

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
2013 Annual ALA conference in Chicago, Illinois.
June 29 and July 1, 2013**

Members present:

Peter J. Rolla, Chair
Dominique Bourassa
Patricia M. Dragon
Steve Kelley
Sandra Macke
Gayle Porter [Monday only]
Robert Rendall
Larisa Walsh
Bob Wolverton

Melanie Polutta, CC:DA Webmaster
Mary Anne Dyer, Intern
Elyssa Sanner, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

John C. Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Dave Reser, Library of Congress

ALA Liaisons present:

Elizabeth Marie German, ALA/ACRL
Richard Guajardo, ALA/GODORT
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM
Francis Lapka, ALA/ACRL/RBMS
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM
Nathan B. Putnam, ALCTS/MIG
Randy Roeder, ALCTS/PARS
Adolfo Tarango, ALCTS/CRS
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons:

Kathy Glennan, PCC

Diane Hillmann, DCMI
John Hostage, AALL
Judy Knop, ATLA [Saturday only]
Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA
Dorothy McGarry, SLA
Kelley McGrath, OLAC
Cory Nimer, SAA
Tracey Snyder, MusLA
Amanda K. 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 some cases are exact quotes included.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of the actual voting members rather than of representatives/liaisons of particular agencies or groups. These votes are a formal representation of Committee views. The Chair rarely votes except to break a tie. The term “straw vote” indicates a poll of the ALA and other organizational representatives/liaisons to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, and a CC:DA position is stated, the position has been determined by consensus.
- IV. In CC:DA minutes, the term “members” is used to apply to both voting and nonvoting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “liaisons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

AACR2 = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2005 revision

AALL = American Association of Law Libraries

AASL = American Association of School Librarians

ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate

ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries

ALA = American Library Association

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America

ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections

ATLA = American Theological Libraries Association

CaMMS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

CC:DA = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

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

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

*Saturday, June 29 1:00-5:30 pm
InterContinental Chicago, Camelot Room*

1225. Welcome and opening remarks

Peter Rolla, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1226. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives [[CC:DA/Roster/2013](#)]

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.

1227. Adoption of agenda [[CC:DA/A/67](#)]

There were no changes to the agenda. **Wolverton** moved to adopt, seconded by **Bourassa**. The motion passed.

1228. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2013 Midwinter Conference, Jan 26 and 28, 2013 [[Minutes from ALA Midwinter January 2013](#)]

There were no corrections or additions to the minutes as posted on the website. **Macke** moved to approve the minutes, seconded by **Kelley**. The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

1229. Report from the Chair [[Chair's report on CC:DA's motions and other actions Feb. 1-June 25, 2013](#)]

The **Chair** reported on the actions taken by CC:DA over the Internet since the last meeting, noting that there had only been one vote, to approve the report of the Task Force on Changes to the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th ed. The task force's recommendation on capitalization of hyphenated names was voted on by CC:DA and approved to be sent on to the JSC as a revision proposal. Many of the recommendations of the task force were editorial changes or changes to the text of RDA that could be made by fast track proposals and were handled by Attig. The **Chair** officially disbanded the task force, and thanked Dragon, the chair, and other members of the task force.

The **Chair** said that CC:DA faces some strict deadlines in its work after the meetings at Annual. Some proposals may not be finished, and some work may need to be continued over e-mail or the wiki. The first deadline will be July 22, to have all work finished for proposals that we are

sending to the JSC. Glennan, the new JSC rep, will then have a couple of weeks to prepare them for the JSC. All proposals are due to the JSC by early August. The next deadline for CC:DA will be September 20, for responses on other constituency proposals. We will have an opportunity to look at the proposals and make comments or recommendations, and Glennan again will have two weeks to prepare our official ALA responses to those proposals. Based on comments by Attig, we will not have quite as many constituency proposals as last year. The **Chair** asked that voting members let him know if they are going to be away from e-mail for several days at a time between now and September 20, so he will know he will not be hearing from them if a vote is called.

The **Chair** called for a motion to officially approve the vote taken over e-mail. Moved by **Rendall**, seconded by **Wolverton**. The motion passed unanimously.

1230. Report from the LC Representative: Reser [\[Library of Congress Report, June 2013\]](#)

Reser noted that he started his Midwinter report stating that he was not Barbara Tillett, and that this is one thing that has not changed in the last five months. Tom Yee is still the Acting Chief, Policy and Standards Division (PSD) and is also Acting Chief of the Asian and Middle Eastern Division. **Reser** said that Geraldine Ostrove, the PSD primary music policy specialist, retired at the end of May after 28 years with LC, so PSD was down one more person.

Reser announced that three former or current LC employees will be receiving awards at ALA. Judith Kuhagen will receive the ALCTS Margaret Mann Citation, Barbara Tillett will receive the ALCTS Ross Atkinson Lifetime Achievement Award and the LITA Frederick G. Kilgour Award, and Beacher Wiggins will receive the ALA Melvil Dewey Medal. All the award ceremonies are tomorrow, June 30, and **Reser** had listings of the times and places for anyone interested.

Reser stated that the budget for LC had been up in the air at Midwinter, and things have not gone well, but the library is operating under Continuing Resolution funding that provides a budget through the end of September 2013. LC was also hit by sequestration March 1, which resulted in a more than \$30 million cut to be concentrated in the last six months of the fiscal year. The budget for 2013 is \$5.2 million less than in fiscal 2006. As a result of the cuts, travel has been reduced, major contracts have been cancelled or reduced and there are few hires, only for critical positions and not even for all of those. There will also be three days of furlough between April 7 and September 7, 2013. **Reser** said they have no idea about the fiscal year 2014 budget and their fiscal office does not know yet what the baseline for that is, because the House and Senate cannot agree at this point. **Reser** noted it was anybody's guess if the sequestration will continue to 2014 or be increased.

There were new BIBFRAME discussion papers issued in May and June 2013, including BIBFRAME Authority, BIBFRAME Annotation Model, and BIBFRAME Resource Types. **Reser** said that if you are subscribed to the listserv, you will be getting these notices. The Update Forum is scheduled for tomorrow, June 30, at 10:30 in the Convention Center. It will be led off by Roberta Shaffer, Associate Librarian of LC, speaking about BIBFRAME in the context of other initiatives going on at LC. Eric Miller of Zepheira will speak about RDA and WEMI.

There will be some presentations by community experimenters from Colorado College and VTLS, and Jean Godby of OCLC will talk about schema.org. The plan is to have it recorded and up on the website within a month and there will be announcements on the BIBFRAME listserv when that happens.

Regarding the Library of Congress/Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements (LC-PCC PS), **Reser** reported that the first update for 2013 was published in May, due to the difficulties in the beginning of the year. There were a little over 80 statements that were released at the time, which mostly consisted of adding or adjusting for “PCC practice” in consultation with the PCC Standing Committee on Standards. The next update on July 9 will also be very large, and will mostly be related to changes to the RDA text approved by the JSC in November 2012. This will include ALA/18, on government and non-government corporate bodies. The last update of the calendar year will be Nov. 9, 2013.

Reser stated that as of April 1, all LC catalogers who do authority records are supposed to be doing them in RDA. He also said that this applies to most bibliographic records and to catalogers who had used AACR2. The catalogers who use other standards, such as DACS or AMIM, will continue to do so.

Other areas impacted by RDA changes include the LC/NACO Name Authority File. There have been a lot of phase changes as part of the PCC Acceptable Headings Implementation Task Group chaired by Gary Strawn. Phase 2 was completed at the end of March 2013. Approximately 372,000 authority records were changed as part of that effort, and redistributed to NACO nodes and CDS subscribers. These were based on running Gary Strawn’s program on the files. There are links for the details of these changes in Reser’s report. The changes left a disconnect in the catalog between fixed authority headings and unfixed headings in the bibliographic records, and they used the program to make corrections beginning on April 8, through June 10, 2013. They changed almost 669,000 of 17.8 million bibliographic records. All changed records were redistributed if they were candidates for redistribution, though many were not. Some changes that RDA caused in LCSH had to be done by hand. Policy specialists changed all the impacted LCSH records in April of this year, and these should have been redistributed by now. **Reser** noted that if you find any missed LCSH records that should be changed to conform to RDA, you can make a proposal to change them. There is a list on the website of subject headings changed by RDA. They still have not made up their minds about some abbreviations, such as ca. and some subdivisions. One of the big changes that will be seen on July 9 in RDA and the policy statements has to do with headings for fictitious and legendary characters and animals with proper names. Thanks to the British Library proposals to add some attributes for those individuals and persons, LC can move more quickly to shift them out from the subjects file to the names file. The goal is to move all these headings to the names file and to get rid of the subject authority records. The Policy Statement for 9.0 to be published July 9 will explain what to do if there is already a subject heading and what to do if starting from scratch. LC does plan to undertake a project to transition all the headings over eventually. **Reser** noted that there are between 3,000 and 4,000 records and it will not happen overnight. Since it will take time to figure out the impact on the staffing for the changes, LC is asking everyone not to jump in to help too quickly. Everyone is welcome to submit proposals, but **Reser** asked that they not submit thousands at once.

Other documentation affected by RDA include the *Subject Headings Manual* and the *Classification and Shelving Manual*. These are being reviewed for changes due to RDA. Most of the Classification and Shelving instruction sheets impacted by the changes have been revised and posted as pdf files. Both of the updates for these will come out later this summer / early fall. In November, these revisions will be incorporated into Cataloger's Desktop.

Reser stated that Bruce Johnson has provided a lot of information in the report on work done earlier in the year on ALA-LC Romanization tables. Highlights for the year include revisions to the Urdu, Pushto, and Sindhi tables; new Macedonian, Rusyn, Serbian and Tamashek tables; revisions to the Bulgarian table; and a Coptic proposal. All of the Romanization tables are available on the website and will be incorporated into Cataloger's Desktop when the next update is available.

Reser announced that the Cataloging Distribution Service (CDS) will no longer be printing any cataloging documentation. They are moving into an online-only world for cataloging documentation, where anything that is new will only come out online. They will continue to sell inventory for the current stock of publications until it is sold out, and then it will not be reprinted. This is based on consultant studies done in 2012 to help deal with a declining customer base that no longer supports the cost of the products. All documentation will continue to be in Cataloger's Desktop and Classification Web. **Reser** said that CDS is hopeful that this will give it a sustainable financial model. Beginning on July 1, there will be a lot of pdf files on the website for publications that had to be paid for in the past but will now be free. Many of these were posted last night. Older publications will take some time to be converted to pdfs, but will all be available for free as downloadable pdf files soon. The exceptions to this will be the last two print products, the RDA changes to the *Subject Headings Manual* and the *Classification and Shelving Manual*. Those update packages will be the last new print updates, and after that will be only online. **Reser** also announced he had copies of the CDS announcement related to the online-only documentation, if anyone would like to see it.

Myers asked about the implications of this for a selective repository library in terms of its items list: will these titles drop off automatically or is there some action that needs to be taken? **Reser** said he did not know but suggested that on the announcement there should be an e-mail address for CDS info at loc.gov that hopefully can give an answer.

The **Chair** announced that CC:DA has to approve the ALA Romanization tables for European languages, for the official ALA approval. Bruce Johnson has been working on several Romanization tables for European languages and we will be voting on these, probably later this summer. The Chair noted there is a 90 day public review period, and after any changes are incorporated, CC:DA puts its official stamp of approval on them. He encouraged everyone, especially if they have expertise in these areas, to make public comments to LC, and said we will have a brief CC:DA discussion of the Romanization tables before the vote.

Hillmann had several comments, including one about the end of the print era and documentation. She noted that there were two sources of authoritative information on subject headings – one is Cataloger's Desktop and the other is the pdf files. She said there is no mention of id.loc.gov. She said she thinks she knows why it is not listed as an authoritative source, because it is incomplete and no one is sure of what is there. **Hillmann** stated that more and more people are relying on id.loc.gov and do not know the limitations of what is there. This needs to

be addressed in the world of online documentation and linked data. **Hillmann** also discussed the updates to MARC relator codes. It was problematic because the old relator codes are not there and there is no versioning that she can see on the id.loc.gov platform. They are just changed with no information about how they were changed and she felt that was not adequate. She had received a complaint from Gordon Dunsire working on an analysis, and if doing that type of work you cannot just be surprised when something disappears and there is no versioning. She felt that was a critical problem that needs to be addressed and discussed, and something better needs to be done than continuing to upload files. **Hillmann** said she did not know if people think CC:DA should participate in discussions about it, but a lot of folks here may be unaware of these things and that can be kind of problematic as well.

Reser said regarding the comment on the relator terms code that he can pass along that information to the MARC Standards Office, which can make those changes.

Hillmann said the short term fix would be to put up the old file to have access to it. She said there does not seem to be any discussion to turn id.loc.gov into something that can support linked data. In its current state it cannot support linked data and that is a serious problem. **Reser** said he could pass the comments on, and stated that the CDS announcement is only about documentation supporting the creation of subject headings, not the subject headings themselves. He did say her point was well taken with id.loc.gov and subject headings, and that they do not match necessarily, but they are getting better.

Hillmann said there were two authoritative sources, one in pdf, which is not a particularly helpful format, and one behind a paywall. She said this is not a good situation for LCSH moving into the future. **Attig** noted that there were three authoritative sources, because the authority records for LCSH were still available. **Hillmann** said it would be nice to have a bigger open discussion so people can plan and know what they can rely upon. **Hillmann** also said that there was a lot of expertise at this table, and with LC losing people quickly, perhaps we can step up.

The **Chair** reported that he has taken note of the questions, and whether the issues with id.loc.gov are something that CC:DA can work on. We can continue to talk to Reser about them and will see if there is a role for us in resolving the issues.

1231. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

Attig began his report by acknowledging the appointment of Glennan as the new ALA representative to the JSC and asked attendees to offer their congratulations and support for her work as JSC rep. **Attig** noted it will be her responsibility to carry future proposals or discussion papers approved by CC:DA to the JSC. He said that Glennan will be active in discussions in Chicago Making sure she understands what we are trying to accomplish and the rationale for our proposals is important, and that she understands what needs to be done with the documents under discussion. Glennan will also be setting a work schedule for CC:DA actions over the next few months with the Chair, and this will depend on how much is accomplished during the meeting. They are hoping that we can get proposals approved during this meeting and prioritize how much discussion and work is needed for the rest.

Attig said he has agreed to serve as Glennan's backup as JSC rep. and will continue to post messages, participate in e-mail discussions, and comment on the wiki, and will also be preparing some documents for submission to the JSC. He is also planning to go to the meeting in November and write his blog, as he has for previous meetings. **Attig** noted that Judy Kuhagen said when she started on minutes from November, she was glad to have his notes in addition to her notes in interpreting what was happening.

Attig continued with the JSC updates since Midwinter. At that meeting Troy Linker had announced the modifications to the Toolkit release schedule for 2013. There was no release in February, but there was one in May that included French and German translations and many chapters from the rewording project. As usual, there were a number of fast track changes. The next release will be July 9, and will include all revisions approved at the JSC's November meeting and some further fast track proposals. There will be no release in September, with the next release to be in November, which will allow for additional fast track proposals. The deadline for those is early in September, so **Attig** said if anyone has any ideas, to let Glennan know.

Fast track changes released in May included resolutions of inconsistencies or the provision of missing instructions. A number of these were the result of some observations from German and French translators. Changes also included the correction of some examples. A lot of it was formatting but some substantive changes were made to examples, the addition of changes to relationship designators, and addition of terms and definitions to the glossary for terms in RDA controlled vocabularies.

For the July release, **Attig** submitted all fast track proposals that could be prepared by the deadline but there is a backlog of some issues still pending. These include issues with inconsistencies, missing instructions, correction of examples, and relationship designators. **Attig** noted that the JSC has been consistently adding to relationship designators in all three appendices but realized that the appendices were not complete and that some things were missing when published. They are pleased that people are interested and anxious to use relationship designators and have made a number of additional suggestions, and the JSC is trying to move the new designators through as quickly as possible.

The report of the Chicago Manual of Style task force that was approved by CC:DA has been submitted to the JSC as 6JSC/ALA/22, along with the changes to the editor's guide and fast track changes included in the task force report. The JSC has started collecting information on what proposals constituencies plan on submitting for November and **Attig** noted there is a much lighter agenda than last year's record number of proposals. Most of the constituencies have stated their intentions, including ALA. One item on the to-do list concerns the abbreviation of place names used as qualifiers. The British Library has indicated plans to submit a proposal on abbreviations and other differences between the authorized form of the place name and the form of it used in qualifiers, in order to make the two forms consistent.

Glennan reported that one thing that strikes her about what the JSC is considering, which is a little more focused than in the past, is the distinction between discussion papers and proposals. She is looking to CC:DA for support and understanding in how to respond to the possible discussion papers that will be submitted, which may include one from the Deutsche

Nationalbibliothek on first issue versus latest issue entry for serials, a Deutsche Nationalbibliothek proposal relating to parts of the Bible, and follow ups by EURIG on last year's discussion papers. There are different levels of CC:DA participation possible. **Glennan** said our response is stronger with more people looking at and commenting on proposals. You do not have to be a voting member, as liaisons have access to the wiki, so everyone please contribute. If you stick your neck out and people step on it, it hurts a little but it is important to see all sides of the position and we need a strong response. **Glennan** said she will bring the music perspective, but we need all perspectives. She stressed that everyone's voice is very important in this process.

Attig said we should be receiving all these proposals in the last week or two before the August 5 deadline. We will add the proposals to the wiki when the JSC receives them, and the wiki will be open for discussion. He also asked everyone to please contribute. **Attig** asked if there were any questions or anything he needed to clarify.

The **Chair** asked about relationship designators being added to RDA. While he knows they are being done as fast track proposals, do they need to come through CC:DA or are there other mechanisms for those to be suggested to the JSC? **Attig** replied not as a group. We had agreed that proposals from the ALA constituency in general would go directly to him and he would contribute them to the fast track process. Commenting on proposals from other groups, he will consult as needed. Typically the issues are not that difficult. Glennan will have to work out her pattern of consultation of issues, but no formal action is required by the committee to put forward a fast track proposal or to respond to one.

Glennan said that it was true for all fast track proposals and not just relationship designators. She asked the committee to please let her know if they have something that might be good as a fast track proposal, noting that fast track proposals can be submitted to the JSC at almost any time. She has had discussion with the PCC, encouraging them not to sit on proposals until the deadline or until they have the perfect list. **Glennan** said that others may see the same problems and may get in line before you but with a different solution. There is only so much energy we can devote to this and it is better to let her know when you have something in mind, so we can cut down communication and duplication efforts and keep things moving.

The **Chair** asked if there were any other questions. Everett **Allgood** from the audience asked Attig if there was a place to go to see relationship designators that might be in the pipeline before replicating suggestions. **Attig** replied no, but said there is a list Glennan has access to and that she can check when information gets to her.

1232. Proposal on variant title as access point (RDA 6:27.4.1): Attig [[Variant title as access point \(RDA 6.27.4.1\)](#)]

Attig reported that at midwinter, Deborah Fritz raised a number of issues for discussion related to things she discovered in making RIMMF (RDA in Many Metadata Formats) effective in creating records for various RDA entities. A number of these were turned into fast track proposals and some others were jointly decided to be application profile issues that did not need to be part of RDA instructions. There are, however, some issues they felt warranted actual

revisions to RDA, and **Attig** is presenting two proposals, this one and another on color content that will be discussed on Monday morning. This proposal has to do with the fact that the instructions for constructing variant access points representing works in RDA 6.27.4 currently say to construct a variant access point for the preferred title of a work on its own, and to construct a variant access point, when the work has a creator, based on the creator plus the variant title. However, there is no instruction to construct a variant access point based on a variant title on its own. This is a missing variation and Fritz is interested in it because if she has this, she can program RIMMF to create several variant access points, without needing to retype the information. This proposal adds a paragraph to the instructions that says to construct a variant access point using the variant title for the work on its own. The proposal includes examples, and parallels the existing instructions on constructing variant access points.

Maxwell commented on the order of the instructions, and questioned the order of the two paragraphs. **Attig** responded that they did play with this and discuss it. There are actually three variant access points: the first is author-title based on variant title, and to him the next would be to deal with the variant title, and next deal with the preferred title. **Maxwell** noted that he thought that was probably why it was done that way. **Attig** asked if there was general agreement to deal with preferred title first. The **Chair** said he was hearing some mumblings, yes. **Attig** said he would make a note on that.

Tarango noted that in practice in MARC we do not do this. We provide 1XX and code 245 to generate access points and provide 246s for variant titles. We do not ever provide actual author-title variants in the MARC bibliographic environment. **Tarango** asked if this would apply to both authorities and bibliographic records. **Reser** noted that if it were for bibliographic records, it would be in Chapter 2, variant title instructions, and this is just for Chapter 6.

Reser questioned **Attig** why he did this for the general instructions but did not propose the same changes for the variant access point for legal works, religious works, and official communications. Were there any reasons for this? **Attig** noted that it was inadvertent.

Reser continued that the equivalent music instruction is also different, and we might look at whether all five should be more consistent. He also asked whether **Attig** had considered submitting this as a fast track change rather than a proposal. **Attig** replied that he had not seriously considered this because the proposal involves adding an instruction that was not already there and could not be done as a fast track, and especially given what **Reser** just said, we need to look at this in a more formal way.

Kelley noted that with the Solzhenitsyn example the authorized access point and variant access point are the same. The **Chair** stated that he had the same question, and mentioned over e-mail that it looks like the variant access point should have Cyrillic script but Roman script was repeated twice. **Attig** replied that he thought it was probably an editorial error.

The Chair asked if there was anything else people want to comment on about this proposal. He noted that he thought it may not be in a form for voting. **Attig** asked if we would prefer to see text for the additional rules affected by this before voting on it, or is it enough that we have agreed we are going to deal with those. The **Chair** said he saw one nod for seeing the text before voting, and asked for any other opinions.

Glennan brought up the JSC's RDA Music Joint Working Group. If we are just looking at all special types of works beside music it might not be critical for the working group to be involved, but if we consider music the group will probably have to look at any proposals. **Snyder** asked if it will go through CC:DA. **Glennan** replied yes, because it is an umbrella proposal. She explained that the way the charge of the working group is written it looks like all music proposals have to come from that group, as an attempt to have discussion among experts before sending it out for generalist review. With something that is part of the general instructions in Chapter 6 we can probably tackle it and the working group can then comment on it if it thinks we were off base.

Maxwell asked why we think this is necessary since we have been creating these records many years and never had this kind of variant. He noted that the only place we have ever done this is in series authority records. **Maxwell** added that the system can index the title without having it in a separate field and asked why we need to add this mechanical thing into the rule and why do we feel we need this. **Fritz** responded that what brought her to think of this is that there is an instruction for variant title for preferred title, and it was felt there was a need for that in RDA. Then they would also need variant title on its own. She explained that in MARC, we do have separate subfields which you can use to instruct the system to index anything after title. Without the split in MARC, you just have a string, and there will be no way to tell the system where the title begins. If we leave the authorized access world and access points something created on the fly from variant title and preferred title, then this is a moot point anyway. While we are still in this environment, though, there is an inconsistency. **Maxwell** agreed the main thing is the inconsistency. **Fritz** said that right now it is the authorized access point that is composed of those two fields. It is mainly just making what is inconsistent consistent, and you need to either take off the preferred title or add the variant title as an additional access point. While trying to explain the reasoning of why that title needs to be indexed separately, she proposed this. She noted that we have had inconsistencies with serials forever. **Maxwell** agreed it was hard to explain and he did not know why we did it with series either. **Fritz** added that many systems never indexed subfield "t" because it never occurred to them. She felt it was much better to make things explicit.

The **Chair** expressed thanks to Maxwell for bringing up a critical question and said that we want to make sure CC:DA agrees with this proposal before going ahead. He would like to hear some other discussion and at the very least take a straw poll, especially if this is going to involve a lot of extra work and to make sure that people agree with this. **Attig** added that we do want to make sure this is something we want to consider, especially if it needs extra work for the additional rules and examples.

Walsh said that the OCLC macro for authority name title records already populates this variant access point in the 430 automatically.

Tarango said he agreed with Maxwell and questioned whether this is a problem that needs correcting. **Maxwell** said that none of these are required, and he has the impression that preferred title was written into the rules because it can be done. He expressed concern about making it sound like it is required, as OCLC is putting it into the macro. **Maxwell** said he realizes it is not going to be core but is concerned it may wind up being treated as core. **Attig** believes that without this instruction, if you put in this variant access point you are wrong, because there is

nothing that authorizes you to do so. **Maxwell** said that we have been informed we can do almost anything with variant access points.

Reser pointed out that it was not in this proposal, but at the bottom of the second page of the instruction it says you may make any other variant access points necessary. **Glennan** agreed, that the last paragraph says to construct additional access points considered important for access. She said by including this particular variant we are calling out one of those cases you might want to consider. It is not core, as none of these variant access points are core. **Glennan** also stated that while there are reports of this happening, she has not yet seen such a variant access point generated as a 430 in a macro in OCLC. She added that this falls under cataloger judgment and by proposing it we are just saying it is just something to think about.

The **Chair** called for a straw poll, and asked for those who agree with the proposal and would like us to keep working on it to vote yes, and for those who do not think it is necessary and do not want to see it put into RDA to vote no. The results of the straw poll were 21 yes and 15 no votes. The **Chair** announced that we will go ahead with this, but we will not vote on it yet due to the extra work needing to be done on it. There will be another CC:DA vote on this over e-mail.

Glennan noted that she was worried about extending this in the area of special instructions and examples, and would be happy to receive examples in religion, law, and official communications. This is not her area of expertise, and she would like some help, if we have to approve this by July 22. **Attig** said if possible we can use what is already there, and see what we can put together.

Meyers asked about the expected proposal from the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek regarding Bible headings and said that specialized instructions may become more complicated than anticipated. **Glennan** replied that the German proposal concerns RDA 6.23.2.9.2, parts of the Bible, and may be submitted to the JSC by August 5. **Attig** noted that it was not the rule for access points, but the rule on preferred title for parts. **Meyers** wanted to confirm that the text we would be working with was more general than that and wanted to make sure we are not getting into a quagmire. **Hostage** commented that the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek is proposing changes to where RDA calls for using the Authorized Version of the Bible to create names of books. Its proposal had some discussion about entering parts of Bible books directly under their own names, but he was not sure if that is what is going forward. **Maxwell** noted that there are quite a few more instructions than Reser mentioned that may be affected, especially regarding the Bible, and there are possibly many other places in the instructions that need to be looked at and revised. **Attig** said we will see how finite it is and if it is too much he will report back.

The **Chair** introduced one item not on the agenda, noting that CC:DA likes to acknowledge special service. On the occasion of Attig stepping down as JSC rep, the **Chair** introduced a proposal prepared by Rendall and Bourassa honoring Attig for his service to CC:DA. The proposal commended Attig for his work and many accomplishments on behalf of CC:DA. The **Chair** called for a second to the resolution. Seconded by **Wolverton**. The **Chair** then proposed that the motion be accepted by acclamation, which was followed by a round of applause and a standing ovation. **Attig** said it has been a great group to work with and noted that together we have done some really good work. He thanked the committee and said he is proud to have been part of it. The **Chair** thanked Rendall and Bourassa for their work on the proposal, and Myers for helping to shape how the motion would go.

1233. Report from the TF on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K: Lipcan [\[Task Force Report and Appendix K Revision Proposal\]](#)

Lipcan began his report by thanking members of the task force, Attig for reformatting the proposal, Glennan for adding some terms, and those that commented on the proposal on the wiki. He said he would like to address the comments on the wiki first before opening up discussion to the rest of the committee. **Lipcan** reported that some typos were noted and will be fixed, including under CC:DA recommendation No. 2, where the wording should use gender specific terms for each of the currently gender neutral terms. Attig left comments about formulating examples throughout the proposal and making them consistent with the rest of RDA, which will be taken care of. **Lipcan** brought up part of Section K.1, the brief paragraph before the first relationship designator “associated with,” on page 3, where it says how some relationships are not specific to persons, families, or corporate bodies, and can be used in more than one section. The task force made a point of putting them here rather than repeating them so they could have a list of widely applicable ones here.

Glennan said that she may have made this comment on the wiki, but wanted to know if we think this is good idea. And if so, what allows a term to go on this list and not a more specific list? She asked whether we want to go through rest of the comments first. **Lipcan** said we may as well talk about it now. **Glennan** said it was her understanding that if using the same term for more than one group 2 entity you need a qualifier to separate them, so you cannot, for instance, use donor under each one by itself without a parenthetical qualifier. She said she would like to see some sort of principle for what causes a term to come into this part of the list rather than having a qualifier by itself in the lower part of the list. **Lipcan** asked if it is understood that qualifiers will be used. **Attig** replied that it is our understanding that each concept must be unique within a particular vocabulary. He said the question is whether this appendix is a single vocabulary or the subsection is a separate vocabulary. **Attig** stated that it is better to consider the appendix as a whole as one vocabulary and if you use the same term in more than one subcategory, you must somehow distinguish it. He added that alternatively, we could adopt a principle that if it applies to more than one, to put it in the general list. **Attig** noted that if that was our principle, we could avoid the whole issue. **Lipcan** replied that he would prefer to avoid that issue.

Attig stated that the general list is going to be problematic, and is the most structurally problematic part of this proposal. He added that you can have some sort of principle to tell you how to do this, and one of the ways is to say if it appears in more than one list to put it in the general list. **Lipcan** said he thought that was the operating assumption. **Attig** said that there were some exceptions that did not do that. **Lipcan** noted that some were missed.

Maxwell questioned why we feel it is necessary to distinguish them. He can see why we have a qualifier for group 1 entities that will make a difference if we separate things out so we know which entity it is related to. In this case, though, if the relationship designator is attached to a corporate body, we know it is attached to a corporate body, and he did not see the utility of adding a qualifier saying this is used for a corporate body. He would prefer to be able to use “event organizer” without any kind of qualifier, and he does not see why we cannot do that. **Glennan** asked if this is what this proposal does now and **Maxwell** responded yes. **Attig**

explained that the proposal does so by putting terms in a general category, not specific to one group 2 entity.

Glennan asked what the advantages and disadvantages would be to putting qualifiers where they would occur, noting that these terms have to be disambiguated if they appear under more than one entity. This is the part of the proposal that needs JSC discussion, to determine if it is necessary to separate these terms. She noted that our data model calls for qualifying them if there is not a general section. **Maxwell** responded that they do not need to be qualified because it will always be evident from the context, that it will be attached to a personal, family or corporate body name. **Attig** stated that in his understanding the expectation is that the relationships are self-defining in such a way that it does not depend on your looking at what is at either end of the relationship. He asked Hillmann if that was correct and if she wanted to expand. **Hillmann** said she thought the operative issue is looking at these problems from the point of view of how a machine can use them. Humans make associations and do not have to worry about exclusiveness in a lot of situations, but that is not true with machines which are very dumb and reliable. **Maxwell** added that he was not thinking about humans needing to do this. He said he was thinking that IBM is coded as a corporate body and presumably a machine would know from the code that it is a corporate body.

The **Chair** stated that the sticking point is if we call this list one vocabulary, then each term has to be unique and cannot appear multiple times in the same vocabulary. He noted that if we put “donor” in all three sections, we would need to qualify it. As a practical thing, he asked Maxwell if he would prefer to have it in a separate section, so that qualifiers are not needed. **Maxwell** said yes.

Hillmann commented that she thought a separate category that is unqualified fitting into a vocabulary that has qualification is a bit problematic. For one thing, she noted that in RDA vocabularies there are unqualified terms intended to be used in a more generalized sense where there is no need to associate them with a particular usage. It makes it difficult to see how that would work because it throws things into the air that she did not recall having been discussed. We need to think about what we want this to do and if we want this to be used more generally and not just within traditional libraries. We are no longer, she hopes, in the library silo but trying to move beyond it.

Sprochi suggested changing the terminology, such as “donor person,” “individual donor,” and “corporate donor.” **Attig** noted that there was some of that and it is one way of disambiguating the terms. **Hillmann** asked if this is only ambiguous in some situations. Trying to think about this as a machine does, if you are doing this as a triple, the ideal thing is to have three URIs. The first URI is the subject, then you have the middle part telling you what the relationship is, and the third part telling you what the object is. She said there is no need for, and did not understand how, you would use the extra stuff that is being proposed here in that context. **Attig** asked what extra stuff she was referring to. **Hillmann** said having qualified and unqualified terms in the same vocabulary seemed like an over-specification that she does not understand.

The **Chair** commented that he did not understand because it seemed before that Hillmann did not like the general section not attached to person, family, or corporate body.

Tarango said in referring to the triple, and like Maxwell had said, if you have a corporate body URI and a donor, it does not really matter that it is a corporate body because the nature of relationship is already defined. **Hillmann** said that it works the same as with a role with any person, corporate body or family, as we know they all can be donors. She said the problem is where there are specifics where that does not apply. **Attig** stated that he thought he could see what Hillmann is saying and what we could do is have a single list with all these terms. He said what he thought we were trying to do is have some categories we can break out and make the list easier to deal with by breaking them out. He noted that all we are doing is singling out certain things, but on the other hand there are some that are generally applicable. He said he is becoming more comfortable with this, that we are not reading too much into more specific categories, and that it is simply a breakdown of terms.

Hillmann said she thought the complications came from the fact that we are still thinking of this stuff of relationship as both an element set vocabulary and an attribute-type vocabulary and that makes things tougher when we try to think about how it actually works. **Myers** brought up the idea of triples from Hillmann, and questioned if the key is in considering a degree of specificity of a relationship or in this case relationship designators. He asked if there is a functional need to limit the inputs and outputs or ranges of parties on each side of a relationship, and if so, then we do need that specificity when we develop the relators. If not, then we can suffice make do with the general terms. **Roeder** commented that he just sees this list organized in a way to help the poor humans. The **Chair** agreed that is what he saw as well. **Attig** noted that we tried to read too much into it.

The **Chair** summarized by saying that the sections of this document are not meant to say anything about the terms. They are just meant to help catalogers who have a family that they are cataloging and need to easily see relevant terms they can use.

Reser said that it may need to be stated more clearly in the introduction, because the same thing is not really true with Appendix I. He noted that the type 1 entity is really important and there are not free-floaters in that respect. He also commented that there are a number of terms that are not in the general section but are in more than one of the other sections. He explained that how they differ is the reciprocal; for example, “teacher” is reciprocal to “student” but in a different section it is a reciprocal to the institution at which a teacher teaches. **Reser** questioned from a machine perspective, how does that work out or do we not expect machines to make the reciprocal. He said he was not sure that computers would know which way to go. **Hillmann** thought it depends on how you are expressing this. If you are using traditional RDF, you have an explicit reciprocal: “is teacher of” or “is teacher at.” You would distinguish those because they are different kinds of relationships. The fact that someone is a teacher is one fact but you want to be more specific if talking about the relationship as part of their role as teacher. Right now we are not doing that in current RDA vocabularies, but there are some suggestions that those should be more specific. **Attig** reported that in Appendix J, for vocabularies as they appear in the Toolkit, we have identified reciprocals in every case. They may not be coded at this point, but that we were advised to identify them. **Hillmann** said that if you are expressing them as an OWL ontology, you would have them encoded there as reciprocals.

Lipcan commented that we do have some of these relationship designators written that way, e.g. “teacher at” and “teacher of.” He suggested that we could eliminate the general section and take

those terms and populate them into each subsection, so that we have effectively a navigational aid with a complete set of terms for each type of relationship, i.e., person to person, person to family, corporate body to person, and the reciprocals of those. Someone looking would see the entire set and not have to cross reference the general section or look at the family to person section, and be confused by the lack of a particular term. We are not saying there is a unique set of terms in each section. **Glennan** asked if this means posting the same definitions in multiple places – i.e., “a person, family, or corporate body ...” or in the family section it just says “a family...” **Attig**, however, said that then you have different relationships. **Glennan** agreed and said then you have to disambiguate the terms. She said it is definitely better and could see the point from the user standpoint – “I have a family and I just want the family terms.” Part of the problem is that we are structuring this as readable text, and not real data that we can sort on.

Macke noted the benefit for validation of having separate sections, so that for example a corporate body could not be called a godfather if that term does not appear in the corporate body section.

Sprochi noted that we have to decide if we are making rules or giving a list. **Hillmann** added, or providing terminology or vocabulary, because you have different requirements there. If you are aggregating it for human documentation, the requirements are different than if you are trying to create a vocabulary and making it possible for machines to read and validate.

Attig said he thought we needed some direction on this before we leave it. He asked if we can do a straw poll on whether to retain the general section or break the terms up. The **Chair** called for a straw poll, with yes votes meaning a separate section at the beginning for the general terms. There were 16 yes votes. The **Chair** then asked for no votes meaning no separate section for general terms. **Hillmann** stated that is not the same thing. She commented that we are still not separating the issue of building a vocabulary for terminology or building the documentation for humans. The **Chair** then canceled the straw poll.

Hillmann said that you can arrange the terms any way you want for human use. **Attig** replied that as far as he is concerned, the question we want to have answered is how we want to arrange them in this document. **Hillmann** said if you are going to arrange them for human use, and if you have a separate general list, that is the worst of both worlds. You still have a place where there are all the terms that can be used within families, but they are in two different places, and to her the question is wrong.

Dragon asked if it would be possible to reformat this as a table and have the terms and say what could be used for persons and corporate bodies, etc. **Attig** responded that we could do all sorts of things and there are a number of documents that would be useful, including an alphabetical list of all terms in a single list. He stated that this parallels the way we have documented other appendices of relationship designators and while we might make suggestions of other ways to present this, he suggested that we follow this format.

Hillmann expressed her concerns that in terms of validation and creating vocabulary that is explicit about the context in which something can be used, it might be worthwhile to mock up how that would work as well as what it would look like to human beings. **Attig** said he would hope that sort of analysis happens as the proposal goes forward but he was not sure we have the opportunity to do that as part of the proposal. One of the reasons that this section of RDA has

been so difficult is because the issues that Hillmann raises have not been worked through and the JSC did not have the right expertise to do it. These are issues that need to be looked at, but what it comes down to is to know how we want the document to look and how to arrange it to provide the best guidance for catalogers. **Attig** asked if that was a fair working hypothesis for what we want to do in the medium term. **Lipcan** said that he thought we were working all along under the idea that it is for human use and not to establish a set of unique vocabulary terms. **Glennan** stated that it has to be for both. **Attig** agreed.

Hillmann noted that there was one more complication here. She said even if you are building a vocabulary within a registry, it will still have human and machine versions of the information. If the analysis has not been done, in terms of what are the restrictions of the particular terms, there will be a problem of uniqueness, and an html page that does not make the distinction.

The **Chair** stated that we cannot spend any more time on this issue, and asked **Attig** if he wanted to go ahead with a straw poll on display and editing.

Attig questioned where we stand now. **Glennan** said she could not see how to move forward based on this discussion. She commented that if we cannot discuss this further and come up with marching directions, then it does not go anywhere.

Myers asked if it was accurate to say we agree there are relationship designators that are general in character and asked if the reason why this is not fast tracked, is because we are proposing introducing an entire section of general relationship designators. He asked if we are still on board with proposing relationship designators that are general in nature. The **Chair** replied that he did not think the charge of the task force was to come up with a list of designators that are general in nature.

Attig explained that what has happened in developing a list of designators, is that it was noticed that many are not limited to a particular corporate body or person to person relationship but can apply to more than one category, if not generally to all categories. He said that one proposed solution is to break these out into a generalized vocabulary. Another solution, he said, was to duplicate the terms wherever they are appropriate. That is essentially where we are right now. The **Chair** noted that what **Attig** said is a display and editing issue, and is not tackling the case of whether this is a vocabulary.

Myers questioned the approach we have taken in submitting this as a revision proposal. Can it be a fast track issue? He questioned how big an issue this is. **Attig** responded that it was a rather large one. If **Glennan** is correct, then we do not have a way forward here. He noted what we would end up doing is taking the individual terms that seem to be valid and do not raise problems and put them forward as fast track proposals. The main reason the proposal is problematic is because of its extent and that the undeveloped vocabulary is now a big and unwieldy one. **Attig** asked what we want to do with this.

Roeder suggested sending it forward without the general section and leaving that for another day. **Maxwell** replied that those are the most important terms. **Glennan** said she was willing to do that but said the terms in the general section need to be in their respective individual sections because of the need for those relationship designators. If that is the direction CC:DA wants to go, we would disambiguate those and put them in. Having been a back-up on the JSC she has seen

that there is a lot of interest in the community as a whole in relationship designators, and in more and more specific relationship designators. If we pull out a number of these Group 2 entities because they are too hard to deal with, then those are probably the ones that people want the most.

Maxwell has a question about what Hillmann said, and asked why the arrangement means we do or do not need to disambiguate terms. It should depend on what kind of relationship it is, and not on where it appears in the list. **Attig** noted it was true as long as wherever a particular term appears, if the reciprocal and definition are identical in all cases. He said that he is seeing that it is not the case. **Maxwell** noted that it was for these terms though. **Attig** said that if that is true, that is fine. **Maxwell** asked for an example where it is not the case.

Hillmann said that it was a pretty general RDA thing, where that kind of specific restriction has made a lot of that stuff problematic. She said it was easy to provide definitions for the constraining ones, because they were constrained in the definition, but harder to do the general ones because the definitions are not constrained. She said she thought if you are going to stick with the same definition in all cases, then the general ones are the simpler ones and the problem becomes ones that are specific to certain kinds of relationships between certain kinds of entities, and those are going to need both a general and a specific definition.

Glennan commented that one way to move forward with the terms we have identified as general that have broad definitions and broad reciprocals is to repeat those terms. We can explain to the JSC that is what we have done with terms that are general, that the terms will appear multiple times – when you get to the section on corporate bodies do not be surprised if you see a term that you saw for persons as well. We could, between now and July 22, look at the particular definitions that were brought up on the wiki as problematic and possibly applicable to more than one Group 2 entity and see if reciprocals are available and can be generalized or not. **Glennan** asked if that sounds like a reasonable approach to the problem. Several people voiced agreement. **Attig** noted that with any given term if we run into difficulties, we can hold it back, get it right, and submit it as a fast track proposal later on, but we could get the bulk of these things in. **Hillmann** said she would be happy to work in trying to clarify what the issues are in ways that would be useful.

The **Chair** thanked Glennan and said it sounds like a good solution. He noted he was hearing support for that in the room. He asked Lipcan what other issues he needed us to deal with.

Lipcan asked how much time he had. The **Chair** said that the general consensus is that we want to move on with this and told Lipcan to take the time that he needed and we will deal with it.

Attig remarked that when it gets down to specific terms it might be more effectively dealt with by discussion on the wiki.

Lipcan referred to a comment left by Attig regarding references to separate sections: if, when the reciprocal is on a different list, we should add a reference. He said he thought the answer is no, at least for each term. Perhaps we should have references at the top of each section, like at the top of the section on persons to corporate bodies we should say to see also the section on corporate bodies to persons, instead of adding a reference to every term. **Attig** noted it was just a comment. **Lipcan** said maybe we can work that out on the wiki.

Lipcan also mentioned K.4, about relating architects and architectural firms to buildings. He agrees with Schiff that there are some access points, especially museums, where the access point represents both the corporate body and the building. Having the relationship between the architect and the “corporate body” is something we want to have a place for. He gave as an example Frank Gehry and the Museo Guggenheim Bilbao. The Bilbao is both a corporate body and at the same time a building.

Glennan commented that it was a real problem, a data modeling problem. It is an American practice that we treat things as corporate bodies and geographical locations, and that may not apply to an international group. She stated that the JSC may have to approve this. The museum as building and the museum as corporate body are different entities and we should not have same character string or authority record referring to both.

Attig noted that this is actually a U.S. subject cataloging practice, and that we would do well to postpone it until we can deal more fully with subject relationships. **Lipcan** asked if Attig was suggesting that we remove these relationships. **Attig** confirmed yes.

Reser discussed whether we have the same issue with some of the things that relate place to place, like capital to country, and if that was actually an Appendix L issue. **Attig** said he raised that question on the wiki, and said it seemed to him that if it was really jurisdiction to jurisdiction, then this is the appropriate place for it. He said the country of which a place is a capital is a jurisdiction, but he was not sure it works the other way, whether the relationship to the capital is to the jurisdiction. **Lipcan** suggested that it is the same issue as the museum, in a way. **Attig** confirmed that it was a tricky one, but thought it was less clear to him than the architecture case.

Lipcan mentioned that Maxwell brought up in an e-mail to the task force the question of families that have changed names and the fact that the ancestor-descendant relationship designator was not quite correct. **Maxwell** suggested that it could be discussed on the wiki, and he could find the record in question. The **Chair** agreed that it seemed like a question about a specific term. The **Chair** asked if there were any other general issues relating to the proposal that we need to discuss.

Reser brought up the “is or was” issue. There is only one definition of “leader” with both “leads” and “led” – and yet really all designators can refer to the past or the present. Whether someone is currently a student or was, the same relationship designator should be used. Can that just be taken care of generically at the beginning to say that these are for both past and current relationships? Some terms, like those that include the word “former,” specifically define time periods, but others do not. The **Chair** suggested that we could use a fictitious present tense for everything, and the time frame will be implicit, but we should be consistent. **Lipcan** asked if he wanted that integrated into the proposal. The **Chair** suggested not specifically calling it out but just using the present tense for everything. **Hillmann** noted the problems of maintaining it otherwise. The **Chair** suggested looking at where the past tense has been used, like leads or led, and get rid of the past tense. **Maxwell** said he thought it needed to be made explicit that we use the present tense when we mean anytime. He has talked to people who want to change an authority record because someone is no longer an employee of a company. The **Chair** concurred. **Attig** added possibly also the assumption that unless otherwise stated, because there are a few of them that are very definitely past tense, such as “former ...” or “descendants.”

Reser said the second issue he had is whether some of these are too generic, if looking at everything on this list as a hierarchy. You are only using this list if you want to indicate a specific type of relationship, not the generic one because the generic one is already inherent. There are a lot of other issues with individual terms where one term is used to define another, like partner, but the really high-level ones bother him. The **Chair** asked if he could make a list of those and add them to the wiki. **Attig** noted if you want to do it now, fine, but you will always have the opportunity to do it for the LC response.

Maxwell commented that he appreciates the high-level ones, especially in reference to triples, where you need to have something to stick in there.

Tarango noted that in the use of prepositions there are some inconsistencies and that some do not make sense, and suggested a policy be set to guide when to or not to use prepositions. The **Chair** said that we talked about prepositions at a previous meeting, and said he was not sure if Lipcan had any language from that discussion that could be added to the introduction. **Lipcan** responded that he thought the policy is to use the prepositions that are in the relationship designator – e.g., “influenced by” or “named for” – and that they were asked to include prepositions where appropriate. The **Chair** said that was maybe another editing issue and asked Tarango to point out examples where the preposition does not make sense.

Attig, just to clarify next steps, asked Lipcan if he was going to do an edited version with all the things that he has noted as needing to be done. **Lipcan** replied yes, if he understands what needs to be done. The **Chair** commented that the big thing is adding the general terms at each section. **Lipcan** agreed yes, with the generic definition. **Attig** mentioned other editorial changes including changes to the introductory material. **Lipcan** summarized the changes to include: stating more explicitly in the introduction that the sections are a navigational aid for humans; that we are using the present tense but the terms can be used for past relationships; and changing the examples. **Glennan** added removing architect/building terms at this time. **Lipcan** also noted the specific terms on the wiki. **Attig** said he thought that, rather than waiting for the wiki discussion to be completed for the rest of the editorial work, the sooner we can have it the better. **Lipcan** noted that we have been working a long time and that people have been asking about it. **Attig** said that would be great.

The **Chair** said he would like to recommend that our wiki discussion now be about specific examples. That is the level of detail we now need, and said he was going to close the discussion on the general issues. The **Chair** stated that we know what we want to do, and we want to move forward with this, and this is what we are going to get done by July 22.

Lipcan thanked everyone for their input. The **Chair** thanked the task force for a lot of hard work.

1234. Report from the TF on Instructions on Recording Relationships: Putnam [[TF on Instructions for Recording Relationships: Final Report \(May 2013\)](#)]

Putnam thanked the task force members, Attig for his assistance, people who participated in the straw man poll in April, and those who added comments to questions on the wiki. **Putnam** reported that after the straw man poll in April, the task force took those comments to heart and tried to include more examples in the documentation. He noted that a lot were music related, and

that if someone included an example in their his/her comments it was included in the final straw man poll. The task force was then left with coming up with actual instructions based on examples added in the poll, and there they it ran into some problems. Some minor issues were agreed upon or discussed briefly, such as using the appropriate RDA relationship designators from Appendix J, noting most were already in there but were missing qualifiers for work, expression, manifestation, or item. Another minor issue was the incorporation of additional examples. **Putnam** said there were two remaining issues that the task force stumbled upon, with one being more within its scope than the other. One of these was the discussion of the appropriate number of elements to include within the relationship description and appropriateness or feasibility of including specifically manifestation level elements when recording relationships at the work or expression level. The task force felt that issue really needs to be discussed, along with the use of including non-ISBD punctuation within the examples. **Putnam** said that the current examples of contents notes are all using ISBD punctuation, and that Polutta added some examples to show what it would look like in a non-ISBD environment. That is where the task force stands at the moment.

The **Chair** asked Attig to share his ideas about what we need to do with this. **Attig** commented that he felt the two items pointed out about the examples were in fact editorial policies for examples in RDA. Giving the relationship designators without qualifiers was consistently done throughout that section of RDA as a matter of policy. If we add qualifiers in one section we would have to add them everywhere, which goes beyond the scope of this task force. He thinks that it is stated somewhere, perhaps chapter 0, that ISBD punctuation is used in examples that show more than one element. That does not mean that it is not a good idea to show more variety, but it does mean questioning something that RDA was trying to do consistently. **Attig** continued that if this were any other time but right before deadline for JSC, we could have a general discussion about this and get some advice about moving forward. The fundamental question we need to address quickly is whether anything from this group will go forward to the JSC as a discussion paper. If not, then we can have a general discussion, but if it is, we need to figure out how to make that happen. **Attig** stated that he wanted to submit something from this task force because it is one of ALA's major initiatives and it would be nice to give the JSC a progress report and get a sense from it on some of the major issues, including the point that when describing a work relationship you should use work attributes. There is nothing inherent in RDA to make that happen and that was not the practice in most examples in the text, which is why we are still working through examples. But it is a high-level idea worthy of discussion. On the other hand, in order to have that discussion we would need some sort of meaningful document, which means some form of a straw man proposal. But he is not sure if we have enough time to do something that is not confusing, i.e., with a lot of examples that do not follow the practice that we are proposing to recommend. The question now is whether we can revise that proposal to the extent that it will be a meaningful basis for discussion by the JSC.

Polutta asked Attig to clarify what he meant by examples: by taking out all work examples, taking out all non-work elements? **Attig** replied yes. **Polutta** noted that it would just be a lot of deletions, which is not hard to do. For her, the difficulty is because it is all within the ISBD structure, and it will rip the heart out of that punctuation structure because the ISBD does not follow work element order. **Attig** noted that in fact work element is pretty much irrelevant to the ISBD. **Attig** said that one choice is to simply delete examples we have not had the opportunity to update, and hopefully there will still be enough to provide the basis for discussion. **Snyder**

suggested we submit it without examples to give the JSC the proposed layout if we do not have time to clean up examples.

Glennan said that while she thought it was a good idea to break these down by categories for the chapter they are in, she did not understand how to do a structured description of a work or expression. An authorized access point is sort of a structured description, but chapter 25 is broken down already into the section on structured descriptions and a section on authorized access points, so they are two different things. However, there is no way that an authorized access point is not structured. **Attig** added that that is not what RDA means by structured description, and **Glennan** agreed. She wonders if this discussion paper goes forward whether we should say that for this whole section there are no examples because it just does not apply.

Polutta agreed that it does not completely make sense.

Attig replied, speaking just of a contents note, which is the most fully developed part of structured descriptions. He thought there can be a list of preferred titles of parts, and asked if that is a reasonable contents note. In some cases, such a list is appropriate because they are parts of the work that will be applicable to all expressions or manifestations. If you choose to do it at that level, you can come up with a meaningful structured description. **Polutta** asked if Attig was referring to the manifestation level. **Attig** replied no, at the work level, using the preferred title. He agrees that for most of the things for which we make contents notes we should be doing it at the manifestation level and in fact we create the note by copying the table of contents from a particular manifestation.

Polutta said she believes that it is never explicitly stated in Chapter 24, the general instructions chapter for the following chapters, that we need to talk not just about single works but works in aggregate and in parts. She said it was implied and assumed, based on many of the examples, but not explicitly stated. **Polutta** hoped we could explicitly state this so that it would be a clear justification for when she wants to provide chapter titles in a contents note as well as individual work titles of a collection of essays or just an individual work title. **Maxwell** said that it is explicitly stated in the definition of work. **Polutta** replied that maybe she was looking for the instruction in the wrong place then because she was looking in Chapter 24, which is what they were working on. **Maxwell** said it was in the chapter on the definition of work. **Attig** stated that the definition of the entities is in Chapter 5. **Polutta** added that it would be helpful to have something that refers back to that definition.

The **Chair** stated that **Attig** has raised a couple of general questions and voiced concern that we are getting a little more specific that he wanted us to get. Before getting to that level of discussion he said we needed a conversation about what is going to move forward. The **Chair** noted that one option proposed by Attig calls for turning our straw man proposal into a discussion paper, and submitting that by our July 22 deadline. He asked Attig what the other option would be. **Attig** replied that it would be not doing that, and continuing discussion on the proposal and giving advice to the task force. The **Chair** said if we choose the second option that we would want to get into some of these specific questions but if we are going to put this forward as a discussion paper we do not have the luxury of that time. He noted that Putnam has said the task force is having some personnel issues, including losing members and burn out. If we choose the second option of continuing longer term work on this, then we may need to reconstitute or at least repopulate the task force. He stated that was something for CC:DA to

consider as well, if we have the person power and the bandwidth to do that right now. The **Chair** asked Attig, if that sums up where we are now. **Attig** confirmed that it did. The **Chair** then called for a quick discussion on that level, on whether we want to hurry through a discussion paper to the JSC, noting it was not a proposal so it did not need to have quite the level of detail that a proposal might have, or do we want to take more time to continue working on this following some personnel changes. The **Chair** asked the task force members if they or anyone else have any thoughts.

Myers asked the task force if we are in a position to articulate and identify the questions to be addressed on this issue and are we able to articulate some options. If the task force feels we can do so and has yet to flush out question then we go another round. **Polutta** said she did not have a clear sense of what we would be arguing for or against. She stated the need for new members and more discussion before they can put forth a coherent discussion paper. **Putnam** said he agreed. **Myers** stated he thought we have our answer. The **Chair** noted that unfortunately, it was the harder one.

Snyder mentioned another possibility, and asked Attig and Glennan if the straw man proposal is not bad, take out the work examples, and look at where that would leave it, and if it would be a respectable document with simple changes, given the short amount of time. **Polutta** also asked how good it had to be for a discussion paper. **Snyder** noted that we do not have the time or people power and suggested if we make cosmetic changes, would it be worthy to submit to the JSC. **Attig** replied that mostly editorial work needs to be done on the straw man proposal. He stated that we do not have to deal with all of the examples that are in AACR2, and that we just need enough to illustrate issues we want to raise. He suggested it might not be that difficult, noting that Myers made a critical point. **Attig** questioned what we are asking the JSC to do other than look at this discussion paper. He did not see the questions we have now as being much different from those of the original paper that got us started. He felt that it would not be that difficult to turn out a discussion paper, but that it was not clear what the task force wants to identify as issues at this point. **Polutta** noted that she would have to reread Attig's paper to remind her of the points. **Putnam** added he did not know how much commentary they can provide along with that in two weeks, and that it goes back to Myers's point.

The **Chair** noted there were four "votes" for continuing work and not submitting the report to the JSC this round. He asked if anyone wanted to argue for turning the straw man proposal into a discussion paper for this round by July 22. Noting the silence, the Chair said he thought we have an answer. The key players, the task force and JSC reps, want to take more time with this and said he thought this is what we should do. He asked if CC:DA is ok with that.

Glennan, referring back to what Attig said, commented that if we do not know what we want the JSC to discuss, then we are not ready to send this as a discussion paper. We can provide cleaned up examples, but what we want to do is send better examples if we can and figure out what we want to know, and then send it as a discussion paper. If we do not send something forward this year then we have to wait another year, and this is an area of RDA that people have found lacking. On the other hand, if we are going to send it forward, then we need to identify all or nearly all of the issues we want the JSC to decide on; otherwise there is not much point.

The **Chair** asked the task force members if that is the question, and do we want feedback from the JSC on cleaning up examples. **Polutta** noted that she thought the question was larger than that. **Snyder** raised the issue of contents notes, and the **Chair** noted accompanying material.

Attig remarked that he originally brought up this issue because, although RDA says a number of things about structured descriptions of relationships, people had a hard time finding them because they do not think about the issue in those terms. In fact there were no instructions in RDA for describing relationships. He asked if we need this, and if we do, how are we going to write those instructions. He threw out some ideas about using appropriate elements to describe relationships, and came up with the idea that since the relationships are specific to WEMI entities, then the attributes used to describe relationships should be as well. This is the crucial issue, and where he most wants feedback. This would be a major change in how examples are done and raises some problematic issues, which we could illustrate with the examples we have found and the discussion here.

Polutta asked Attig if he wanted to raise this as a discussion point with the JSC this year. **Attig** replied that he would kind of like to. **Glennan** noted that we are torn, and that we would like guidance, but do not want to put something out half-baked. **Attig** agreed that we know we are not ready for a proposal but the opportunity for advice about how to formulate the proposal could be useful. But there is some work to do to create the type of document for meaningful discussion with the JSC.

The **Chair** stated that he was going to wrap this up, noting that it appears the sense is that we are not going to do something and he wanted to make a decision. **Attig** suggested that he, Kathy, and the task force talk about it later and that the final decision will be up to the task force. **Polutta** also suggested a more intimate discussion after the meeting. The **Chair** said we will table this for now and said he will confer with the task force.

Attig asked if we have any more time, and said the issue of combining data elements from different WEMI levels has come up in other contexts. There are notes on expressions that include page numbers, which are not expression level information. There has been some superficial clean-up but the JSC has not really addressed the issue as a principle and that is the question here. In a structured description, how strict do we want to be? Do we want to be wide open, or do we want to try to focus on appropriate data elements but not exclude others? Or do we want to be as strict as possible so you can validate that all the information comes from appropriate data elements? Per **Attig**, those are the choices. Whether we raise this to the JSC or simply continue the discussion here we will have to deal with it. The paper the task force put forward explains how we encountered this and the difficulties it causes, with, by implication, some possible options for dealing with it. The **Chair** responded that he needed to have us move along, and while Monday is full, we may squeeze it in if we can form a question, or have some discussion over e-mail. He thanked everyone for their participation, and noted that this is a big issue and that we need to keep working on it.

1235. Report from the TF on Machine-Actionable Data: Lapka [[TF on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Interim Report \(May 2013\)](#)]

Lapka began his report by saying that this task force picked up where the previous one left off. He outlined some of the major recent developments, noting that the two major components of the charge the task force was working on in this term were defining the extent of expression element in the RDA element set and adding the aspect-unit-quantity model in the RDA element set. For extent of expression, the major work of the term was aimed at finding ways to define vocabulary for recording that element. The task force recommends that the vocabulary be based on content type. For the task of introducing the aspect-unit-quantity model, they attempted to model statements of complexity, and considered that dimension is a subelement of extent. He also asked whether the paper as is or with some changes would be suitable for sending along to the JSC for discussion.

The **Chair** agreed that he thought that was the main issue we wanted to look at with the task force, and asked Attig if he wanted to add anything. **Attig** said he did not, but that it does represent an advance over the last discussion paper and it is worth asking the JSC to look at it. He noted that maybe the next two weeks could be used to articulate discussion questions. They are inherent in the paper but with some effort could be made more explicit.

The **Chair** asked for comments on those two issues. First asking if this paper is ready in its present form to be sent along to the JSC as a discussion paper, and if so, what questions do we want the JSC to answer about this.

Mark **Scharff** from the audience, who was also a member of the task force, brought up a number of issues in the paper surrounding music. He stated that one of the major issues that needs to be resolved is to figure what to use for extent of expression for notated music. **Scharff** noted the problem of how to measure a composition, when you have not put it on paper or performed it. He also mentioned the issue of how to present user-friendly expressions. He was happy to see the proposal have the display element parallel to the machine actionable element and assumed it was intended to be an explicit element as opposed to something generated on the fly from other data. The **Chair** asked Scharff since he was on the task force, if he wanted the report to go forward with these questions. **Scharff** replied yes, and noted that music is the problem child.

The **Chair** asked for other comments or questions, especially from representatives of a specialized cataloging community. **McGrath** commented that some of the terms that they potentially rejected for extent of expression might be more appropriate for form of work. She mentioned having the manifestation as one object, such as a coin, and problems in how you would present that, noting you would need a more generic term, and the difficulty in doing that. **McGrath** said she was not sure for things like three-dimensional materials, but felt the form of work would be a good place where you could put terms like “realia” in gmds. She said that kind of vocabulary might be a better place to put things, and noted the difficulty in building a vocabulary for certain things.

Glennan said that she was looking at the question about statement of extent for drawings and their manifestations, so she looked at FRBR. The form of work in FRBR included terms like math and drawing and the form of expression in FRBR includes terms like math and drawing. **Glennan** said that FRBR itself is not making a distinction at those levels, and is using the same terms at both levels, similar to McGrath’s coin reference.

Hillmann noted that we should not worry about some of the FRBR issues, as Dunsire is tackling some of those issues. Regarding Kelly's point about it being difficult to build a vocabulary for certain types of things, she said that we need to recognize that there is more than one way to build a vocabulary. One way is the way we have chosen so far to extract what we know and is useful going forward. She mentioned the benefit of usage and being able to see what people actually do and said that was another way of determining what kind of vocabulary is needed. **Hillmann** said that what is exciting about this kind of thing is that you get a chance to try this stuff out and add to our understanding of vocabulary. She said she sees this effort as one piece of the attempt to move us away from the traditional 3 by 5 card model, and noted how we have expanded from that to things that could be very extensive

The **Chair** said that was good background for what we are trying to do with the task force.

Sprochi said in reference to McGrath's comment about the coins, that the task force tried different vocabulary at different levels, but we also have to deal with reality. She discussed the problems of different ways to describe a map as a work, versus a map as an expression, versus a map as a manifestation. **Sprochi** noted that realistically, we may have to deal with a description of coins all the way down. **Hillmann** responded that she hears that argument all the time and said she is not convinced. She described a work experience where people were stealing and reselling maps from books in the stacks and how they needed to go through and identify the ones that had not been stolen yet. **Hillmann** said this was not an easy task, but that this type of information would make it possible to identify items like this that required preservation. **Hillmann** stated that there is a real desire not to go down this road because it is complicated, but that there are some real reasons why this will help us

The **Chair** stated that he was cutting the discussion off, as we needed to go back to the decision of what to do with the discussion paper. He asked what is the sense in the room, and if people are happy with the paper or feel it needs more work. The **Chair** noted that Scharff has identified some work that needs to be done. He asked if the paper is ready to move forward or if there is more in it people would like to see changed, or if everyone finds it just too confusing.

Tarango mentioned Hillman's example and the difficulty in imaging use cases and what the actual real implications are. The **Chair** asked with the limited time frame, do you think that needs to be put in now. **Tarango** noted that he had trouble coming up with use cases. The **Chair** said that the addition of use cases to demonstrate the value seems more like an editorial suggestion, and was not substantial. He suggested that we can make it part of the motion, and noted that it was a great suggestion. He asked for other suggestions or comments.

Attig asked if the task force is able to do this. **Scharff** noted that it came up in their discussions. **Lapka** added that he is not going on vacation, so yes.

The **Chair** called for a motion for this to go forward to the JSC with examples of use cases, noting that CC:DA members are welcome to vote no, and then we will reformulate the report.

Lapka asked if it was use cases for expression or other aspects. **Tarango** said either one would be helpful. **Attig** added if machine actionable, what sort of actions were needed.

The **Chair** called for a motion to send the report to the JSC as a discussion paper, with the inclusion of a few use cases. Moved by **Kelley**. Seconded by **Bourassa**. The motion passed unanimously.

The **Chair** thanked the task force for its work, and acknowledged the work done by **Lapka**.

1236. Report from AALL on treaties: Hostage [\[Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties\]](#)

Hostage began his report commenting that instructions on authorized access points for treaties are in many cases based on the first named signatory of the treaty. This is often not very helpful to users, especially with multilateral treaties; many of the access points for multilateral treaties start with Afghanistan, Albania, etc., since they are at the beginning of the alphabet. AALL wants to propose removing treaties from the category of works with corporate bodies as creator, which leads to creating authorized access points based on the preferred title for treaties. This change is at the heart of the current proposal. **Hostage** noted there were also slight changes proposed in recording the date of a treaty and with punctuation. AALL is asking to move this forward to the JSC. He also thanked Attig for his help in rearranging and editing the proposal.

The **Chair** thanked Hostage for his work and the thoroughness of his proposal and asked for comments.

Hillmann, as a former law cataloger, asked Hostage if he recalls how long they have been trying to get this changed. **Hostage** noted that many people were unhappy as soon as they saw RDA. **Hillmann** mentioned the problems with AACR2 as well and was happy to see this. She said the fewer of the artificial constructions designed to create order in a card catalog we have going forward, the happier we will be and the better we will be able to do our jobs.

Tarango asked Hostage if he could explain about the dates, and mentioned some confusion regarding the different types of dates used with treaties. **Hostage** answered that it varies somewhat with type of treaty and type of information you have available. Bilateral treaties are normally but not always signed the same day, but the more parties the more variation. Some international treaties are drawn up within an international conference or sometimes at the general assembly of the UN and adopted by conference or general assembly on a particular day. Some countries may sign on that day or may sign at a later time. International treaties can be signed over many years. **Hostage** also noted that a signature is not the only way to become party to a treaty. He said we should not focus so much on the date of signature, as sometimes the important date is the day the treaty is adopted by an international conference, and AALL wanted to include that as a possible date of treaty.

Glennan asked to clarify that by not giving a priority in choosing a signed versus adopted date in RDA 6.20.3, the proposal is leaving it to cataloger's judgment. By not asserting a priority order, it is being left up to the individual to choose the best conclusion about what date to use. **Hostage** replied yes, essentially.

Maxwell asked how we are going to help the users who do not know the name of the treaty. **Hostage** replied that in the past we never tried to make entries for every country that was party to a treaty. He noted that the proposal includes an open-ended possibility to make variant access

points, and for bilateral treaties making various access points under the names of the parties is given a high priority. **Maxwell** asked how we help users who do not know the title of a treaty. **Hostage** said he was not sure how to help, but an artificial construction was used in the past. **Maxwell** agreed it was artificial but said it helped people. **Hillmann** noted that it was a gathering device but said there are lots of other ways to gather things together, such as genre or subject, which are used in other situations and seem easily applicable to this one.

Hillmann asked whether dates are going to be described carefully, in terms of what they are or represent. A cataloger may apply one date to a treaty but there might be another date more relevant to the person searching for it. So one might have the date of signing, a date of voting in a particular country, etc., but there is no reason to necessarily rely on only one. **Hostage** said one could create an entire database with information on treaties but for cataloging purposes we have relied on one date and the proposal does not intend to change that. That would be a whole different proposal.

Hillmann commented that it had the same value as applying more access points for signatories, as it gives you a better chance to identify the treaty you are looking for. She is not saying that catalogers should be required to do this, but it should be an option for some of the more complicated treaties. **Hostage** said it might be useful. He noted that in some tables in the UN database you can have three dates for each country and over a hundred countries signing. That is a lot of metadata, with date of signing, date of accession, date of enforcement, etc. He questioned if library data are the places to look for that and is it realistic to expect us to supply that. **Hillmann** mentioned the difference between capabilities and expectations. She suggested that some countries may be interested in recording the signing of treaties to which they are a party. We may not expect or require everyone to do it but it may provide additional information that would be locally useful.

Glennan noted these were interesting points. She said that the current RDA definition of that element is the date of signing of the treaty, etc., so a very specific date. This proposal generalizes a date element that was already more specific and we need to be very cautious about what we are really proposing. She agreed that the granularity suggested by Hillmann might be useful.

Tarango asked whether what Hillmann was suggesting might be handled by a note. **Hillmann** said no, and stated that Glennan expressed it well. We do not want to get rid of important specifics. We need to differentiate between the choice of date, and that loosening this up is good, allowing for the specificity of date recorded. The date could be specified as the date of signing, of going forward, etc. There are a lot of dates that you can envision as being important to someone searching for a treaty. We do not expect catalogers to supply all those dates but you do not want then to get rid of that kind of specificity just because rules are built for people. The **Chair** asked Hillmann if she thought what she was suggesting could be accommodated in this proposal. **Hillmann** replied yes, she thought so. **Attig** disagreed and thinks it would have to be a new proposal, noting that Hillmann was proposing to change the scope of date of treaty and perhaps indicating the nature of the date being recorded. He thinks this is beyond the scope of this proposal. It may be worth doing but suggested not trying to put it in this proposal. **Glennan** stated that adding it would require subelements at 6.20.3.3 and further glossary definitions. For her this also brings up the question of proposed changes to 6.20.3.3, and we need to be clear that

we are changing the scope of the element and broadening it. We might want to come back and redefine it later.

Maxwell said he was not against the date of treaty element, but given the change in the way we identify treaties now he questions why the date needs to be in an access point. We needed it before to make the heading unique but that would not be necessary under the proposed changes. The date is to distinguish access points but if they are based on title they will more likely be unique and will not need to be distinguished. **Hostage** said it helps in identification and we have always done it that way. He added that multilateral treaties entered under title always had the date entered as well, and that most people consider it valuable information.

Reser questioned if there was any reason to keep it in Chapter 6 rather than incorporate the changed instructions into Chapter 19 where we have other relationships, between works and bodies. It seemed like an additional category of corporate body related to a work. **Hostage** agreed Reser was probably right, and said it probably does not need to be in Chapter 6, but AALL did not try to tackle that as they had enough on their plate already. **Attig** noted that it was still part of a variant access point and there is some relevance to it as an element rather than relationship. **Maxwell** said it does remain as an element, but in the current system there is no place to record it except as an access point. If we take it out of the access point we do not have any place to put it. **Attig** pointed to the subfield g and noted the problem with MARC. **Maxwell** suggested that then we need a MARC field to record it. **Meyers** said that was a proposal to take to the MARC Advisory Committee.

The **Chair** asked Attig and Glennan if they felt work was needed to be done on this and if we could take this on during this cycle. **Attig** said he felt it was up to CC:DA, if it says the proposal needs significant changes and if there is time to get the work done.

The **Chair** asked whether to have a straw poll on that question or to move to a vote. **Glennan** noted that the main issue was brought up by Hillmann about date, and asked if there are things besides it that CC:DA might need to resolve. The **Chair** noted other issues raised by Reser and Maxwell. He said he did not want to vote without hearing a sense of the room, so he said he would take a straw poll. The **Chair** summarized some of the issues raised by Hillmann, Glennan, where signatory treaties belong in the rules, and where they belong in the MARC format. The **Chair** then asked how many people were comfortable sending the proposal through as written [10 yes] and how many would like to see additional work done on these issues we raised before putting the proposal through to the JSC [3]. The **Chair** noted the many abstainers, but said that the poll passed with a clear majority of those voting.

Myers commented that he felt the Chair did not phrase the question very well. He thought the question is do we send it as is or send it forward with instructions to resolve the issues in the time we have. **Glennan** said she interpreted it as voting to send it forward as is; if additional work was needed it was not something that will happen in next two weeks. The **Chair** added that the issues raised represented substantial changes and something we would need to vote on at a separate time. **Glennan** asked if that changed anyone's vote. The **Chair** asked of those voting who would change their votes. **Myers** mentioned also that those who abstained might have changed their opinions. The **Chair** asked for a vote to support moving the proposal as written forward, the issues non-withstanding. He called for a motion from CC:DA members to approve

and send the proposal by John Hostage forward to the JSC as an ALA proposal. Moved by **Walsh**, second by **Rendall**. The motion passed unanimously.

1237. Report from the RDA Conference Forums and Programs TF: Abbas

Abbas reported that this would be the final report of the task force, as it is disbanding after this meeting. First she reported on the general RDA Update Forum at Midwinter, which had not already occurred before the last time she reported to CC:DA. The session had 161 people initially; by the end of the session there were 214, so it was a full house. There is another Update Forum tomorrow as well, which hopefully indicates interest and that people are really coming to learn what they need to know for their RDA implementation.

The task force had a one-day pre-conference yesterday (June 28, 2013) entitled “RDA: Back to the Basics.” This session was focused on those individuals who had not been to other pre-conferences or had not taken other RDA training. The pre-conference began with a view from the administration, with Chris Cronin presenting, then Chris Oliver talked briefly through the conceptual models and gave a wonderful history of RDA as well as the rationale behind the development of RDA. The participants commented that they found this extremely useful, and it helped them gain an even more in-depth understanding of why RDA is being implemented. The attendees were people who really had done very little in terms of training for RDA or implementing RDA. They all said it was extremely practical, hands-on, and worth the money. Fifty-five people originally registered and there were nine walk-ins, for sixty-four total participants. Overall the pre-conference went really well.

Abbas outlined three more RDA forums tomorrow (June 30, 2013). First, starting at 8:30, is one called “How will RDA Impact Your System?” with vendors discussing implementation plans. Vendors such as Sirsi Dynix, Polaris, Ex Libris, and Innovative Interfaces Inc. will present their plans to change their systems to accommodate RDA. A full house is anticipated.

The second forum will be the RDA Update Forum at 1:00pm. A wonderful cast of presenters, including John Attig and Kathy Glennan, who will be introduced as the new JSC rep to the rest of the cataloging community, will be there. This session should be really helpful for the attendees.

The last forum is called “RDA Implementation: Stories and Strategies,” held at 3:00pm. The idea behind this is to have people come and talk about their RDA implementations. They will talk about successes, barriers, things that they have had to do to get support for their implementation, etc., so a host of different people are coming from different libraries for that session. Abbas said she would do attendance counts for each of these sessions so CC:DA can see whether the interest level regarding RDA is being maintained.

Abbas reported that the task force’s members are also very active in non-ALA contexts, getting the word out about RDA. Abbas did a presentation to her own libraries, to the tech services unit and the public librarians so they could get a feel for what the records might look like in the future, and how this might help them increase their services. Bobby Bothmann has been really busy presenting in Illinois, New Hampshire, and all over the place. Barbara Schultz-Jones and Ric Hasenyager are doing a presentation tomorrow (June 30, 2013) at 3:00pm on “The Twilight of AACR2 and the Breaking Dawn of RDA” for school librarians and small public libraries.

The first presentation of the task force was at ACRL in Philadelphia, as the group has been trying to cover all the bases. Abbas provided a tally of all of the programs the task force has put on: since 2008, when this task force was originally convened, they have put on 6 pre-conferences and 19 forums. Abbas mentioned that Nannette Marie Naught and Abbas will be the incoming co-chairs of the CaMMS Continuing Education Committee, which will be charged with putting on these programs after the dissolution of the task force.

The **Chair** thanked Abbas for her report and asked if there were any questions or comments. As there were none, the group moved onto the next agenda item.

1238. Report from the RDA Planning and Training TF: Chair

The Chair reported that he did not have anything to report regarding the RDA Planning and Training task force, as he has not been in touch with this task force. The Chair concluded the meeting a half hour early and dismissed CC:DA until Monday at 8:30 am.

*Monday, July 1, 2013, 8:30-11:30 a.m.
InterContinental Hotel, Camelot Room*

1239. Report from the MARBI Representative: Myers

Myers reported that MARBI ceases to exist at the close of this conference. Other than the nine representatives of the three ALA divisions, the MARC Advisory Committee consists of the same members as are on MARBI. The MARC Advisory Committee (MAC), organized by LC in its role as Secretariat, will continue to function in support of the development of MARC for as long as it is needed. Liaison relationships to the committee are being clarified between MAC and the various constituencies.

Myers reported that the agenda for this conference was fairly light: two discussion papers and two proposals. Discussion paper 2013-DP05 considered adding indicator values to the bibliographic format field 588 in order to differentiate source of description and most recent source of information data, and to support the generation of display constants reflecting the same. Three questions were proposed in the paper: whether the solution was agreeable (it was), whether a single indicator value for both AACR2 and RDA terminology description was agreeable (it was), and should a “blank” indicator be redefined or made obsolete. There was discussion about use for indicators, but the committee settled on a simple redefinition. Committee discussions also explored the source of information included in this field, variations in the respective text, and differentiating serials (“latest issue consulted”) versus integrating resources (“viewed on”). Ultimately the committee decided to stick with the most recent source of information. This discussion paper will return as a proposal.

Myers described discussion paper 2013-DP06, which considered adding to the authority format field 388 in order to record chronological terms or data not included in genre terms as “out of scope.” This would support the information included in 650 \$y, where the 655 HISTORIC does not allow inclusion. There was broad recognition and support for providing a mechanism for recording and using this information. However, the execution as presented in the discussion

paper was problematic as it gave a confusing mixture of the information available, as well as indicator values possible (and how those values were defined) and a mixture of chronological periods from various schema. Discussion ensued, but ultimately the discussion paper will return with some improvements as a proposal.

Myers reported that Proposal 2013-08 was to define a new controlled subfield 7 in the 8XX series added entry field in the bibliographic format. This was proposed by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek to support their approach to series treatment, which has a higher degree of analytical approach than is normally used in Anglo-American contexts. The proposal uses the framework provided in the linking entry fields in the 7XX block to support a new two-position controlled subfield to indicate first the type of record for a related item (the series that corresponds to the Leader/06 value for that related item) and the bibliographic level of that comes from the Leader/07. This proposal was approved with minor edits.

Myers discussed proposal 2013-09, which defined a new subfield for qualifiers to standard identifiers. This is an expansion of a previously approved proposal to do the same on field 028, which was done at ALA Annual 2012. The proposal now adds subfield q to fields 015, 020, 024, and 027, but NOT to field 022, per conversations with the ISSN committee when the proposal was in the discussion paper phase. There was some small discussion about multiple occurrences of subfield a in the 015 and how it would be managed if both subfield q and a were present, but the consensus was that an individual would break the data into two separate fields should this qualification be employed. This proposal was approved with minor edits. This subfield q is essentially a new label (albeit with a much broader set of qualifications) for the subfield b for the binding information in field 020 in legacy records.

At the close of the MARBI meeting, Sally McCallum thanked and recognized members present and past for their 40 years of contributions to the development of MARC by members of the MARBI committee and community. **Myers** asked for questions, and as there were none, he concluded his report

1240. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta

Polutta reported that in response to discussions at a previous meeting, she transferred archival material from the old website as far back as 2008, including agendas and documentation from each meeting. She did not complete individual postings for each document, but plans to do so eventually. She asked if 2008 is a sufficient cut-off date or if she needs to go further back, as it was close to the beginning of the discussion of RDA as a topic.

Attig asked if Polutta was still maintaining the archival site as a way to access older materials so that people can access older material even if they have to go to another site. **Polutta** asked if Attig was going to maintain the Penn State site and he replied that for the time being there is no reason to pull it. **Polutta** commented that we will have two archival sites, so the older material is not going away, but asked what CC:DA wants available on the current site. **Glennan** responded that 2008 is too late, as discussions of AACR3 occurred in 2005. However, the priority is that materials are accessible. **Polutta** asked for confirmation that she could stop transferring materials to the new site at 2008. The **Chair** asked that she go ahead and put all materials back to 2005 on the current site to guarantee a corpus of RDA-related materials in one place. **Polutta** agreed to do so.

Polutta also created individual pages for each task force through 2008, as long as it was still functioning in 2008. She will go back to 2005 and do the same. To address the concern that many of the posts were not printer-friendly, Polutta made a Word document for this agenda as well as installing a 'Print friendly PDF' plug-in. This plug-in appears as an icon at the bottom of each post or page and transforms the information into a print-friendly version, without taking up quite so many pages as a native post.

As the current URL is <http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog>, **Polutta** would like to make changes so that the base URL, which is connected with the old site, goes to the base URL of the blog. She hopes that both URLs will go to the same location, therefore giving everyone the same information. She would like to make a change that <http://alcts.ala.ccda.org> will be the home page URL for the current site. The **Chair** asked that Polutta send a post to the [rules] listserv with that URL once that change is made so all members have that URL. **Polutta** affirmed that she would do so.

Polutta concluded her report by reiterating that she welcomes feedback on the usability of the site. The **Chair** thanked Polutta for her report and her work on the new website (especially the record of meetings), and asked if there were any questions.

Lipcan requested a link to the wiki in the blog section of the new website. The **Chair** wondered if there would be a way that discussions could be transferred to the actual website so members would not have discussions in two places. Having one spot for reports for each of the task forces would be helpful as well. **Polutta** responded that it should be possible to do that with the WordPress site, and that she would look into which extensions would be best for that. **Glennan** cautioned that discussions and draft reports should be restricted to members and liaisons only. **Polutta** responded that the WordPress software inherently allows comments to posts or pages to be moderated, and also that some people can be given a login id that would allow them to skip moderation.

1241. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Linker

Linker reported that he had a very short update and then would be open to questions, as he usually gets plenty from CC:DA. Recent improvements made to the RDA Toolkit include:

- Fast-track and LC-PCC PS changes
- Links from Cataloger's Desktop to AACR2 now resolve to AACR2 in the RDA Toolkit.
- Multi-lingual interface is now available, based on the primary language of an individual's browser. The user preference section allows you to change the language of the RDA Toolkit to another language temporarily by logging into the profile.
- Released French and German translations.

Linker reported that the release schedule is currently being determined, whether it should be 6 or 4 times a year, in large part due to the communities that are making updates. ALA Publishing Services would like to make it quarterly instead of 6 times a year, yet are open to bringing it back to 6 times a year. Six or four times a year are manageable schedules for ALA Publishing Services. The one major update a year for the RDA Toolkit is based on the JSC meeting. The other releases include fast-track and policy statement changes.

The upcoming July release will have the JSC update, AACR2 index, LC-PCC policy statements, and an upgraded workflow editor that is multilingual (for French and German and will be extended further past that).

Upcoming things include additional policy statements from the National Library of Australia and the British Library. Other groups were willing to integrate their policy statements into the RDA Toolkit. **Linker** reminded the audience that those additional policy statements can be turned off in the user preferences so they do not clutter the display if they are not useful. ALA Publishing Services is still working towards integrating the RDA Toolkit with the rdavocab.info registry, something that was delayed with the rewording of RDA. Other user preference changes include re-envisioning how the bookmarks work, to appear later this summer or fall. He welcomed ideas for future improvements to the RDA Toolkit.

Linker reported that the rewording of RDA is complete. It was a long process, but all chapters have been released in English as of May 2013. There is still some catching up to do in regards to translating the rewording. As there was some reformatting in RDA, the translation was affected.

Also under upcoming things, the Spanish translation is in its first draft. It might be ready in November, but more likely February. There are several other translations that ALA Publishing Services has been contacted about. Some people are translating for their own study; while that is encouraged, ALA Publishing Services asks that they talk about publishing the translation once it is completed. Not every language will be able to be put into the RDA Toolkit, as expenses have to be taken into account. For example, the Chinese translation will only be available in print.

There will be a new cumulation of RDA in print. ALA Publishing Services will re-release the entire text, as enough change happened on nearly every page to warrant a re-release. The update will include all the changes through the July release and will be available in September. Also in the works is an e-book version of the print version of RDA. It will not be the RDA Toolkit – it will have internal links to RDA, but not to the LC-PCC PS or other external resources, and a very rudimentary search engine. It will enable users to quickly pick examples out from the rest of the text, and will probably have uneven usage across devices. The e-book version will not be updatable, so it will be re-released each time there is an update. As a goal is to meet people where they are in regards to accessing RDA, the e-book version solves some problems with its lower price point and lack of subscription. ALA Publishing has a first draft of the e-book now.

Linker concluded his report by introducing the group to James (Jamie) Hennesley, managing editor for the RDA Toolkit, and then invited questions from the group.

Tarango asked if complimentary access to the RDA Toolkit would be given to members of CC:DA. In response, **Linker** indicated that giving a version to CC:DA members should be possible. He also mentioned ALA's budget shortfall, of which RDA was a contributing factor. The projected budget assumed that people would subscribe to the RDA Toolkit sooner than they did in preparation for adoption of RDA. A subscription increase did not occur until April, when it had been projected for January. There is a 169% increase over last year, with about 2,000 currently subscribing institutions. Before RDA starts to plateau, that number needs to be more in the 4,000 or above range. However, usage of the toolkit is up by 500%. The time per page has gone down, indicating that people are using the RDA Toolkit as a reference tool instead of as a study tool.

In regards to the translations, **Maxwell** asked if it would be possible to look at two translations side by side, or if one could log in twice and see RDA in the two different languages in two different browser windows. **Linker** responded that the RDA Toolkit was not built for side by side usage because ALA Publishing Services did not think it would be primarily used that way. He suggested looking at PDFs of RDA if someone wanted to compare the translation to English. **Maxwell** noted that if he were looking at the German, he would want to look at the English original. **Linker** asked for James Hannelley's input. **Hannelley** responded that if the preferences were changed, a user would only be able to see RDA in German. If the user moved away from the RDA Toolkit and came back, it could be reset to the browser's preferred language.

Polutta asked if it would be possible to set up a second user profile. **Linker** responded affirmatively, as long as you had two different email addresses in the profile. **Polutta** suggested that the ability to see two translations simultaneously would be helpful when answering questions from Latin American catalogers, and she will need to consult both versions to give them an answer. **Linker** said the two-translation idea could be put into development if there is a strong use case to justify it. **Maxwell** expressed interest in determining the use case, as he can see the usefulness of the ability to see two translations simultaneously. **Attig** suggested putting the idea on the development blog to gauge interest and determine a use case.

Moving away from the translation question and the RDA Toolkit, **Myers** expressed his hope to see quicker through-put of RDA-support publications, specifically several titles that he has been anticipating for over a year. **Attig** mentioned that he saw approval copies of one of the titles in the ALA Store, so its publication must be close. **Myers** mentioned that as these titles are very timely, it does not do any good to get it out to market after everyone has implemented RDA. Getting the titles out earlier, rather than later, would facilitate sales of and make use cases for the RDA Toolkit. He expressed his concern at the delay in publishing these important resources, as the supporting documentation marches hand in hand with the development of the RDA Toolkit. **Linker** acknowledged that Myers made a fair point. Several titles were held back because ALA Publishing Services wanted to see how the rewording of RDA held up against the supporting publications. These publications were not on his daily radar, but are getting there now that the unusual issues have been handled. Now that ALA Publishing Services is at the very end of the implementation part of the RDA Toolkit, the maintenance and updating can occur more regularly. It is a fair point that these publications need to get out there quickly. **Linker** reminded the group that ALA Publishing merged with Neal-Schuman, which had a slowing effect on the release of titles from both organizations. Now things are going out the door more quickly and 17 titles are supposed to come out from ALA Publishing in the next six weeks.

Wolverton asked about the breakdown of the types of institutions subscribed to the RDA Toolkit. **Linker** responded that the institutions were not asked that question when they signed up, so ALA Publishing Services only knows anecdotally. As far as they can tell, there is a mix, largely of academic libraries, but with more public libraries than expected. Last year the subscribers were about 70% United States and 30% outside the U.S. Now it is grown to 68% U.S. and 32% outside. The uptick is occurring now, with more use of RDA in Germany. The subscribers are from 67 different countries.

In going back to the translations, **Hostage** asked about the quality control of the new translations. **Linker** replied that what ALA Publishing can do is fairly limited, but it tries to make sure that

the translators have a good review process. Each case is different, but in the case of the Spanish translation, the partnering publishers put together a review committee with representatives from national libraries from different Spanish-speaking countries. ALA does not have the resources to be that quality control.

The **Chair** asked if there were any further questions for Troy Linker. As there were none, he thanked Linker for his update.

1242. Report from the PCC liaison: Glennan [\[PCC Report for CCDA June 2013\]](#)

Glennan acknowledged Becky Culbertson, chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, who prepared the report. **Glennan** remarked that with every PCC report she starts by saying how busy the past six months have been, working on RDA documentation, and this time around is no exception. It is an ongoing process, identifying issues and determining the best approach to solving the issues and creating best practices for the community. Even non-PCC participants use the documentation.

PCC had its Operations Committee meeting on May 2-3 in Washington, D.C. and had a number of discussion items that needed more direction. Since Midwinter, the following have been updated: the PCC Post RDA Test Guidelines, updated to include bibliographic and authority records; the Post Implementation Hybrid Record Guidelines for both integrating resources and serials; and PCC and RDA frequently asked questions. There is a recognition that it needs to integrate policy and practice decisions so these are more readily available and in one place. It is working with LC to make that happen. The PCC also issued guidelines on core relationship designators for bibliographic records. There is a form to fill out for PCC members to propose other relationship designators (which is not the only way to propose relationship designators to the JSC).

Glennan also mentioned a report from the PCC Task Group on the Creation and Function of Name Authorities in a Non-MARC Environment There is an LC-PCC policy statement for RDA 9.19.1 for fuller form of name. This was the first attempt on the PCC's part to try to get a policy out there for people to use before it is published in the RDA Toolkit. This is generally not acceptable, but the policy statement was important enough that the PCC agreed to publish the statement on its website as something people can start doing immediately. This is something that the PCC would prefer not to do, but if there is a decision that needs to be made known quickly, especially regarding the creation of authority records, it can be posted on its website.

The Standing Committee on Standards has been working through consolidating the remaining 25% of the RDA LC-PCC Policy Statements. It is now broadening its work to include new policy statements and changes to existing policy statements. **Glennan** asked that if someone has suggestions of changes that do not rise to the level of an RDA proposal, or if you want to test the waters to see if there should be an RDA change, then get in touch with the Standing Committee on Standards. She encouraged thinking of solutions to existing problems and considering a policy statement as a way to handle those problems, and not just stopping if you notice a problem with RDA. The Standing Committee on Standards proposed several terms to the CC:DA Task Force on Relationship Designators in Appendix K, as well as several fast-track changes to the JSC. Planning is underway to move the CSR and BSR core element statements into the RDA Toolkit.

The Standing Committee on Training had the RDA NACO series bridge training videos posted to the Cataloger's Learning Workshop. The RDA NACO Program Training Workshop Task Group, chaired by Lori Robare, is completing its final editing on NACO training materials. The PCC training meeting on Friday at this conference spent a lot of time talking about training opportunities: what some of the new guidelines are if you want to host training at your institution; what PCC is looking for; and what you should be anticipating. These guidelines are going up on the PCC website. Ongoing new training materials will continue to be posted on the Cataloger's Learning Workshop website, which is updated continuously. Glennan reminded everyone to look at the materials on the website, and pay attention to the dates that the materials were updated to ensure the user is looking at the most recent version.

Regarding documentation, the PCC has determined it will not be creating any more AACR2-related documentation. It is working on finalizing the BIBCO Participants' Manual, which will only have references to RDA. The Cooperative Cataloging Division at LC is down to four members, due to retirements, so it is focusing its work on where the profession is going.

Glennan concluded by asking for questions. As there were none, the Chair thanked Glennan for her report.

1243. Report from the TF on Place Names: Rendall

Rendall reported that the Task Force on Place Names was formed in March 2013 and given a long time frame to complete its work. This task force was given a very broad charge to clarify and suggest revisions to RDA's instructions on recording place names. The charge also includes very specific suggestions: to consider removing the instruction to record larger place as part of the preferred and variant name of a place and instead add instructions for creating authorized variant access points at the end of Chapter 16, where there are currently empty placeholders that could be filled in.

The task force's charge goes on to suggest two ways to handle larger place: either as an element inserted into the middle of Chapter 16, or as a relationship element of larger and smaller place, which would most likely involve drafting parts of Chapters 33, 37, and Appendix L, all of which are currently empty, so there is a pretty big assignment before this group. It has been charged with submitting an interim report at Midwinter 2014 and a final proposal at Annual next year for submission to the JSC in the fall. The instructions that the group is supposed to be looking at and revising in Chapter 16 on place names are still in flux. The revised version of Chapter 16 from CC:DA and approved by the JSC last year exists, but has not gone through the rewording process. That was completed recently and should be in the RDA Toolkit on July 9, 2013. Then the task force will have the base text from which to start. Meanwhile, it is possible that new proposals from other constituencies will be submitted to the JSC this year that will change things enough that Chapter 16 will have to be rewritten again. The British Library plans to submit something regarding the use of abbreviations in authorized access points for place names, and at one point EURIG was planning to submit something on federations, so the task force will wait to see what happens.

Rendall reported that the task force has discussed several general approaches. Although there is some concern about the effect on legacy data, there seems to be general agreement on the task force that we should stop using prescribed abbreviations for certain arbitrary categories, like U.S. states. The task force also seems to favor simplified and generalized instructions so that

individual agencies can make their own decisions on such questions as whether to qualify a place in the U.S. with the state or with United States, so the task force may want to make the instructions more general and then allow LC-PCC PSs, or the equivalent in other countries, to tell catalogers which larger place to add, if any, in given situations.

Last month Rendall distributed within the group two drafts that attempt to show how the instructions would be reorganized based on the current version of the text. As for the two options on how to handle larger place, the majority of the task force thinks that handling the larger place as a relationship would be more logically consistent with the approach to other relationships like this in RDA, instead of recording it as part of the preferred name of a place. They are also aware that any of these changes would have wide-ranging impact on other instructions for hundreds of examples elsewhere within RDA. So the question has already arisen: what are we really trying to accomplish here? Is rearranging the rules like this on principle really helpful, or are we fixing something that really is not broken? The task force, and then CC:DA, will need to consider this as the task force moves forward on this issue.

Rendall expressed his hope that the group would have one or more strawman proposals to show CC:DA either by or before Midwinter 2014. The Chair thanked Rendall for his report and the update on the task force's activities. As there were no questions for Rendall, the group moved to the next agenda item.

**1244. Discussion Paper from OLAC/MusLA on technical and performing credits:
McGrath and Snyder** [\[Discussion paper on the inconsistency between Chp. 2 & 7\]](#)

The **Chair** introduced the joint discussion paper from OLAC and the MusLA on technical and performing credits. He expressed his hope that, as the two communities were unable to decide how they felt about this issue, CC:DA would be able to decide how it feels about this issue and determine if we should continue working on it. CC:DA should also pay attention to the options in the discussion paper to determine if there is a best option that could turn into a proposal for the JSC, or if CC:DA should send this forward to the JSC as a discussion paper.

McGrath reported that MusLA and OLAC were asked to look into the inconsistency between the way that most statements of responsibility are recorded in RDA. This comes from Chapter 2 and the information is transcribed from the resource itself. Certain things are pulled out of the resource; for example, publisher, and then performers and artistic and technical credits are handled differently. There does not seem to be a principled reason why these particular types of credits should be treated differently from other statements of responsibility. The current situation has arisen because what was in AACR2 about performers, and artistic and technical credits, was transferred to RDA without much thought. The two elements (performer and technical credit elements) were placed in Chapter 7 in the section about describing content of expressions, because most of the roles that are traditionally put in those elements are related by RDA to the expression. That is the main difference: the statement of responsibility is related to the manifestation and is a transcribed element, whereas these other elements are mapped to the expression entity, and are not transcribed elements as it stands now in RDA. The two groups looked into why the performer and technical credits got to be this way, the biggest reason being display issues. The statement of responsibility does not work very well when there are lots of statements of responsibility. When this occurs, the information appears as a big blob that makes it hard for patrons to read. A neat order of statements is not presented on a CD like it is in a

book. The order of credits on the title frame might not actually be useful. There was a common feeling that the statement of responsibility is a poor way, as a concept, to display such information. It was created in the book context and for some materials it might be useful, but for music and audiovisual resources it would be useful to have some flexibility in the display. Some people like the flexibility of not having to transcribe, particularly from title frames, but to be able to take that information from somewhere else. But AACR2 does not have a real principled distinction between these two things – it was inconsistent, and in fact the artistic and technical credits definition included the statement, “those that contributed to the artistic and technical production who are not named in the statement of responsibility.”

Between these two groups there was some difference, to a small degree, of struggling with how to make this issue fit into the context of RDA. OLAC and MusLA identified the following options. The first option is to make a principled distinction. The problem with this possibility is that no one could come up with such a principle. Overall, it did not seem like a desirable solution. A second option is to not make a principled distinction, but to put everything in the statement of responsibility. This would be a difficult solution to implement on the practical side, because everyone is in an ISBD/MARC environment. If a cataloger looked at the display, and actually tried to put everyone responsible in the statement of responsibility for a feature film, it is hard to see how it would be useful to someone. Some of the people on the committee felt that in option 3, one thing that could be done was to make the statement of responsibility optional, as was the case in an earlier draft of RDA, for some materials, like serials. Then people would put everything in non-transcribed fields.

There was a general feeling that these two elements do not really belong in Chapter 7, but really belong in Chapter 2. However, if you get away from transcription it is harder to relate these things to the manifestation. The statement of responsibility is information about who created the work or who contributed to the expression. It can contain both kinds of information, and is related to the manifestation because of the transcription element, at least in the RDA paradigm. On the other hand, looking at the examples, there is a note on the statement of responsibility in RDA – the example says “attributed to so-and-so.” How can this be justifiably attributed to the manifestation in the statement of responsibility when it is actually an attribute of the expression? If that practice is okay, then credits notes should also be able to be included that relate to the statement of responsibility. The fourth option is similar to the third option, in that most of this information would or could be put in non-transcribed elements, i.e., notes. Rather than have RDA tell you what to put where, it would provide the option of how to separate elements and notes could be mapped to more than one MARC field. Maybe it is all really the same element in RDA, but it is complicated because of the current system.

McGrath concluded by saying that part of the problem OLAC and MusLA encountered is that even if there is agreement that the flexibility of a non-transcribed element is desirable, and one that does not have to be ordered like the statement of responsibility, it is unknown how to make that fit into RDA. Perhaps there is another approach to this issue that could work.

Attig explained that one of the things that drove this issue and caused the JSC to want further work on it was a discussion with the ISBD Review Group regarding how RDA does things versus how the ISBD does things. He will provide CC:DA with an electronic copy of the ISBD text. The situation is not clear, as there is nothing specific about performers, either saying that

they fall under the scope of the statement of responsibility or not, despite the fact that the text has a long list of various things that fall within the scope of the statement of responsibility. On the other hand, the ISBD does make a distinction between major and minor responsibilities, which may be relevant to the current discussion.

In considering the options presented, **Attig** agreed with McGrath that with option one it is difficult to find something that works satisfactorily for all types of materials. A distinction between types of responsibility for work versus responsibility for expression may work well for some sorts of things, but for other resources it does not work at all. He does not see a principled distinction that works or obviously comes to mind. Regarding option three, when there is more than one statement of responsibility, only the first statement is core. To a certain extent, the cataloging community already does what McGrath suggested in option three. **McGrath** stated that she understood the complaint to be that, as with a feature film, it is not obvious as to which statement the cataloger should pick to be core. **Attig** agreed, and suggested there are some issues with what multiple statements could mean, and determining which statement is the one recorded as core. That circumstance could be handled with an application decision. Rather than making it non-core, what could be said is to use relationships rather than statements of responsibility to identify persons and corporate bodies responsible for different aspects as an alternative to transcribing how those statements appear. It may be just as effective or even more so to use this method. Perhaps describing relationships is another way to get into some of this. If the cataloger decides it really is a relationship, the cataloger can use alternatives such as the authorized access point or do some sort of description. There are some possibilities that can be explored.

Myers observed that part of this issue is that the statement of responsibility becomes enormously large when other credits are added to it. But the statements are already enormously large, so he is of the opinion that it is not worth worrying about the space. Following up on Attig's comment, **Myers** stated that beyond the first statement, the other statements are not core. He suggested making an LC-PCC policy statement that states that the practice will be to expand beyond the first statement to include director and first production company, and the cast and technical credits can be recorded as notes. This would preserve the current practice.

One of the options discussed, under option four part B, gets into transcription issues, which **Myers** no longer sees as an issue. There used to be an LCRI for AACR2 that told catalogers exactly what order to put the technical credits in, but that went away. As a non-specialist cataloger, it can be very challenging to figure out what some of the foreign language terms translate to because there are several terms that are false cognates. **Myers** suggested transcribing the technical credits as is, therefore simplifying the situation. Catalogers also have allowances to pull in credits from outside the title frames because there no longer is a chief source of information. The **Chair** summarized Myers' comments by stating that the instructions should say that all of this goes into the statement of responsibility. Agencies could then make decisions for their own practices, such as would be written in an LC-PCC PS. **Myers** confirmed that the Chair understood his points correctly, that this issue could be dealt with as a policy decision because a lot of these issues evaporate under RDA.

Maxwell mentioned that he has been trying to teach this issue to various groups and it is impossible to teach. He cannot explain to people why, for instance, Chris Columbus is not an artistic credit and why the producer goes in a statement of responsibility, and why to transcribe

one thing but not another. People who are not experienced film catalogers cannot understand this issue. He takes the opposite tack from Myers, something closer to option three, and suggested that there should not be a statement of responsibility for motion pictures at all. Instead, everything could be put in the notes. **McGrath** pointed out that what is currently in RDA is largely as it was in AACR2. **Maxwell** agreed that it is largely the same, and that experienced film catalogers would understand and know what to do, but new catalogers and catalogers that do not regularly catalog films would not understand. He would prefer that CC:DA recommend something simple, such as put everything in the notes.

Glennan noted that those expressing opinions spoke exclusively about moving images. She wondered if there would be a single solution that addressed both the performer issue and the moving image issue. A fair amount of manipulation occurs during cataloging and creating performer notes. There is not a simple way to present the difference between “someone who is playing the piano” versus “someone who is playing the piano on the fourth work” in the contents note, and actually trying to match performers with pieces and compilations. There is a lack of guidance, and this is a problem in RDA as well as ISBD. It does not mean there is not a one-fits-all solution. The statements of responsibility are important. **Glennan** is of the opinion that the ability to manipulate the statements of responsibility rather than transcribe them, in some situations, could be helpful. She emphasized the importance of providing usefulness to library users. The other problem in this issue is MARC. There is no ability to parse out in a MARC display different statements of responsibility: one for production, directors, etc. However, this can be done through different notes and different fields, but not within the same MARC subfield. **Glennan** asked if a compromise exists. Is there something that will meet both the A/V and music communities’ needs? Is there a solution that helps both catalogers’ training needs and library users’ needs? CC:DA can make a principled decision, but maybe that is not the best overall decision. **Polutta** piggybacked on Glennan’s comments to ask whether the group was allowing MARC to control the thinking on this issue. She suggested saying, “This is all one extended statement of responsibility” in RDA, and in the implementation of the best practices decision, extend the statement into the notes for display reasons. No matter what MARC does, RDA can consider this one statement of responsibility but for display reasons we are separating it into different MARC fields.

Maxwell sees a distinction between sound recordings and films in that, as the paper says, there is a practical difficulty by the catalogers in watching the film. Transcription would require going through the film frame by frame to transcribe the notes. **Polutta** responded that best practices decisions would come into play in such a situation. **Snyder** pointed out that in RDA, the cataloger is not bound to transcribe from the title frames. **McGrath** noted that RDA states that the statement of responsibility should come from the same source as the title proper, but additional statements can be added from the container. She also noted the importance of recording the title proper from the title frame, as the title proper on the container can sometimes vary from what is on the title frame.

Snyder noted that the transcription of statements of responsibility seems problematic. With budget problems and understaffed workplaces, it becomes a time issue for video catalogers to continue to be required to suffer through watching all of the films to be cataloged. In regards to music, she agrees with Glennan about wanting to be able to manipulate performer statements, especially on compilation CDs. It becomes more complex, especially with resources from other

countries. Transcription, and helping patrons understand catalog records, is less of a problem for a foreign language book where you can use “editor” or “translator” as relationship designators. For instrumentalists, though, you want to know the instruments they are playing, but the relationship designator is simply “performer” because a more specific relationship designator does not exist. She would not want to be required to transcribe performer statements

Sprochi agreed with Maxwell about training. In regards to the idea of doing this for the user, the problem with the extended statements of responsibility is that no one can find any information in them, for example, with the RDA option to transcribe affiliations in the statement of responsibility. The authors cannot be identified in that mass of text. She gave the example of someone looking up a film and trying to identify which “Hamlet” they are looking at. The quickest way to identify which “Hamlet” varies for each user. She does not feel that users are going to care about “this specific production company.” To have that information in the record would be nice and useful for users, but not in the statement of responsibility. The information should be somewhere in the record, but to put all of that information in a paragraph-long statement of responsibility is unnecessary. **Myers** responded that he agreed with Sprochi’s comments in principle. However, the challenge in implementation for catalogers is they have no a priori knowledge of what will be the disambiguating point for the eventual users of the record. For example, there are films that are largely known by their directors, or by a key performer, or by date of release.

McGrath responded that there are lots of problems with the display of moving image information in MARC or ISBD, but those aspects cannot be fixed by CC:DA. In wrapping up, **Attig** pointed out that this was a good discussion on a preliminary report. He would like to see the discussion continued and explored more instead of passing the paper along before the group is prepared to offer or suggest any specific changes. He suggested that the group continue working on the paper, and re-present the paper as a proposal or discussion paper at CC:DA’s next meeting.

Glennan responded that while a lot of problems were discussed, one or two paths forward, or discussion questions, have not been identified to go to the JSC for feedback. Before going forward, she would like to see the group coalesce around one or two options and some very specific questions that it would like the JSC to consider and address. The **Chair** thought that Glennan’s assessment was fair, as he still heard some disagreement amongst the group. **Tarango** suggested that in looking for a solution, the serials community be contacted as it has successfully omitted using the statement of responsibility.

The **Chair** stated that the comments would be passed to the group working on the discussion paper, and that he would work with the group to bring this discussion paper back to CC:DA at Midwinter.

1244. Proposal on alternate corporate identities: Schiff [\[Pseudonymous corporate bodies\]](#)

The **Chair** introduced the next agenda item, a possible proposal presented by Adam Schiff. The **Chair** iterated his goals for the group’s discussion of this proposal: does CC:DA want to take on this issue? If so, should a task force be formed to look at this issue further?

Schiff explained that the discussion paper came about in the course of upgrading some AACR2 records to RDA. He was upgrading the authority record for the music group REM and discovered some sources that indicated that REM had gone by some other pseudonyms. In the context of doing this research he discovered that one of these pseudonyms had also been established in the authority file but there was no relationship recorded in the authority records between these two bodies. Apparently the occurrence of pseudonyms is common with recording groups; it was used often in the early jazz recording era where the same group was given a different name because it was on a different record label, and for contract reasons it could not use its real name. This has happened with symphony orchestras as well, where they had to give themselves other names for recording and contractual reasons. Originally, Schiff asked Attig for some relationship designators for alternate corporate identities. However, Attig thought that this issue was probably a greater issue than just adding a few relationship designators, because the whole concept of pseudonymity is not in RDA except for personal identities. So Attig suggested that Schiff come to CC:DA and propose that the instructions be revised so that corporate bodies could have pseudonyms as well.

Myers asked how CC:DA could avoid taking up this baton and carrying it forward, given Schiff's thorough and well-researched proposal. However, since a lot of this issue pertains to the music community, **Myers** suggested that perhaps that community would be the best one to speak to it. **Attig** added that it is uncertain how far this issue extends beyond musical groups. He asked if CC:DA thought that further investigation would turn up other cases that might need to be included in the proposal. **Attig** explained that the two options he sees are: CC:DA cannot think of anything Schiff has not uncovered yet or CC:DA needs to look at this issue more closely to see if the proposal should be expanded before the group pushes the proposal forward.

Bourassa identified an example from the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek where a group of artists have both individual names and a group name, and is in NACO. The corporate NACO record has a 110 for the group name, but also lists the individuals, who have individual NACO records. **Attig** clarified to say that names for groups of artists may also be included in this proposal. **Weitz** mentioned that this has also happened with theatrical groups, in similar situations where a theatrical group was under contract to one recording or video entity and performed for another entity under a pseudonym. He believes that this happens relatively often with performing groups in music, theater, and dance.

Maxwell observed that the language needs to be general in order to accommodate all possibilities of pseudonymity. He noted that it does not sound like another relationship designator is needed, because it is the same relationship as exists between persons, but the relationship needs to be categorized as available for corporate bodies and family names to cover all the bases. **Reser** reported that the JSC did this, about four or five years ago. He specifically remembered a spreadsheet with two issues: whether fictitiousness expanded beyond Chapter 9 and whether pseudonymity extended beyond Chapter 9. The end result was that the JSC agreed not to expand initially. The JSC did talk about these performing groups as a candidate, and in the discussions of it the JSC said "oh, it is just another corporate body, do not treat them as something different." Then a cataloger would have to figure out which one was the group's real name, which one was its pseudonym, and if it is having different contracts held by different bodies, etc. **Reser** said that he would look through the archive to find the original discussion. **Schiff** thought that it came from him originally. **Reser** said that it could have, but he thought it

was when discussions centered around FRAD. Chapter 9 can be tied very easily to FRAD. He has an English copy of FRAD back on his desk, and could see if it is something that needs to be added to FRAD before it gets added to RDA or if it should happen at the same time. He remembers this topic being a stumbling block during RDA development.

Mark **Scharff** stated that there are a number of groups that could fall into this area. He added a caveat that for marketing reasons, a company or recording company can employ different label names themselves. This is something to be aware of: a trade name might not be a corporate body.

Maxwell suggested that the pseudonym issue needs to be written into the rules, for both families and corporate bodies. Fictitiousness extends beyond Chapter 9 because corporate bodies are defined as groups of persons who have a name, and since persons include fictitious characters, so a group of fictitious persons who have a name are in fact a corporate body in RDA unless they are explicitly remitted, but perhaps should not be remitted.

The **Chair** responded that the fictitiousness discussion is out of scope for this proposal. However, there is consensus to tackle the pseudonym issue, expanding this proposal to include families with the caveat Reser brought up regarding FRAD. **Attig** stated that part of the consensus was that there are other issues to explore, and whether this issue needs a task force. The **Chair** asked for some discussion on the topic of creating a task force.

Maxwell asked for clarification on the issues that a task force would need to discuss. The **Chair** identified the historical issue brought up by Reser and the reconciliation with FRAD. **Attig** added that a task force would need to find more examples and extend the instructions to families, as well as identify how general the proposal should be. **Schiff** commented that the draft he wrote is general, and the two examples it provides just happen to be musical groups, as they were easy to find. An instruction does not need to have five examples. **Glennan** suggested that, politically, it would be helpful if the proposal had examples outside of music groups, as a different group already carries a charge to make music proposals for RDA. The CC:DA discussion from today implies that there should be examples beyond music.

Tarango mentioned that one issue alluded to in the discussion is if a pseudonymous corporate body actually represents a separate corporate body. Catalogers would need guidance to be able to determine this. **Weitz** identified a family pseudonym: David and Amy Sedaris perform as the Talent Family. **Reser** responded that there is nothing about corporate bodies in FRAD that defines the persona that pseudonyms have for persons. There is one section that includes fictitious organizations. **Reser** believes that this issue is messier than originally thought. **Attig** commented that part of the generality issue is if CC:DA would want new relationship designators for alternate corporate or family identities, or whether to generalize the alternate identity relationship to apply to all alternate identities.

The **Chair** summarized the discussion by stating that the creation of a task force is needed, and asked for a motion to create a task force to further investigate the question of family and corporate pseudonymity, and to create a proposal to make these changes to RDA. Moved by Kelley and seconded by Wolverton. The motion passed unanimously. The **Chair** sent around a sign-up sheet for the new task force and asked that interested persons sign their names.

1245. Proposal on colour content: Attig [[Colour Content \(RDA 7.17\)](#)]

Attig discussed the origins of this proposal, which came from a number of questions that Deborah Fritz brought forward regarding color and illustrations in RDA. The topic of this proposal was also brought up when the JSC started looking at the vocabularies for color content. Firstly, the group chose not to create a vocabulary for color content because it could not agree on how to spell the word. Secondly, there seemed to be a lot more different vocabularies that said more or less the same thing but had some significant differences, like explicitly identifying black & white content in certain circumstances, but not in others. That became the basis: to see how consistent we could be, whether the color of still images, color of moving images, etc. needed to be dealt with separately. This includes a strawman proposal for what a unified single set of instructions might look like. **Attig** said he would go through the discussion points with CC:DA, as he does not think that the strawman proposal should be a proposal to the JSC. Instead, he thinks that this should be a discussion paper, with the strawman proposal as illustrative information to show what this might look like. For the discussion points, CC:DA can either leave them as questions or if there is a consensus, CC:DA can make them a recommendation. **Attig** reiterated that he wanted to go through the questions, and if there seems to be a consensus, ask CC:DA to make a recommendation.

Attig's first question is: when putting together the strawman proposal, it seemed difficult to make this a formal vocabulary, in the sense of a list of terms to be selected from, with definitions. It is rather a set of instructions that say, "when you record a certain term..." Turning that into a definition seemed problematic. This is to say that this is not really a vocabulary, but it is recommending the use of certain particular terms under defined circumstances. Does that distinction make sense? Do you really want to make this a formal vocabulary?

Myers commented that he recently tried to RDA-ify the 300 fields in the Union College catalog, and it is challenging. If catalogers are to move forward reasonably with these kinds of endeavors, it would be nice to avoid the effort that he went through in the future. Myers believes that CC:DA should really be considering a formal vocabulary that can be supported with a vocabulary registry, and that in itself will address the color/colour issues because a cataloger can then parse out whether to translate it as color or colour depending on nationality. **Attig** responded that it is a minor problem and agreed that it could be addressed in that way. The major problem is that if the cataloging community is going to define colors, catalogers have to decide whether black & white are colors, and the cataloging community has been arguing about this for decades.

Myers pointed out that the British Library already seems to have made its own decision regarding that question. **Myers** mentioned a question that was posed on AUTOCAT or RDA-L to the effect of "Hey, I just saw this black & white reference in illustrations field in an RDA record. What's going on?" and someone explained that the British Library was recording that information. **Myers** said that, for the reasons **Attig** articulated in the rest of the paper, the cataloging community now has a set of instructions regarding black & white for one set of resources and a set of instructions that says not to use them for another set of resources. Myers questioned the principle behind that decision. **Bourassa** asked where a cataloger should stop listing colors: after white, blue, red, yellow, purple, lilac, etc. **Attig** responded that that was his main point, that the CC:DA can never do a complete vocabulary because there is that option to record specific colors. The CC:DA does not want to construct a vocabulary for the names of colors. There may be one that is already created that can be used.

Tarango commented that his response to a vocabulary hinges on his interpretation of what we mean when “tone” is qualified. In his view, those are processes that give color. In terms of a vocabulary, if a cataloger is only trying to identify the color, then there is not really a need for a vocabulary.

Attig responded that he received some sense of a reaction to his first question, and asked if any others wanted to comment. **McGrath** commented that for certain types of materials, it is very common to give a very specific color or colors in the record. **Thurstan Young** from the audience suggested that a way forward with this proposal would be to distinguish between black & white and other colors, as black & white are not primary colors, and therefore we could move forward in that way. He elaborated that since it seems to be an issue whether or not black and white are colors, a way around that would be to split those colors off from primary colors. The **Chair** asked that since this would impact visual and artistic materials, does a vocabulary already exist for something like this? Is this a wheel that needs to be reinvented? **Attig** responded that at this point, it is sufficient to raise the possibility that we could look for a vocabulary, as this is only a discussion paper.

Moving on to question 2A, **Attig** felt we had already commented on it, suggesting that the inconsistencies are unnecessary and are in fact getting in the way of things, and a single vocabulary and a single set of instructions would be a good idea. He asked if that consensus was still true. There were no objections, so 2A will definitely be a recommendation. **Attig** left the issue of tinting and toning until the very end of the discussion. We may have a resolution based on consultation with the people who know what they are talking about, and suggested getting a revised version of that in this paper.

Attig moved the discussion to the topic of grayscale. Grayscale is, in a sense, covered within the scope of black & white, but only for digital images. He got some confirmation that this is a software setting that applies particularly to digital images, and has to do with how pixels are coded. Therefore, there are some reasons for applying this only to digital images: one, it is valuable information, and two, it is legitimate to treat digital images differently. He found no disagreement with this analysis.

Myers asked a question: if there is a black & white illustration, other than a line drawing, would there not be half tones, etc.? **Attig** responded that those characteristics are covered by the definition of black & white. The exception is for digital still images in grayscale, the only thing to which grayscale is currently being applied. **Myers** asked if a generalist would be able to distinguish a black & white image in half-tones from a grayscale image. **McGrath** responded that a black & white image literally means there are only black pixels and white pixels, and there is no gradation within the image. In grayscale images, the intensity of the black pixels is varied, to create shades. **Myers** asked if this was not in terms of an illustration in a book, but in terms of an actual, two-dimensional still image. **McGrath** replied that a digital image is the only thing that has this distinction, due to the pixels.

Maxwell asked a clarifying question: given both a print-out of a grayscale image and a print-out of a black & white image, does the one still image remain grayscale or are both print-outs black & white, since grayscale can only be digital. **Glennan** responded that the definition in the strawman proposal is straight black & white, straight from what RDA says right now, although it is currently applied only to still images. She read, “Black & white: If the resource or content is in

black & white or shades of gray, record black & white.” That is what RDA instructs right now, except for digital images. We are not proposing to change that, but the question is whether the grayscale exception for digital images should be retained. She observed that it is apparent that retaining the exception is plausible. **Maxwell** suggested that or, vice versa, it could be generalized. **Glennan** stated that generalizing it would have broad implications. **Attig** summarized by saying that the definition of black & white includes shades of gray, but apparently there are different ways of creating those shades of gray. Grayscale is only one of those ways of doing it. Shades of gray can be created by the intensity of the black & white pixels within the image, but that is not grayscale. **McGrath** clarified by saying that Attig’s definition of “shades of gray” IS grayscale. The digital image would be monochromatic with only one intensity of black and white; that is what is recorded as black & white in a digital image. People who deal with those types of things, who scan in black & white versus grayscale, understand the difference. She does not believe that the distinction carries over to a printed image.

Weitz raised a question that would need to be researched: over the course of the history of microforms, the idea of grayscale may have filtered in. He was fairly certain that the term or phrase “grayscale” long predates digital imagery, thereby creating another exception. The **Chair** suggested that this topic needs more research and the discussion should move forward. **Attig** responded that he was inclined to recommend retaining the exception, but that there are some issues about what grayscale actually means and what it applies to.

Attig moved to the next topic to be discussed. There is an instruction to disregard color matter outside of the actual content of the resource, and the example is the border of a map. He tried to brainstorm other things he wanted to include as examples, but as it was not particularly clear, he is inclined to leave this topic as a question: are there other things that should be included? He raised a related topic for discussion: should the instruction to disregard color matter outside of the actual content of the resource be an instruction or part of the definition? He asked if anyone had a strong opinion on which way to include it in the proposal, or should he leave it as two options. CC:DA members and liaisons had no strong opinions on this topic.

Attig then reported on his understanding of tinted and toned in regards to colors. He initially did not really understand what tinted and toned meant, but received information from McGrath. In the practice for moving images, tinting and toning are both chemical processes that are applied to black & white film stock. It still strikes him as strange, that we are not saying what the color is but that it is no longer black & white. But that has been the convention, and it is confined to something that started out as black & white and now is essentially a single color, modified by the application of a single other color. **McGrath** passed around an example of an image that is both tinted and toned. She explained that tinting is the clear area of the film that is actually dipped in some kind of dye. The toned part is the black part of the film – there is some silver emulsion in there and some other chemicals or metals are added to that, which changes the color. The printout has some yellow tinting and darker toning. It is possible to get two colors out of both processes, but it is still based on black & white film.

Attig followed up McGrath’s example by saying that the question is do these both apply to still images, or are tinting and toning applied to photographic images that started out as black & white? That understanding needs to be confirmed. If that is correct, there is now a consistent set of definitions to be used. **Attig** referenced Tarango’s early question, that because it is a process,

should it be included in the color content statement? **Attig** suggested that raising this question as a discussion point is the way to handle it. Catalogers certainly could, as they have been doing that, it is currently in RDA, and hopefully catalogers know a little bit better about what that means by now. The question is, should we actually do it? Particularly since it is something that is been added to black & white, a compound term, and those can be problematic in a vocabulary. **Attig** feels that the appropriate question to include in the discussion paper is, “if this is what it is, do we want to continue to record it as part of this element?” He asked if this sounded like a reasonable way forward and invited contributions from the group.

Lapka responded that one more source to keep in mind is the very soon-to-be-published DCRM (Graphics) also treats the subject of tinting. In that context, they define it as a term used to describe prints, most often lithographs, in which the image in black appears against a light colored background that has been applied with a second or third colored stone, also used for photographs. **Attig** suggests that such a definition describes it as a chemical process, and might be a little bit too specific. He said he would take that into account and thanked Lapka for his comment. **Attig** thought that he assumed it could be applied to photographic film, and that was the limit of the use of that concept. If it applies to other types of graphic printings, it might be a little more complicated. The **Chair** asked Lapka if he knew if that definition talked about black & white images with color added to them – is it the same definition as the one in Attig’s proposal? **Lapka** replied that with tinting in lithography the primary visual image would be applied in one pass, and the color is added from a different stone upon another pass.

Glennan added that another thing that we can get into with tinting is hand-tinting of black & white film before color photography came through. That probably also needs to be addressed somehow, or explicitly not addressed. **Attig** asked if it is possible to make a distinction between hand-tinting and hand-coloring, as it sounded like what Glennan described is hand-coloring, which is a physical process rather than a mechanical process.

Myers responded that all of these are getting into very technical discussions. For the respective communities, these definitions are going to be very important and he advocates for seeing them addressed. However, these issues seem to be non-core. These might be the areas where the technical specification of color production are addressed, even in the case of grayscale, even though there are gradations of color and gradations of scale and hue when it is black & white. This might be the area where it is best to avoid over-specifying and going into details in the vocabulary, and instead just provide some options and definitions and let people develop them as is warranted. **Lipcan** responded that he is not sure that a lithograph that has been printed in multiple passes, one of them being black & white, is a tinted lithograph, even though it might be an overall application of the color. He agreed with **Myers**, that the instructions should not get too specific. The **Chair** pointed out that Lipcan was referring to the DCRM definition, which we do not necessarily have to consider. **Tarango** seconded Myers’s comment.

Attig stated that CC:DA’s discussion reinforced that this is a discussion paper at this point, and that we want to raise these questions with the widest possible audience. He thinks that we covered the important issues, unless there are other questions. He will add the results of this discussion to the paper and send it forward to the JSC. **Glennan** brought up a point about the strawman proposal. Right now it carries forward an RDA instruction about text in background – if the text in a resource is other than black and white, for persons with visual impairments, record

the colours of text and background. This needs to be generalized so we are not just talking about “text.” Glennan could not think of an example, but she could imagine a score or map or some other material that could be done in colors to support the visually impaired. She wondered if that instruction should be expanded, and asked for examples that are not text. **Attig** said that this would be appropriate as a discussion point. He was also reminded of something he had not mentioned earlier: it is fairly clear from the definitions of toning that sepia is in fact a specific type of toning and is not something different. It is one that the cataloging community has traditionally called out for special attention, but is in fact an example of toning. He suggested that the sepia issue could be pointed out as interesting information and ask if the practice should be continued.

The **Chair** asked if Attig would like to do some more work on his discussion paper now that he’d heard what people had to say, and re-present the paper before voting to move it forward. **Attig** asked if that would be the best idea, for CC:DA to see a revised version before taking a vote. The **Chair** noticed support in the room for this idea. **Attig** responded that he would try to get it done soon.

Lapka commented that the rare book community was considering bringing a proposal forward covering this same area, specifically having to do with hand-colored items in RDA 7.17.1, which says “For instructions on recording information on hand-colored items, see 3.21.” What the community was hoping to do was to change two words: “For instructions on recording information on copy-specific hand-colored items see 3.21” in order to make a distinction between hand-coloring that is treated as copy-specific versus hand-coloring that applies to the entire manifestation. **Glennan** asked, referencing her earlier statement, whether hand-coloring is already item-specific. Lapka responded no, not necessarily. **Myers** suggested that Audubon’s Birds of America were hand-colored. **Attig** suggested that when the RDA instructions were written, there was an assumption that it was by definition copy-specific. **Lapka** reiterated including that clarification in this proposal. **Attig** responded that he could do that. Since this is a discussion paper, we can put in anything that is relevant to the discussion.

The **Chair** confirmed that Attig had received everything he needed from the discussion. He reminded CC:DA members that they will see this paper again in the next few weeks, and should be prepared to vote on it.

1246. Report from the Chair on CaMMS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment

The **Chair** had nothing to report from the CaMMS Executive Committee. He met with them on June 30 to give them an update. Some CC:DA members have some announcements regarding proposals.

Maxwell reported that SAC is forwarding a discussion paper through the JSC representative on how to deal with the subject-related chapters of RDA. SAC will be asking CC:DA to quickly comment on that discussion paper for SAC. The **Chair** thanked Maxwell for sharing this information and clarified that Glennan will present the SAC proposal to the JSC, as she is the ALA representative. Even though Glennan is affiliated with CC:DA and not SAC, CC:DA does not need to vote on the paper. But given CC:DA’s history and relationship with the JSC and revision proposals, SAC is inviting CC:DA to make comments on the proposal. CC:DA does not

have control over the proposal and should respect what SAC has decided, but CC:DA members and liaisons are welcome to make comments.

Lipcan updated CC:DA on an item he reported on in the new business section of the CC:DA meeting at Midwinter 2013. The Cataloging Advisory Committee of ARLIS/NA has proposed to PCC that artists' monographs and exhibition catalogs be added to the list of exceptions for collective conventional titles in the LC-PCC PS for RDA 25.1. While this is explicitly related to RDA's rule, the role of the illustrations in these publications is to support the discussion of the works of the artists who are the subject of the publication. This is a continuation of the practice of having both a subject and an author heading or access point for the artists. The proposal is to just give the artist's name as an added entry, and not include a collective conventional title. The proposal has been submitted and is now in hands of the LC Policy & Standards Committee.

The **Chair** reported that he had an email exchange with Snyder that included some potential issues, and invited her to speak about their exchange. **Snyder** brought up two things she wondered about, and invited CC:DA to decide by email what to do about the following issues. Regarding relationship designators in Appendix J for work to work relationships, the reciprocals for a textual work and a musical work that uses that textual work are: "musical setting of" and "musical setting." Snyder thought it would be more intuitive to change "musical setting" to "set to music as." This would bring this type of work relationship into line with the existing relationship designators "dramatized as" and others like that. She also noticed that there are a significant number of others that might benefit from a similar revision, and wondered why all the relationship designators do not follow this pattern of using "verb + as." For example, "abstract" might be better as "abstracted as," "novelization" could maybe be better as "novelized as," etc. **Snyder** wondered if there was a historical reason for why this was done this way, and if CC:DA wanted to take a broad look at the relationship designators in Appendix J. **Attig** commented that this issue might qualify as a fast-track change, but there needs to be discussion first. The **Chair** noted that he and Snyder would work with Glennan after September or November about this issue, and this might be something for CC:DA to deal with at Midwinter.

Snyder raised a second issue relating to the last-resort phrases "place of publication not identified" or "publisher not identified," etc., in RDA. The recommendation is to never use that phrase unless the cataloger truly has no idea of the information, and feels that it would be unfair to even put a bracketed [United States?] or [North America?], or even [Earth]. But the publisher, manufacturer, and distributor statements in RDA have what at Cornell they call a "cascading vortex of horror," where if the place of publication is not identified, then all of a sudden the distribution becomes core, and creates a chain of "core...if" statements, so the record winds up containing a kind of ridiculous suite of 264 statements that all use this clunky phrase "...not identified." That has been the understanding at Cornell of this situation, that all of these elements become core. But a recent conversation on RDA-L suggested that maybe the "cascading vortex" does not really exist because advice from LChelp4rda pointed to the definition of "core" in RDA 1.3, which includes the wording, "elements that are applicable and readily ascertainable." So maybe manufacturer, distribution, etc. just are not applicable to the resource being described. If that is the case, then what do all these "core...if" statements mean? **Snyder** summarized her question as: Is it true that the "cascading vortex of horror" does not really exist? How is that interpretation of the RDA definition of "core" reconciled with this?

The **Chair** recommended that CC:DA think about this issue, as it caused a big discussion on the RDA list. **Myers** commented that this issue needs to take up dates as well. There is a recurring issue of “recorded in the resource” versus “recorded in the description of the resource” with respect to dates. The 264 1# subfield c and 264 4# subfield c have gone through three iterations. It would be nice if the roles were sufficiently clear that catalogers do not have to rely on an LC-PCC PS regarding that. **Maxwell** remarked that he would like to have this looked into more closely than to just think about it. The operative phrase is not “applicable” but “readily ascertainable,” and in every other case from every other situation the solution is to just leave it out. He did not understand why cataloging practice insisted that there must be “place of publication not identified” if it is not readily ascertainable. The **Chair** thanked everyone for their comments, and promised that CC:DA would think about this issue after November. **Maxwell** suggested creating a task force immediately, but the **Chair** stated that CC:DA is not ready to do this now, with all the other task forces, papers, and proposals pending, but will tackle it after Midwinter. **Attig** and the Chair suggested that Snyder and the Chair, and any other interested parties, could write a document explaining this issue for Midwinter and formal action could be taken at that time.

The **Chair** asked if there was any other new business or reports from the floor. As there were none, he pointed out a few brief personnel changes: Sandra Macke is a new voting member who replaced John DeSantis; Bob Wolverton is rotating off and the Chair thanked him for four years of service; Mary Anne Dyer will be taking his place; and Michael Babinec will be taking her place as Intern at Midwinter.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 am.