change is 2.2.2.2 for pages, etc., in the exception for early printed resources: We wanted to clarify that where it says "a cover" it refers only to a cover sheet issued by the publisher. That change is independent of the other suggestion, but it's the same rule. The TF also added embedded metadata into the page section. McGrath thinks there are some resources in that type of format that also have embedded metadata. **Scharff** asked if people agreed with the general concepts and approach.

Attig cautioned against seeking to approve the proposal until reading the yet unwritten background and rationale. He gave assurances that the areas of concern would be addressed during this meeting and be finished on the wiki.

Tarango's only concern was the metadata for serials. He prefers to use as the primary source of information the PDF that contains the cover or title page, instead of the home page. He asked: Would you then stop using the home page?

McGrath replied: When we discuss homepages we're referring to cataloging a website, but if you catalog a set of PDFs of different items you treat the PDFs as contents. If you catalog a PDF, you would follow the rules at the beginning which discuss the image on the title page or on the cover, so that would not affect the PDFs cataloging unless you explicitly decided you wanted imbedded metadata.

Maxwell stated that using the word "publisher" might be tricky for a printed resource, and suggested instead, "a cover common to all copies and manifestations" or something similar. **Attig** replied: In this case it refers to the publisher element. Is that a problem? Are you saying it might be a distributor or manufacturer? **Maxwell** stated: It might be a manufacturer. **Attig** replied: Then we need to address it. Let's discuss possible wording. **Maxwell** agreed with Scharff's restatement of the problem to be, the word "publisher" is too limiting in terms of the entities with which we are concerned. The committee generally agreed with the proposed changes.

The **Chair** stated: We will continue to work on this revision proposal draft in order to move it forward in this revision cycle. We hope to see a more finished version with a rationale that includes the things we have discussed.

Scharff discussed Appendix B: Draft proposal for revision of RDA 2.1.2.2 in the MLA proposal. The TF added an addendum an option to do this alternately in 2.2.3: to add a preference for collective title as identifying the resource as a whole. He was not prepared to pass judgment, but invited comments. Discussion centered on how a cataloger determines what constitutes a single vs. multipart unit: Container + disc? Compact disc + booklet? 2 DVD-set in a single container?

Attig stated: One of the issues that we are trying to clarify that would affect this, and the difference between the two instructions you cited, is whether the things we are discussing are

single units, or whether they need to be treated under the instructions for multi-part units. When does the item that you think of as a single unit become a multipart unit without you noticing?

Scharff stated in the report this was one of the open issues that they presented up front, and even the task force members have had some difficulties in determining how things should be divided and how this works out. He asked the group which direction they think the divide should take, and posed a series of questions: Does the presence of a container usually make something more than one part? Does the presence of more than one of the entities being described – e.g., two discs and one container – indicate that item is issued in more than one part? Is one CD in a container with an accompanying booklet issued as a single unit or as more than one part? He again invited comments.

Winzer recalled that at the start of the RDA test a person brought a video which was primarily one item but included a small segment. It was clearly not a collective work but there was no way of treating it as "accompanying" or "with" or anything else. She expressed hope for instruction that allows the cataloger to use common sense on such things, so that a pamphlet that accompanies a video is treated as "accompanying material," not as a collective work.

Attig stated that the discussion was about carriers, not content, but he agreed with Winzer's comment. **Glennan** also agreed, and added: The first part of Winzer's comment pertains to Appendix C and the second part pertains to the issue at hand. Being pragmatic about pamphlets and such, she doubts that the presence of a container to hold a CD makes it a multipart item. It's just part of what is needed, the same as with a case for a video or videogame. If there are more than one disc in a container, RDA is very clear that it is a multipart item; i.e. two videodiscs. If there are more than one physical piece in your container, that seems to be a marker for multipart item. The problem seems to be the one CD with a booklet or a DVD with a rather substantial paper supplement. That's a gray area, because they're all clearly separable pieces, but one is truly accompanying material to the other. One is a primary resource and one is secondary. She prefers a practical solution focusing on the primary item in the case, but that might need to be an MLA decision rather than something we can fit into the instructions.

McGrath was not sure it was a problem, and added: One issue in Appendix C is that accompanying material decision option C where you pick a main part, so the net result would be the same, when you consider the source: the CD and the guide; the DVD and the guide. When you get to part C, does this item have a main part? Clearly the CD or the DVD is the main part, and then you're back to the single unit, and you would review the preferred sources list. It would make sense to apply the basis of identification for a single unit to the CD, and the accompanying material would fall under the accompanying material category in the preferred sources section. This is an illusory problem as long as you can identify the main part which in most cases is common sense.

As a medical cataloger, **Sprochi** sees many textbooks that come with CDs or DVDs that are definitely accompanying items. Likewise with music CDs and textbooks: they both have accompanying materials. She agrees that a CD with a booklet or a textbook with a DVD is a multipart item, but doubts we need to go in that direction. The **Chair** stated she wanted to give

the TF feedback on the questions that need to be answered. She asked for a straw poll on a direction to go.

Scharff stated: We've abandoned the term "accompanying material." Our process thus will require us to return to some earlier instructions that specify how to treat "accompanying material." We want to ensure that this proposal works with how accompanying material was regarded earlier. He invited reaction to the proposed revision of 2.1.2.2 on a conceptual level. It includes the notion of introducing the main or predominant work or content, which is the TF's attempt to restore OLAC's desire to restore that content from AACR2.

Attig stated: The two main issues here are: 1. Whether we want to introduce the concept of predominant part work or dominant work in this rule we're reviewing. That's what we've discussed so far. 2. What we discussed previously is the introduction to the instruction to choose a source that bears a collective title. We're not clear if it should be generally applicable. Those are the uses and the end result before we can forward this proposal. **Scharff** asked: Should those be considered as two separate questions for a straw poll, or just a reaction? **Attig** replied: We've already got those on the list, so write something on the wiki to make sure we deal with those. He asked if there are other issues that we should consider.

The **Chair** invited a straw poll on moving forward the proposal as written, for which there was overwhelming support. The committee expressed interest in ignoring accompanying material in these cases and agreed that the draft proposal was on the right track. The Chair stated: We can put more specific questions on the list. **Attig** asked if that means that we do not need to consider the addendum, which was there in case we were not happy with the proposal? **Scharff** agreed and added that the addendum was there in case we thought we needed to move it out of here. **Glennan** stressed that the issue was trying to determine whether we are going in the right direction here, not about wordsmithing.

Glennan said that Appendix C (Draft proposal for revision of RDA 2.1.2.3) concerns resources issued in more than one part. The TF did not find mutually exclusive categories in the existing instructions. Glennan asked whether having mutually exclusive categories is a good idea, so that you know what you're doing, or do you at least want an ordered list so that if you hit something, you stop there? And if we are not able to do mutually exclusive categories, if a decent substitute would be to pick the first one on a hierarchical list that meets the criteria?

Glennan continued: One of the problems in reviewing the first set of instructions in 2.1.2.3 was the difference of being sequentially numbered and sequentially ordered and issued. These were not seen as mutually exclusive categories, so we created "sequentially issued" and "simultaneously issued." **Attig** agreed that this is a reasonable way to look at it. The task force rewrote this section on resources issued in more than one part to create mutually exclusive categories.

Glennan continued: The current wording in Appendix B was especially confusing. We think that there are "sequentially issued" resources that are: 1. "Sequentially numbered" and issued in order, and 2. "Sequentially issued" resources that are either unnumbered, or "sequentially numbered" but are not issued in that order. For example, many collected works are issued out of order such

that, for example, volume 10 is published first. Are these reasonable breakdowns? The rest of those instructions did not change. In one case, you identify the lowest numbered issue or part available, and in the other case you identify the earliest issue or part that you can distinguish.

Tarango had no objection in general, but said: In Appendix B where we discuss sequential description, substantive issue, and identifying the issue of a part, it is problematic for serials, as we always choose the lowest number regardless of issue date. For example, I have issue 4 and 10 both in hand, but 10 is dated earlier than issue 4, so you say I should pick issue 10. We need it to say that we pick the earliest number or part. **Glennan** stressed that the TF did not change the text. **Maxwell** stated: This is a rule for unnumbered things. **Tarango** replied: No, it says "or sequentially numbered, but issued"—that's the problem.

Glennan invited continued discussion on the wiki and feedback on needed wording. She added that they could create another numbered thing and exclude that word, if that is what will work. **Attig** asked Glennan to make it clear when this occurs, as he won't know when a substantive change is made to the RDA instruction.

Glennan agreed, and stated: We used some AACR2 wording which provided a unifying element language in substitute for C. We will probably change some of the wording and assess it. We might want to consider changing to "predominant part." The concept is simultaneously issued resources where one piece, such as the piano part in a piano trio score, is the unifying element and the other pieces are secondary. In RDA it's definitely considered as a part, as they are three physical pieces. She invited additional wording on the wiki.

Glennan continued: The final category concerns the lack of a predominant part wherein if we can identify the resource as a whole use that. If it lacks a unifying part, e.g. a published, printed encyclopedia, choose the source of information identifying the lowest number or part available, such as volume 1 of the 1980 edition of Encyclopedia Britannica instead of volume 12.

Glennan continued: The final category is rather moot, and mostly unchanged. An AACR2 rule moved to RDA allows music catalogers, when faced with a multi-disc set and no collective title, to use the sources identifying individual parts as a collective source for the title. We replaced "ordered" with "sequentially numbered" as we think that was intended. So, are we going in the right direction? If not, please tell us what to do instead. She implied it would help to have suggestions to clarify wording especially for material types, as the TF members don't represent the serials community very well. The committee agreed that the draft was basically going in the right direction. Serials experts will contribute improved wording in the wiki.

The **Chair** thanked Glennan, and invited McGrath to summarize information on workflows that was included in the TF report. The Chair also invited further discussion online. **McGrath** discussed the workflows that she had created. The TF had much trouble understanding what some of the rules meant. It seemed easier to make a workflow or flowchart that represented the questions throughout the process and then try to reverse-engineer that. The workflows were linked to the document that was sent out. The question is whether to continue with the workflows and to update it. It might be a useful addition to the toolkit to help people move through and adjust to the instructions. The workflows would be a flow chart on how to make decisions about

what is the basis for identifying the preferred source of whatever you have in hand. McGrath wasn't sure how many people have opened the flowcharts. She asked for opinions and whether this should be pursued.

Glennan found the flowcharts very helpful, especially in clarifying issues when facing a set of different materials especially for complex situations, and working through them to learn about the decision making process. She stated: The flowcharts could be useful as reference materials and possibly useful for training, especially since some of the information is not in the same place in RDA. It gives you a way to visualize your decision-making without having to go all over in the rules, because they're all in one flowchart. McGrath's work needs to be updated via the proposal process. The instructions references would be useful; **Glennan** could not recall if those were added.

Attig said: This could be an RDA workflow with an attached graphic; as well as a textual workflow. I would like to include something like that in the proposal to help JSC to understand what occurs when dealing with parts of it that would be relevant. We'll need to consider that. Let's keep the proposals separate for decision-making purposes and assess later whether it makes sense to keep them separate or not.

The **Chair** stated that they had approved the first one that was discussed and will work on the others. Also, there was interest in the flowchart. CC:DA agreed that the task force's draft workflow charts were helpful and should be included with the proposal that goes forward to the JSC. Ultimately, they could be added to the RDA Toolkit.

1202.   Revision proposal regarding Hearings: Schiff

[CC:DA/Schiff/2012/1]

This proposal addresses the impact of a recent change to RDA that makes hearings named corporate bodies. This represents a change from AACR2 practice. The committee agreed that this is not a desirable outcome and recommended moving forward with option 2.

The **Chair** stated that some discussion about this proposal occurred on the discussion list, including discussion about some complexities. Adam **Schiff** included two questions in his proposal about hearings: 1. Do we agree with the changes the JSC made in 19.2.1.1C, i.e. that hearings should be treated as named events, or 2. Would we prefer that RDA treat hearings the same way they are treated in AACR2, where the creator of a hearing is the body that held the hearing?

The issue of hearings as creators surfaced when Schiff created a PowerPoint presentation comparing RDA to AACR2. When he started to incorporate this instruction into his presentation, he realized that the JSC had changed the way hearings were treated. They are now named events because they are in a category with exhibitions, fairs, and festivals. A clause at the bottom now says that a hearing can be considered to be a creator, provided that the conference, exhibition, or event is named in the resource. Schiff said: If you say that the hearing is a creator, the hearing requires a name. In other words, he name is for the hearing, not the sponsoring body, which is a

different practice from AACR2. Also, the example in RDA has a sponsor as a creator, which does not seem to fit the rule change.

Attig said: The JSC probably did not intend that result. **Schiff** agreed with Attig's assumption, and added: I raised the issue that if the JSC did not intend to make hearings creators, and have names, then the rule cannot remain as written. So I have summarized three possibilities based on comments: 1. "Maybe hearings are named after all" or 2. "Maybe the sponsor of the hearing should not be considered as the creator of the work." 3. "We don't want hearings to be named so let's move this somewhere else." **Hostage** has suggested we return to ALA's response to the original proposal, but I don't believe that will work, as ALA wanted to move legislative hearings into a new category that in the response says "Legal and governmental works of the following types …" That instruction now just says "legal works." **Schiff** doesn't believe that legislative hearings are legal works and thinks that we want to treat hearings in the broader sense. Even the proposal limited hearings to governmental and legislative hearings, but other kinds of bodies like ALA hold hearings as well.

Randall was surprised that the JSC did not intend for this situation to occur, because he specifically addressed it when the original idea was presented. He had suggested a way to change it but doesn't recall what his specific suggestion was.

Maxwell believed that Attig is right concerning the JSC's intentions, and that the JSC needs to say "We did not intend that and we need to fix it." The trouble is they did change it. **Attig** agreed and added: Whether we intended it or not, we did change it. **Schiff** stated: In which case the example of this body needs to be deleted or moved or changed to the form I have given, which in this case raises the question of, does it convey the idea of a corporate body as required? There are most likely many hearings whose title does not convey the idea of a corporate body and would need to be qualified by "hearing" or something similar.

Winzer asked Attig if he meant that if we changed it we can't change it back? If not, she prefers option 1 of Schiff's proposal. **Schiff** stated: Whether or not it's option 1 or 2, I suggest that you consider changing "conducted by legislative and government bodies" to either "conducted by legislative, governmental, or other bodies" or just "conducted by…" **Maxwell** suggested: Take it all out and say "transcripts of hearings." **Schiff** agreed that would work and added: For option two, would you say that works for court hearings? **Maxwell** repeated: Just say "transcripts of hearings." **Schiff** stated: In section D, if you were to choose that option, the last thing in parentheses would be "transcripts of hearings" unless you don't want "transcripts" and want to use another word. If you choose option 2 and create a new category, you would say something like "Works that incorporate hearings" or "transcripts of hearings." **Maxwell** asked: Does it have to be word for word? Or could you say recordings of hearings? **Schiff** guessed that legal folks would have a verbatim text of the hearings, and added: A report from attending a hearing would probably not count as a hearing.

Schiff continued: If the agency that held the hearing gave a summary of the hearing, is it still responsible for the hearing? Perhaps it would be in a different category? A collective thought. **Randall** replied: You can have different types of works, either the sponsoring body's thought or

opinion or an outright transcript. Option 1 is a little too restrictive and really stretches the idea of collective thought. **Schiff** agreed that it was not collective thought.

Randall continued: It might be better to have a new category that says "Works from hearings that were conducted by the body." **Schiff** stated: Unless you want to change the wording where it says: "Works that record the collective thought" to something else that would be easier to create. **Maxwell** stated: That's a very important category, collective thought. **Schiff** stated: It's a transcript of proceedings, somewhat like conference proceedings. **Randall** agreed.

Schiff stated: Conference proceedings are an event, but there's a little difference because they are considered named. Hearings are an event, but we generally don't want to consider them named. **Myers** suggested something like: "works that may be collected as part of a hearing" since there seems to be an impasse. But in the interest of time, in response to the question, we have agreed we would prefer to revert to the AACR2 practice and consider option 1 or 2. It sounds like the argument has been made that we should choose option 2 for creating the category, and wordsmith how to convey what we want and where to put it. **Attig** stated: I don't think we need to do all that.

Winzer stated: The corporate body is not a new category. It's the same corporate body as a legislative committee, so calling it a new corporate body doesn't make sense. **Schiff** replied: No, create new categories for which the corporate body can be considered a creator.

Myers stated, in response to Winzer's concern, that the corporate body is the sponsor of the hearing, but the actual output is more than just the words of the respondents to the hearing. **Maxwell** stated: If we do this, is part of the revision is to cross out "hearing" in part 3?

The **Chair** invited a straw poll about option 2, to verify the amount of support for this direction, to do further work on the wording, and do a vote later. Option 2 states: Create a new category of corporate bodies considered to be creators, and decide where to put that in the language. The poll result was overwhelming consensus to use option 2 as the basis for the ALA proposal.

1203.   Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta

Polutta presented her work on the proposed transition of the CC:DA website and showed part of the CC:DA test website that she set up on Wordpress.com. She stressed two points for which she requested group feedback: 1. The organizational structure, using the categories and tags (an integral part of Wordpress software). Attached to each post are tags (top topics). For example, any proposal has the author's name, the topic and group it pertains to. For example, MLA and music. Each proposal also has more specific information such as medium of performance, libretto, and so on. These are searchable terms that you can input in the search box of the Wordpress blog site. You can also search based on tags, and the categories therein, and select the group that you want to see. She also applied one or two categories as appropriate to each piece of documentation that was discussed in the past six months, such as proposals, TF reports, and official documents, each of which was designated as a working document. Each one was labeled as "proposal" or "CC:DA document" including agendas, minutes, etc. Some were general

presentations or discussion topics that may have had "presentations" attached to them as a general topic.

For example, items such as the LC report, or the JSC report were labeled with "Reports" as a category. Individual posts can have multiple categories and multiple tags – it's not a one-to-one relationship. Also, one item can belong in multiple locations and categories can be changed. Polutta can access each post from the dashboard, check off multiple ones, do a bulk edits and change categories for an entire group. For example, as ALA Annual 2012 ends, Polutta will change all the Working Documents into Archive Documents, so it will not be a permanent category. Working Documents will always be categorized as current. This is based mainly on the organization of the current website, but information is easier to categorize in Wordpress. Polutta wanted to ensure that these cover all the categories that the group can think of, that the categories are appropriate, that the group can understand all the ways that she applies the categories, and can find things on the website. She asked if there were any other categories that the group thought were appropriate.

Attig asked if hierarchical relationships among the categories were worth working on, and said: I believe you said it was possible. **Polutta** agreed, and pointed out that in this entire area are all child categories. Each category is currently a parent category, but Polutta can easily change one to a child category in order to retain "CC:DA Documents" as a child category and "Adult CC:DA." Each can be separately checkable, so that some can belong to a sub-category but not necessarily to a parent category. She is unsure whether any are currently appropriate to these child categories. She is open to suggestions but is unsure whether that would add to functionality. **Rolla** asked if just one level of hierarchy was possible. **Polutta** replied: No, it will do quite a few levels. Wordpress is very flexible.

Attig said: We'll need to review it again. The general question was to confirm that it does support hierarchical relationships, and the fact that you can set any up represents that there aren't any, rather than a desire not to use them. **Polutta** agreed, and said that as she examined things she saw nothing that was automatically always a subtopic. **Attig** asked where the definitions and categories were. **Polutta** said that she would create appropriate documentation later. When she decides on a final form, she will write an analysis of the CC:DA documents on the website as to how she created categories and used different tags so that the existing policy can be followed by her replacement

Scharff asked: Does the "About CC:DA" mean to include documents that come from other ALA bodies that to pertain to CC:DA, for example, something from the ALCTS Executive Committee about our duties, or is it about "Here's who we are?" **Polutta** stated: It's more about "Here is who we are" as CC:DA, with topics such as how to submit a revision proposal. The CC:DA Documents category includes agendas, minutes, procedures, official statements, as well as documents we would send to the higher executive bodies for publishing. You can overlap between the two.

Tarango asked what the category "Helpful Information," was about and if the workflow tag was scalable and repeatable. **Polutta** stated her intent to write guidelines on how she uses the tags and categories. She added: The categories are simpler, fewer, and much more established. They

must be established in the dashboard for them to be used. She can write definitions for categories that should be included. The "Interesting Helpful Information," is about: "I can't think of anything and I don't know if I'm going to do that one." The tags are much looser but can be controlled to an extent. For example, when Polutta opens a new proposal, she can ask the system to show the most commonly used tags in the past, so that she can ensure consistency in using specific tags. When posting the proposals she made sure to use as tags: who proposed it (the person); the body making the proposal; e.g. MLA, CEAL, or AALL; the base topics; and time of meeting with which it was associated. Those are the four tags that she applied consistently.

Rolla asked: Do you envision this as being set so that only the webmaster will have sole permission to edit the website? **Polutta** replied that it does not have to be solely the webmaster. You can give levels of permission for this. It is quite possible for each person on this committee to have access. She will need to test it to verify what levels of permission she can get. For example you can say to a person, "You can view these posts, but not every single one." **Rolla** stated: If the permission technique works well, perhaps we can ask TFs to identify a few tags that are important for that TF to have included.

Polutta agreed, and added: Certainly something to display more appropriately the words used with the tags. They are simply online readings of the TF summary statements, including the title, and introductory statements. If I wanted to insert anything like better definitions, I would add those tags. I tried to use the vocabulary the TF used.

Attig said: Or it can start with the chair's charge. **Polutta** stated: Everyone likes the categories and tags. She will add a list of helpful links to the Blogroll that are currently on the website. However, the list of links is very long and she is not sure if they are the most current or are necessary. She needs help with reviewing which links are most needed.

Polutta cannot show some information such as the WordPress.com unlimited site where only certain options are used; whereas a self-hosted site (which is what we have) does allow this. She cannot demonstrate some features (that we will have) such as Sticky post, which allows a prominent item, such as a meeting agenda, to remain as the top post, placed at the beginning of the website, no matter if other posts are added later.

Polutta continued: WordPress has themes which pertain to layout and organization. She chose a simple theme with a small font, a 2-column layout, a broad column on the left and an informational column on the right, with all the links you can access. She chose to follow a basic structure and did not include a picture. She also wanted to demonstrate the current structure to ensure that it made sense to the group.

Attig asked: this is one page, not the site protocol page? **Polutta** stated: Yes, and no. This is the current home page of the site, because this is the most recent post that I added. We can set it up so that what displays as the top post can always be different, or it can be one post that is consistently shown.

Attig asked: Does it have to be a post? **Polutta** stated No, it doesn't have to be a post that is first.

Attig asked: It can be a basic definition of what the committee work and structure…?

Polutta stated: It can have a static page as the site's primary home page, and not necessarily the most recent post. Also, she wanted to show the basic structure that she set up in the individual posts. This is not the best representation because she intends to have a post associated with each TF. Individual posts will be updated with new information related to that TF instead of separate posts for each piece of the TF. She showed an example using a proposal. She wants to have in each post the document title as the post title; the embedded link to the PDF document, that is still printable; plus the document number in each post associated with CC:DA. She intends to have a separate page that lists all of those together, the same as the current document number listing because those all need to be on one page. She wants to make sure that it is associated with the individual document and the individual post. That is the basic pattern she intends to follow in creating the individual posts.

Lipcan asked: Do you envision us using the comment functionality in Wordpress? How does that interface with the work that we are doing on the wiki? **Polutta** would eventually like to present that issue as a proposal to replace the wiki with the blog's comment functionality. She said: This might be a good thing because: 1. Within Wordpress you can do Ready Posts i.e. Ready Comments. This allows one person to make a comment, and you can make a comment in response to that comment, and the latter comment will show as indented in relation to it. 2. You don't need to know wiki coding to do that; all you need to know is word processing and typing. You can also control it so that only those who already have login and password can be allowed to comment and they will be automatically approved without Polutta having to approve it, as she does currently: Each comment requires moderation, i.e. Polutta's approval it before it displays.

Attig stated: The other nice thing is that you can set up an RSS feed so it not only would replace the wiki, but also replace some of our email discussions. You could have the features of both. **Polutta** said: Any comment can be set up to be sent directly to your emails so you don't have to go to the post to see it.

The **Chair** acknowledged the software's great potential, such as future uses, and potential to replace some other tools. She suggested discussion about this software at Midwinter, and that in the interim it would be set up and run. She offered to help with the transition. It has been something discussed throughout her term. **Polutta** would like to use the blog to test it instead of the current website.

Attig stated: The two issues that may need more attention are: 1. Review the list of categories. 2. Decide whether there's anything more for the home page to have as standard text. These are worth more discussion.

1204.   Report from the Chair on CCS Executive Committee Meetings; Other New Business; Reports from the floor; Announcement of Next Meeting, and Adjournment: Chair

The **Chair** and **Rolla** attended the CaMMS Executive meeting on Sunday. Before the conference two document revisions that CC:DA had completed were approved, The Procedures and "How to Submit a Revision Proposal." Those are now posted on the website. The **Chair** alerted CaMMS

Executive Committee that CC:DA had approved the revision to "Building International Descriptive Cataloging Standards" and that CC:DA will send the final version to them for approval.

There was a brief discussion about representation on CC:DA. The Chair and Rolla agreed that the addition of the new liaison from RBMS completed their desire for representation at this time. They also briefly discussed their desire to stay engaged with what happens after MARBI to ensure there is adequate representation as that moves forward.

The **Chair** announced several membership changes. Kevin Randall and Kathy Winzer will leave as voting members. They have both provided tremendous expertise and service to CC:DA in terms of vision and leadership on task forces and revision proposals. She thanked them for their service. They are still TF chairs and will not leave yet. The **Chair** announced that she will rotate off CC:DA and Peter Rolla will be the new chair.

The **Chair** will wrap up some CC:DA business by email for the next week or so. Sylvia Hall-Ellis did not complete her term which would have ended at this conference. She was replaced by Dominique Bourassa, who after completing that term now begins a regular two-year term as voting member. Three new voting members are: Steven Kelley, Larisa Walsh, and Gayle Porter, an intern for the past two years. The Chair said good bye to Jennifer Miller as intern and Karen Weaver as GODORT liaison and thanked both for their service. Richard Hardoff is the new liaison. The two new interns are Mary Anne Dyer and Sandra Macke.

The **Chair** announced the next Midwinter meetings on Saturday 1:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m. and Monday morning 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. in Seattle, January 26 and 28, 2013. **Myers** recognized the Chair's graceful and wonderful service for the past two years. The **Chair** thanked Myers and stated: It has been an honor and a pleasure to serve with all of you. She adjourned the meeting at 11:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Gayle Porter, Intern

Lori Robare, Chair