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
2014 Midwinter Meeting in Philadelphia, Pa.
January 25 and 27, 2014

Members present:
Peter J. Rolla, Chair
Dominique Bourassa
Patricia M. Dragon
Steve Kelley
Sandra Macke
Robert Rendall
Larisa Walsh
Mary Anne Dyer

Melanie Polutta, CC:DA Webmaster
Elyssa Sanner, Intern
Michael Babinec, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:
Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Dave Reser, Library of Congress

ALA Liaisons present:
Jennifer Baxmeyer, ALA/ACRL
Richard Guajardo, ALA/GODORT
Francis Lapka, ALA/ACRL/RBMS
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee
John Myers, MAC
TJ Kao, 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:
John Hostage, AALL
Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA
Dorothy McGarry, SLA
Kelley McGrath, OLAC

Cory Nimer, SAA
Lori Robare, PCC
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
MAC = MARC Advisory 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, January 25, 1:00-5:30 p.m.

Doubletree, Ormandy Ballroom

1247. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Peter Rolla, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1248. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group [CC:DA/Roster/2014]

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.

1249. Adoption of agenda: Chair [CC:DA/A/68]

The agenda was adopted without changes.

1250. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2013 Annual Conference, June 28 and July 1, 2013: Chair [CC:DA/M/1225-1246]

The **Chair** acknowledged posting to the website proposed changes to the minutes. **Dyer** moved to approve the minutes incorporating those changes, **Bourassa** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

1251. Report from the Chair [Chair's report on CC:DA motions and other actions July-December 2013]

The **Chair** noted his report on the actions taken by CC:DA online from July through December 2013 and called for a voice vote to confirm and approve the votes taken electronically. **Dragon** moved to do so, **Walsh** seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

The **Chair** circulated signup sheets to the committee, liaisons, and visitors for two task forces to be formed after Midwinter. Both task forces were approved by CC:DA at ALA Annual 2013.

1. A new task force to look at a discussion paper by Adam Schiff on pseudonymous identities of corporate bodies.
2. A revived task force on recording relationships. This group, chaired by Putnam, has been working on the issue for a couple of years but has lost members recently and needs new people. There is still time to draft a discussion paper for JSC in November. The task force will look at structured descriptions and relationships such as work-to-work and work-to-manifestation. There is a need to clarify these relationships in places like contents notes (about which RDA has nothing to say).

Anyone interested in being on either task force is urged to contact the **Chair** for more information.

1252. Discussion of CC:DA minutes: Chair

The **Chair** continued a discussion begun earlier on the Rules listserv about a proposed new format for CC:DA minutes, and thanked participants for their input. In those emails, the **Chair** asked: do you refer to the minutes, how often, and for what specific purpose? Interns do most of the work on minutes which are then proofread by the Chair and volunteers. It is a big effort resulting in long documents — for example, the minutes for Annual Conference meetings can exceed 60 pages. Is this the best use of CC:DA's effort? The **Chair** invited further comments. Highlights of those comments include:

- Earlier availability of minutes: **Glennan**, as the JSC representative, asked that the minutes be available before the next JSC meeting with less detail in order to have more promptness. The **Chair** noted that the CC:DA constitution and bylaws say the minutes should be available by one month before the next ALA meeting, which is not soon enough for the JSC calendar.
- Detail of the minutes: **Myers** noted that the details in the minutes helps those responsible for reporting to other bodies, and that anything that streamlines the process so that minutes are available to liaisons is welcome. He also noted that transcription was emphasized in recent years as the minutes covered review of RDA drafts, but is not necessarily needed anymore.
- Archive of audio files: **Macke** suggested that an archive of the raw sound files be made available to the committee members.

The **Chair** announced that we will aim for a middle ground between pure transcription on the one hand and a barebones summary on the other. A narrative format will be kept for continuity with previous meetings' minutes, but the interns will have more leeway to summarize important arguments and concentrate on the points made rather than the back-and-forth of discussion. The goals are to be more succinct and get the minutes out faster. Please email the **Chair** with any further comments.

1253. Report from the Library of Congress representative: Reser [Library of Congress report, January 2014]

Reser reported on activities of and staff changes at LC. See the LC report for details. In addition to the content of the written report, **Reser** noted that LC hopes to fill 3 of the 5 currently vacant division chief positions this year.

1254. Report of the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Glennan [Report on JSC Meeting, November 4-8, 2013, and on other JSC activities July-Dec. 2013]

Glennan gave highlights from her report on the November 2013 JSC meeting and other activities of the Committee since July 2013. See the written report for details. Highlights of Glennan's report include:

- Summaries of the outcomes of the meeting.
- ALA publishing plans 4 releases this calendar year, in February, April, August, and October. JSC is finalizing the text of those updates. Because the cost of updating RDA depends on the number of chapters touched, monitoring of the changes is needed.

Avoiding delays is desirable, but all minor changes might not be published immediately to keep costs under control.

- JSC is creating an updated strategic plan and accompanying work plan that will encompass the next 3 years but also address work annually and be updated annually.
- JSC is finalizing working groups on three specific issues.
- Anyone helping **Glennan** write future proposals or discussion papers should note that the JSC will now include an abstract with each of these formal papers for use on the JSC website and in announcements because the titles are not descriptive enough.
- The 2014 JSC meeting is tentatively set for November 3-7 in Washington, DC. Expect deadlines to be similar to 2013: the end of July for proposals and discussion papers, the end of September for our responses to constituency proposals. Once the JSC finalizes those dates, we will finalize the deadlines for CC:DA.

Glennan described the outcome of ALA's proposals to the JSC:

- **6JSC/ALA/22: Revision of A.29, Capitalization of hyphenated compounds; changes in *Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th edition (2010):** Several of the JSC's other constituents did not support the proposal, so it was withdrawn. However, two heading-related changes from within the proposal were accepted.
- **6JSC/ALA/23, Revision proposal for RDA instructions for treaties:** Was generally accepted with changes at the meeting. **Glennan** thanked John Hostage, who worked with her to prepare a follow-up proposal incorporating the changes. The revised proposal is being reviewed by JSC and changes will appear in a future update of the RDA Toolkit.
- **6JSC/ALA/24, Variant title as access point (RDA 6.27.4.1, 6.28.4.1, 6.29.3.1, 6.30.5.1, 6.31.3.1):** Not accepted. The RDA Examples Group is working on providing appropriate examples to clarify those situations.
- **6JSC/ALA/25, RDA Appendix K Revision and Expansion:** Was not accepted as written, though the JSC did see the need for it. The JSC agreed on general principles, detailed on page 12-13 of the report, for when the proposal is referred back to CC:DA.
- **6JSC/ALA/26, Colour Content (RDA 7.17):** JSC discussed the paper, but ALA decided to withdraw it because a different approach was needed. CILIP plans a proposal, expected in 2014, which will model color as two distinct elements: 1. identification of monochrome vs. polychrome, and 2. description of various production processes such as tinting and toning that can modify the color content. CC:DA will need to comment on CILIP's proposal.
- **6JSC/ALA/Discussion/1, Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA:** JSC encouraged revision proposals to create an Extent of Expression element and to develop an Aspect-Unit-Quantity model. The recommendation to create an Extent of Item element was not accepted, and issues relating to extending the RDA/ONIX Framework were referred to a new JSC working group.
- **6JSC/ALA/Discussion/2, Treatment of Subjects in RDA:** The decision is to wait for reconciliation work by the FRBR Review Group before making substantive changes because RDA needs to stay in sync with FRBR. However, it was accepted that ALA could propose a high level relationship element in RDA Chapter 23. The SAC RDA subcommittee will work on that, with a proposal expected in 2014. While CC:DA does not vote on SAC proposals, it will be made available for comment.

- **6JSC/ALA/Discussion/3, Instructions for Recording Relationships:** Key issues were discussed and referred back to ALA for creation of proposal in 2014. The **Chair** mentioned that he is looking for volunteers for this task force.

Glennan reviewed follow-up actions for ALA, described in detail on pages 16-17 of her report.

Glennan presented a possible ALA action for consideration by the committee. In response to 6/JSC/ACOC/9 about adding qualifications after an identifier (such as "paperback" after an ISBN), the JSC is not interested in making a proposal, but CC:DA could do so. In discussing whether to pursue this, CC:DA members made the following points:
- Qualifiers for ISBN/ISSN: These qualifiers are not parsed, and separate subfields do not exist in MARC for the qualifier. It was mentioned that if the complaint is articulated in terms of subfields, then MARC is the context in which subfields occur. If it is articulated in terms of elements, then that is an issue for CC:DA. The **Chair** suggested that anecdotal evidence would be helpful in determining if catalogers would like to be able to record these elements.
- Recording versus transcribing: More examples are desired because the current examples are not sufficient to provide guidance. The JSC had a lengthy discussion about abbreviations being used in the qualifiers, if those abbreviations are recorded or transcribed (i.e. "pbk."). Ultimately the discussion determined that qualifiers were recorded, not transcribed. Glennan noted that Appendix B has some instructions that apply to this. The JSC was not ready to make a decision one way or another, but adding examples would add clarification.
- Support for or against creating a proposal: **John Attig** noted that this is not a simple proposal, and maybe the upcoming structural changes in RDA will make this easier. **Robare** commented that this proposal is not at the top of PCC's agenda.

The **Chair** asked Glennan to add this to the list of possible topics for CC:DA to work on at a later date.

Glennan noted that six previous ALA commitments are still pending. See pages 17-18 of her report for details. These commitments include:
- Bible – Apocrypha: **Glennan** recommends waiting for the 2014 proposal from the DNB/LC to see if this issue is resolved. **Reser** recalled earlier proposals under AACR2 to remove Apocrypha as a subdivision, but it did not happen; **Robare** recommended reviewing the minutes from those discussions to determine the specific conversation.
- Bible – year: referred to theological associations for guidance. **Maxwell** noted that there is a direct contradiction in RDA as written: the element is called "date of expression" but the instruction says "record the year of publication" [i.e., the date of manifestation, not the expression. He recommended that the contradiction be fixed. The **Chair** asked that Maxwell email him about this issue.
- Bible – version: this has been referred to subject experts in the ALA umbrella but no action has been taken.
- Expressions of religious works: **Myers** recalled a preliminary report previously produced by CC:DA that recommended the general rule regarding religious works be put at the beginning of the rule, and then follow it by religion-specific instructions. He

recommended finding the report in the website archive and forwarding it to DNB and LC.
Glennan said she would take care of this.

- **John Attig** noted that CC:DA normally only considers religious-based issues in response
  to others' actions. Therefore, the appropriate thing to do is to acknowledge that the
  specialists have been informed of the issues.
- Illustrative content: this was referred to OLAC to consider including audio/video clips as
  well as print. **McGrath** commented that it is not a high priority for OLAC as they are
  overextended with interpreting RDA for mainstream formats.
- General guidelines on recording names containing a surname, etc.: this is from 2010.
  Glennan asked if the RDA rewording project solved this problem. **Myers** suggested that
  CC:DA look at RDA as released versus RDA as revised to see if this is still a problem.
  Maxwell said he would take a look at this issue and report to the rules email list.

Glennan outlined other outstanding commitments:

- Inconsistency between statement of responsibility in RDA Chapter 2 and artistic elements
  in RDA Chapter 7: A discussion paper or proposal for the JSC would be nice by the
  November 2014 meeting. The **Chair** reminded CC:DA that this topic is on the agenda for
  Monday, and the group held off discussions until that time.
- 6/JSC/ALA/16, Video encoding formats: ALA was asked to make proposals to fix the
  errors, but OLAC does not have the technical expertise. **Glennan** asked if CC:DA agreed
  that this is important and knew of any group to help OLAC. **John Attig** commented that
  ALA did respond with a fast track proposal to fix the obvious errors; the JSC wanted to
  take a different approach. **McGrath** stated that OLAC took a practical approach. A
  proposal is needed to enable extra terminology that will help both patrons and staff
  members when loaning materials. **Tarango** commented that this is more of an issue for
  the preservation community, especially when considering reformatting or migrating video
  formats. He suggested that the preservation community would have the appropriate
  technical expertise. **Roeder** will send this issue to PARS and report back.

1255. Five proposals from the ALA Representative to the JSC: Glennan

Several of these proposals were failed ALA fast-track proposals that will now go forward as
proposals. The remaining proposals arose either out of discussions in CC:DA or from individuals
who brought the issues to CC:DA.

   A. **KPG-2013-01:** Revision of RDA 2.12.9.2 and 2.12.17.2: Source of numbering within
      series and subseries [available here]

This proposal is nearly ready to go forward, but it is up to CC:DA to decide whether to approve
it and send it to the JSC. There are conflicting instructions for source of numbering in series and
subseries. The solution is to modify the language to follow similar language in other places in
RDA instructions. Discussion included:
- Continuing resources community: **Tarango** noted that the community is supportive of
  this proposal.

- Digital surrogates: discussion ensued around whether "other digital surrogate" could be included as an option, but it was decided that digital surrogates should be handled separately.
- Transcribed element: As this is a transcribed element, **Kevin Randall** asked if there is a provision to take information from outside the source. **Maxwell** responded that RDA 2.2.4 allows for this.
- CONSER's opinion: **Thurstan Young** from the British Library asked about CONSER's view on this proposal. **Tarango**, while a supporter of the proposal, did not know.

Glennan suggested holding a vote until Monday at the earliest. She expressed a desire to see this issue wrapped up before Annual. The **Chair** asked Robare, as the PCC representative, for her opinion. **Robare** responded that as Tarango has already surveyed the continuing resources community, she senses there is support for this proposal but is happy to wait for an official survey. **Rendall** voiced his opinion that as this is not specifically a CONSER issue because the numbering on series can be on both monographs and serials, but most commonly on monographs, PCC should voice an opinion but the proposal's fate should not rest on PCC's opinion. **Tarango** mentioned that this issue could be discussed at the PCC at-large meeting Sunday morning and brought back to CC:DA's Monday meeting. As no one outside of CC:DA has likely looked at the proposal, **Glennan** felt that the Sunday PCC meeting would not be a good opportunity for discussion.

Feeling that there had been enough input from the serials community during the discussion, the **Chair** invited a motion to approve the proposal CC:DA/JSC Rep/KPG/2013/1 and send it to the JSC. Moved by **Kelley**, seconded by **Rendall**. The motion passed unanimously.

   B. **KPG-2013-02:** Problems with RDA 3.4.5.9, Leaves or Pages of Plates [available here]

Glennan highlighted the problems identified in this proposal regarding leaves and pages of plates. She asked if additional problems exist beyond those already identified in the paper. The main questions are: should this be clarified, and if so, are there additional problems beyond those already identified? How should we proceed, and who would like to work on developing a proposal to solve these problems? Discussion included:
- Difficulties in following AACR2 practices in RDA: **Myers** articulated that there is a lot of work that could be done under this topic, as there are inherent difficulties in RDA with following or advancing AACR2's practice of recording subunits of printed materials in one volume versus multivolume situations.
- Problems with the proposal: **Maxwell** expressed concerns over the early printed resources exception and the disregard clause. He felt that the exception is not misplaced because it *is* an exception.
- Plates in electronic resources: **Sprochi** observed that plates in electronic resources are odd – a plate is a purely print artifact. **Tarango** agreed with the proposal, as he did not want his e-resources catalogers to edit the plate information out of the record, as many e-records are derived from the print record.
- Relevance of this proposal to the TF on Machine-Actionable Data: The **Chair** asked Lapka if this proposal falls into the purview of Lapka's TF. **Lapka** assumed that this is still in scope for the TF, although **John Attig** stated that the TF is concentrating on how

to make information available in a machine-actionable format, not what and how to record.
- Clarification needed on this issue: **Robare** said that she has received questions from PCC catalogers asking for clarification, so as a practical matter it should be clarified.
- How to solve the problem: One option is to have a TF to look at this. **Sprochi** noted that there are a lot of different problems that will be brought up if this issue is looked into, and requires more time. **Glennan** stated that some instructions elsewhere in RDA may serve as a model. A fast-track proposal is not an option, but discussing the solution(s) with LC before sending it to the JSC is possible. **Glennan** feels that if there is interest, volunteers are needed for a task force. **Sprochi** felt that this is important, as someone who teaches cataloging, since this issue is a very difficult thing to explain, or figure out, even for experienced catalogers.
- Clarification of the problem itself: **Maxwell** asked for a clarifying summary of the problem to be addressed. **Glennan** summarized that there is a level of confusion: perceived conflict, disregarding unnumbered sequences, the definition of "plate," the fact that there is no reference on how to record unnumbered plates; there are several elements to the problem. All of these indicate that the instruction could be clarified.

The **Chair** stated that although he hears support for working on this, he also hears a bit of skepticism. The topic was tabled for now and will be revisited on Monday.

C. **KPG-2013-03:** Revision of RDA 9.19 to address placement of instructions regarding "Spirit" [available here]

Glennan would like to clean up this instruction, from an intellectual standpoint: there is a lot of looping back and forth in 9.19.1.2, and the current placement of the instruction for the term "Spirit" is not the most logical within the hierarchy. The instructions all work, even though they are not organized in the way she would have chosen. However, she recognizes that changes may not be necessary, since the April update to RDA will include changes to 9.19.1.2. It may not then be worth untying this knot right now since most of CC:DA has not yet seen the revised text. She recommends waiting for the April update to decide whether to work on this proposal. Some discussion ensued:
- Logical organization: **Maxwell** suggested that the order is not clearly and logically organized. **Reser** stated that the LC follow-up committee tried to do this, and realizes that it is confusing. The **Chair** asked Maxwell to take a look at the instruction after the April update to determine if it needs to be updated. **Glennan** said that the LC proposal is to add phrases in various places to address this issue.
- Redundancy in 9.19.1.8: **Myers** observed that this proposal creates redundancy with 9.19.1.2. **Glennan** acknowledged that this perceived redundancy was her own attempt to clarify the order.

The **Chair** noted that CC:DA cannot judge the effectiveness of the LC proposal because the April revisions are not available, and tabled the topic until after the April revision to see if this remains an issue.

D. **KPG-2013-04:** Core elements in Distribution and Manufacture Statements: what constitutes "applicable and readily ascertainable"? [available here]

As this is a proposal for the involved "cascading vortex of horror," the topic was tabled until a point in the meeting with more time for discussions.

E. **KPG-2013-05:** Date of Production and Date of Manufacture elements – should a priority order be provided to prefer data in the resource itself first? [available here]

There is a conflict in RDA regarding the source of dates and how to indicate supplied dates. This applies to both the date of production and the date of manufacture. Should the same approach be done for both elements? Different? What to include or not? Discussion included:

- Date of production: **Walsh** stated that the date of production should not be included in this discussion as archival collections, etc. would constitute unpublished resources. **Glennan** noted that some materials might have a "date of creation" associated with them on the resource, and some would not. Some unpublished resources do contain dates. **Sprochi** agreed that there frequently are dates on things, and would prefer a "take it from the item itself" instead of "take from the source of description." The issue is that if a date of production is used, the cataloger cannot tell where it was taken from.
- Archival materials: **Nimer** noted that the tradition in the archival community is to not put dates in brackets if the dates are on the resource.
- Unpublished manuscripts: **Lapka** noted that it was odd that the other two elements are transcribed in RDA. **Elizabeth O'Keefe** spoke for the museum community, noting that dates are put in unpublished materials, but there is no confidence that the date was not put there by another individual. It is important to record the date's presence, but not to treat it as a transcribed element.
- Summary: **Glennan** summarized that changing 2.7.6.2 was not necessary, and that would require removing date of production from the list of transcribed elements.
- Conflicting rules: **Lapka** noted that 2.7.6.7 requires information to be taken from outside the resource, and therefore it is at conflict with DCRM and archival processing.

The **Chair** noted that some changes might need to be made to RDA to align RDA and DCRM/archival practice with each other. He suggested that CC:DA table this issue and try to deal with it on Monday, in order to think about the issue further.

1256. Report from the TF on Machine-Actionable Data: Lapka

Lapka noted that Glennan covered many of the relevant JSC updates. The TF will coordinate closely with the JSC RDA/ONIX Task Force. 6JSC/ALA/14 will be folded into this task force's activity. On the agenda for this weekend, **Lapka** noted that the discussion for creating RDA 7.2.2 on duration is relevant to extent of content. The **Chair** agreed that duration bears looking at and will possibly be folded into the TF's work.

John Attig commented that dealing with more structural issues will explode the text of RDA and CC:DA needs to be flexible about reworking it. He assumes that the desired outcome is

recommendations for changing the element set to deal with structural issues, as well as revised instructions for how to handle and encode this information.

1257. Presentation from Gordon Dunsire, Chair of the JSC, with Q&A [PowerPoint presentation**]**

Gordon Dunsire is the current chair of the JSC, and has been involved with the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data since its beginning. He gave a presentation entitled "RDA for Machines" about the RDA carrier, media, and content types and how they fit in with the RDA/ONIX Framework, issues related to the concept of extent and the work of the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data.

1258. Open discussion with Gordon Dunsire

Sprochi asked if RDA was close to the model he presented, and if not, how it might get there. **Dunsire** responded that RDA does need to change; it might take a significant amount of time for RDA to change to match this, but the impact will be radical. **Sprochi** wondered if visualization would help others understand RDA and the RDA/ONIX framework.

Lapka asked who Dunsire sees as the party in charge to make the differentiation between extent and the expressions for extent. **Dunsire** believes the terms are mixed up. The framework is meant to act as an intermediary between communities.

John Attig commented that the RDA/ONIX framework is dealing with the categories as described by Dunsire, and RDA was based on Tom Delsey's thoughts on categories. The categories have to begin on the RDA side.

1259. Five Proposals from the ALA Representative to the JSC (continuation of discussion)

As time still remained, the **Chair** returned the discussion to the proposals from the JSC representative. **Glennan** introduced KPG-2013-04, or the "cascading vortex of horror." This is Cornell's name for the situation where RDA requires the recording of specific core elements, and multiple fields could have "X not identified" in publication, manufacture, and distribution statements if such information is not available. A second interpretation of RDA holds that as this information is not readily available or ascertainable, it is not applicable and therefore not possible to record the information, and the core elements should be left off. CC:DA had a very lively discussion on this topic, with several viewpoints raised and with some disagreements about how to proceed. The extent of the discussion indicates that we have an issue here worth giving our attention to. The following section of the minutes attempts to record all of the various individual viewpoints expressed as well as the decisions that were made on this topic.
The two interpretations as explained above show that clarification is needed: what does RDA actually say, what interpretation does CC:DA want RDA to say, and what adjustments need to be made to this situation? **The Chair** asked if anyone had an issue with putting forward a proposal to eliminate the "cascading vortex of horror." The group agreed that this was not a desirable outcome. **Myers** suggested that "if publication statement is not identified, record these core

elements in this order of priority." He suggested that the overall clarification could be "record what you have, not what you do not have."

John Attig commented that Myers' suggested clarification would assign significance to the absence of a data element. The reason the instructions are so explicit is because then it is clear that a data element is missing, instead of it simply being omitted. **Maxwell** commented that the interpretation of the "cascading vortex of horror" is because the title proper and publication statement are core according to cataloger practice. He believes that the RDA statement "if applicable and readily ascertainable" gives the cataloger a reason not to record the publication statement if information is indeed not applicable and not readily ascertainable. He suggested that cataloger practice needs to change, not the text of RDA.

Putnam commented that since this is a problem, it needs to be stated again later on in RDA Chapter 2. **Maxwell** thinks that the problem is in the practice, not the rules. **Sprochi** commented that when looking at a record, she would assume that the transcribed fields are indeed transcribed, and that the cataloger used his or her judgment in recording some elements instead or in place of other elements because the first element was not present. **Maxwell** responded that such an assumption would be incorrect according to current cataloging practice. **Sprochi** clarified that when RDA was adopted, she assumed that that is what RDA meant in recording the publication, manufacture, and distribution statements. **Maxwell** countered that that is not what the RDA rules tell catalogers to do.

Thurstan Young remarked that there is a possibility of supplying probable publication information based on distribution and manufacture information, as a way to avoid the "cascading vortex of horror." **Hostage** commented that catalogers are interested in recording the statements, not the individual elements. The place of publication is relevant to the publisher, and catalogers can deduce the place based on the publisher. He is of the opinion that catalogers do not need the manufacture and distributor information. **The Chair** asked Hostage if RDA's "core-if" statements allow catalogers to do just that, and **Hostage** responded that there is a problem with the way RDA currently states this. RDA should be rephrased, keeping in mind the idea of the publication statement as a whole to get away from recording individual elements.

Tarango prefers to provide information when available, and infer information when needed. However, he has catalogers who prefer not to potentially mislead patrons by providing inferred information. **Sprochi** stated that the problem of inferring a place of publication from a distribution or manufacture statement is that it would result in three separately coded MARC 264 fields. **Thurstan Young** commented that a "cascading vortex of horror" would still exist from the MARC encoding standpoint. **Maxwell** responded that he did not think the information would be there unless it was readily ascertainable. **Myers** said that his sense of the "cascading vortex of horror" is that it pulls the cataloger down a rabbit hole saying that there is a matrix of three sub-elements (place, name, date) and three statements (publication, distribution, manufacture). If a resource lacks information at the upper levels, the RDA rules require the cataloger to fill in the levels as the cataloger works down, or fill in the levels that the cataloger has. His sense is that the cataloger should fill in the information that he or she has, and leave the pieces blank that the cataloger does not have. He asked if this is what CC:DA wants, what is the best method for articulating this. **The Chair** commented that the desirable goal is to only fill in what the

cataloger has. The real question is can catalogers interpret RDA to allow catalogers to do that, or does RDA require that catalogers must fill in the whole grid?

Maxwell said that RDA does allow us to do that, but we can also improve RDA to make this understanding more explicit, by adding instructions that say "if this is not available, do not record it." **Hostage** thought that changing things would make the publication, distribution, and manufacture statements not core. **Hostage** believes that the publication information is the most useful. The long "place of publication not identified" phrase is not desired or useful, neither is a filled in statement of distribution or manufacture.

Steve Harkow wondered if there could be a separate set of rules for rare book cataloging, and another set for regular cataloging. He expressed concern that if no statements are included in a record, even "place of publication not identified," the absence of data could cause machine-actionable problems. **John Attig** agreed.

Kevin Randall asked if any ISBD considerations need to be incorporated in this discussion. **John Attig** said no, and that RDA is already not compatible with ISBD.

Terry Frick commented that the cataloging community should consider what the patrons want. Do the patrons want "place of publication not identified"? Do catalogers have the time to input this information?

Deborah Fritz commented that if something is published, the publication statement is applicable. If the publication statement is not readily ascertainable, the cataloger should guess. The statement "place of publication not identified" means that the cataloger looked for it, could not guess the statement, and therefore recorded that. In this situation, nothing means something. This can be helpful for copy catalogers and machines when determining information in the future. If a distribution statement is not present, then it is not applicable. She believes it is not possible to have a distribution or manufacture statement without a publication statement. **Fritz** said that this should be clarified in RDA, if this is what the cataloging community believes.

John Attig said that there are applications like machine matching of data and designing user end displays, when the designer needs to know the rules in order to design the displays or interfaces. He believes that leaving the element blank limits what can be done in current and future applications. However, **John Attig** acknowledges that the data required to record in the "cascading vortex of horror" is not incredibly useful to anyone. **Maxwell** commented that the current practice takes some mental energy, and he is not opposed to the current practice of listing the publication statement as well as other statements if available and needed. However, this needs to be clarified in RDA.

Glennan commented that some resources no longer come with the publication place listed on the item in hand. She would rather record that "there is nothing on this item that discussed publication" and have the option to record distribution information if a cataloger thinks it will be helpful. She suggested changing manufacture and distribution to NOT be core, in an effort to provide an option if cataloger's judgment would direct a cataloger in that direction if it is helpful to their patrons. Publication information would remain core.

Maxwell would like to keep the core as written, but if the group would like to change RDA to say that the publication statement really is required, even if it is not ascertainable, then you need to say "it must be recorded even if it is not ascertainable," because as RDA is currently written, the publication statement need not be recorded if it is not readily ascertainable. Therefore, a clarification in the rules would be necessary.

Tarango asked what OCLC would say about the potential for massive duplicate records due to Glennan's suggested clarification of RDA. **Weitz** said that OCLC looks first for MARC 264 _1 fields, then MARC 264 _2 fields, then MARC 264 _3 fields. Whichever field appears first is the one that is considered to contain the place of publication. OCLC has tried to over-simplify things in their matching algorithms. **Tarango** asked what relevance the priority matching on the MARC 264 fields is given when considering whether or not to merge records. **Weitz** responded that it is hard to say that any one particular element would cause a duplicate record situation, but for a particular element, in the case of place or publisher, OCLC has tended to consider the previously used "S.L." or "S.N." to be equal to anything else. To over-generalize, a "non-place" or "non-publisher" is equal to a named place or named publisher, with some exceptions.

Fritz commented that a publisher cannot be inferred from a distributor. If the publisher is not on the resource itself and cannot be identified from other sources, there is no publisher to list.

Maxwell reiterated his suggestion of these three statements being core only if they are readily ascertainable. In summarizing, **the Chair** commented that the publication statement would remain core, and the manufacture and distributor statements could be "core IF" no publisher is readily ascertainable. He stated that given the discussions, there is a need to change *something* in RDA to clarify the situation. **Robare** commented that Maxwell's approach seems like a clarifying solution. **Myers** commented that he has heard three actual possible interpretations discussed today: the full "cascading vortex of horror," the hopscotch version, and the in-between version where you articulate the publication statement regardless, and then hopscotch underneath. He suggested that the discussion be tabled until the members get home to discuss this situation with their colleagues.

Thurstan Young commented that he sees four current practices; the fourth interpretation is accepting the approach that the LC-PCC-PS provides. **The Chair** asked if the group could agree on whether to change RDA or if no changes need to occur. **Dragon** said that the group cannot decide if a change to RDA is desirable until the group decides how RDA should read. **Snyder** agreed with Dragon. **Maxwell** commented that some people do know what they would like to do. **Snyder** said that along with the "cascading vortex of horror," Cornell has a saying, "avoid the vortex, just guess!" She said that this does become a problem with some resources where the cataloger does not feel at all confident in guessing due to lack of information on the resource itself. **Rendall** commented that the discussion has included several different situations, which could be handled by different approaches. He suggested that seeing examples of various scenarios would aid understanding of the possible solutions.

The Chair asked if the desired interpretation is available in RDA as it is written. **Maxwell** said that it is, as many catalogers are "getting by" with the rules as-is. **John Attig** said that two very

different interpretations of the rules exist, and they are both justified, with means that the rules need to be changed in order to clarify what is meant. It comes down to how the cataloger interprets the "readily ascertainable" clause. In order to figure out what the rules are supposed to mean, the rules must be looked at more closely. **Kelley** suggested that for the straw poll, the question should be "should CC:DA consider looking at RDA in order to determine if there is a solution to the problem?"

Myers commented that there are a number of questions involved in KPG-04, the first question being is there an issue. **Maxwell** said that there are two issues: should RDA be changed, and should the core be changed or not. As the straw poll question, **The Chair** asked if the "cascading vortex of horror" is an issue and should it be dealt with by CC:DA. 32 voted yes, 6 voted no. Therefore, CC:DA will address this issue.

Tarango asked if the four solutions suggested could be written out and handled electronically. **Glennan** commented that she did not believe the LC-PCC-PS option could be on the table, as the problem begins when you go down the "not identified" path. **Glennan** summarized the three options in Myers' terms: the full vortex (everything not identified), the hopscotch around the grid (pick and choose what statement(s) to record), and the partial vortex (required publication statement and the other two statements as optional).

Thurstan Young reiterated that the "hopscotch" solution would not be acceptable in MARC. Separate fields with different indicator values would have to reflect the different levels (publication, distribution, manufacture). **Myers** clarified that the cataloger would not be required to fill in each subfield of the separate MARC 264 fields. **Glennan** commented that she did not like the hopscotch method because it would mean leaving information completely out of the field without acknowledging that the cataloger did that on purpose. **Snyder** asked if this situation paralleled the JSC's recent decision regarding the "shopping cart" approach to the place of publication. **Glennan** explained that this was an interpretation problem and the JSC solution means that the first location is required and any other locations are optional. **Maxwell** commented that he is not as bothered by not recording information, but what he would like to avoid is putting the "not identified" statements in all three (publisher, distributor, and manufacture) statements. He would prefer to record "publisher not identified" and then enter just one of the other statements.

Glennan asked if CC:DA is looking for a solution that does not even require the "cascading vortex of horror" unless the cataloger *chooses* to. The consensus was yes. **Rendall** asked if the manufacturer and distributor statements would be left as optional; **Maxwell** answered yes. **Tarango** and **Maxwell** offered to help Glennan gather examples of each scenario.
As the scheduled meeting time had ended but the committee had not come to a complete decision, **The Chair** recessed the meeting and indicated that CC:DA would return to this discussion on Monday.

Monday, January 27, 2014, 8:30-11:30 am
Doubletree, Ormandy Ballroom

1260. Welcome and opening remarks

The Chair reconvened the CC:DA Midwinter Meeting at 8:30am and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors. Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

1261. Report from the MAC Representative: Myers [MAC Representative's Report, January 2014]

Myers reported on MAC actions at the Midwinter meeting regarding three proposals and four discussion papers. The three proposals passed, and three of the four discussion papers will return as proposals. The fourth discussion paper was resolved in a manner that did not require a proposal.

The Chair of MAC reminded MAC members that MAC is now an independent group sponsored by LC, which advises the MARC Steering Group. Under this new arrangement, rather than just participating in the discussions, members of MAC vote on decisions. The MAC minutes will be more precise, focusing on reporting the actions of the committee and not recording the full discussion.

See the MAC representative's report for details on the three approved proposals.

MAC discussion papers and actions:

- 2014-DP01 explored whether and how to indicate that the resource described in a preliminary record is not subsequently published. Several options were explored, including the existing MARC 366 field. This discussion paper will likely return as a proposal leveraging existing MARC field 366 and a new code value in the Leader/05 byte.
- 2014-DP02 explored how to establish relationships between headings derived from different thesauri. Various mechanisms were discussed. This discussion paper will likely return as proposal along the same lines.
- 2014-DP03 explored the development of subfield g, "miscellaneous information," in subject and geographic fields in bibliographic and authority formats, which are MARC fields 650, 651, 150, and 151. This information is usually in the nature of qualifiers that the German cataloging community puts in a separate subfield. There was general support for the intent of the discussion paper, which will return as a proposal.
- 2014-DP04 explored options for improving the user-friendliness of RDA's relationship designators. The submitters of the discussion paper acknowledged that neither solution was optimal. The first option was convenient, which was to truncate the relationship designators down to just the root word and not complicate it with the qualifier/expression and not-qualified for works. Various coding solutions were in option 2, which were acknowledged as clunky. It was mentioned that the JSC is focusing its work in 2014 to resolve the user-unfriendliness of these terms. Gordon Dunsire, the JSC Chair and JSC representative at the committee meeting, preferred option 1 in hopes of a more robust solution, either within RDA and/or outside of MARC. Following this recommendation,

the solution will provide user best-practices, meaning that there is no need for a subsequent proposal.

1262. Report from the PCC liaison: Robare [PCC Liaison's Report, January 2014]

Robare highlighted a few updates from her PCC report. The most notable development is that at the November meeting of the PCC Policy Committee, PoCo decided that there will be an end date for new PCC AACR2 cataloging, just as there was an end date for NACO authority work in AACR2 in Spring 2013. This end date is December 31, 2014 for BIBCO and CONSER contributions. If the records are not fully RDA compliant after January 1, 2015, the libraries cannot code the records as PCC.

Another big development is the changing practice for undifferentiated personal names. This is covered in DCM Z1, 400832. As of November 2013, the new guidelines say that LC and PCC have agreed not to use code b for an undifferentiated personal name in RDA name authority records; all names should be differentiated. PCC will also not add a new identity to an existing name authority record coded "b." Instead, one of the RDA attributes in RDA 9.19 will be applied to create a unique access point.

There were also some instructions made for the maintenance of existing records. There was some discussion at the PCC At-Large meeting on Sunday, January 26, to provide guidance on the instructions.

Standing committee updates:
- The Standing Committee on Automation is working on specifications for automated changes to bibliographic records in RDA.
- The Standing Committee on Standards has revised the CONSER standard record to incorporate information for rare materials; this has been sent out for comments, which are due on February 14, 2014. The CONSER standard record will be implemented shortly after that.
- Micro Reproductions Task Force has sent the report to PoCo and will have some recommendations soon and have those out for the PCC community later this spring, before the Operations Committee meeting.
- PCC has received 16 relationship designator proposals through the form on the PCC website, and encourages submitting suggestions via the form.
- A position paper from Mary Jane Cuneo on series as form of work, qualifier, and in relationship designators was discussed. An RDA series policy group will be submitting an assessment on PCC policies relating to series in the coming months.
- Standing Committee on Training has been working on series training materials, with a public release in the spring. The committee is also developing online training modules on the use of relationship designators in bibliographic records, and anticipates doing the same for relationship designators in authority records. A "Train the Trainer" online module is being developed as they do not have a lot of trainers to train others in NACO RDA.
- There is a new BIBCO funnel for Hebraica names. There is interest in looking at existing NACO funnels to determine if any could transition to being BIBCO funnels as well.

Myers asked how the wider PCC community has considered the NACO implications of RDA decisions for non-PCC members. As editing possibilities of the community have been expanded, non-PCC libraries can now edit authority records. **Myers** asked that PCC be aware of the implications. **Robare** responded that this has not been considered yet. The RDA NACO training is newly developed and fairly extensive, and the group has been concentrating on training for existing NACO members. She will take Myers' feedback to PCC. **Patton** spoke for OCLC, saying that OCLC has talked about the complications for Myers' concern in the context of WorldShare Management Services libraries. Discussions have been revived, but no decisions have been reached.

1263.   Report from ALA Publishing Services: Hennelly

James Hennelly from ALA Publishing Services is now the CC:DA representative, as he now deals with RDA. He reported that fiscal year 2013 for RDA was pretty good, with a steady growth rate in the number of subscriptions (up 115% in 2013). The RDA Toolkit has 8,400 users, or 3.2 users per subscription. Since then, in the first few months of fiscal year 2014, the subscribers have increased to 2,960. Much of this growth has come through direct appeals to consortia.

In addition to new users, there is a very high renewal rate, of 95% through December 2013. People are using the Toolkit more, and more efficiently. A 300% increase in page views and searches occurred in 2013, and a 450% increase in the number of sessions. There has been a 27% drop in the number of pages used per session. The print version of RDA sold 387 units in the first part of 2013. The 2013 revision was then released in early October and sold 423 units. An ebook version of RDA was introduced; there are no sales data yet, but the ebook is available on Amazon in Kindle, EPUB, and PDF formats. The ebook provides the most affordable access to RDA.

The price structure changed for Toolkit, with the elimination of the sole user subscription (details here: http://www.rdatoolkit.org/pricing). Subscribing now gives full access with multiple profiles, which changed pricing from a subscription rate to a strict user purchase. Discounts are offered per cost for user as the number of users goes up. The motivation for this price change was to lower the cost of entry for institutions with a small cataloging staff. It is now $180 for the entry-level price instead of $325. The pricing model for LIS institutions has also changed, as they receive a 50% discount off of the subscription level they join at. Free access is available for short-term training.

Within the RDA Toolkit itself, several new features have been introduced:
- Quick language select was added, without having to change your profile
- Dual-pane capabilities were added to compare two language versions.
- TinyURL capabilities were added to enable specific links for creating training materials.
- A summary table was added that includes links to a relevant instruction archive or to the full RDA text. The current 2013 RDA instruction archive reflects RDA as it was prior to the April 2013 release.

Upcoming releases are scheduled for:
- February 2014: policy statements for Australia
- April 2014: JSC updates
- August 2014: expecting major revisions to German and French translations, and possibly Spanish and Finnish, along with best practice notes for the music cataloging community. This release could be pushed back depending on the translation progress. Finnish could provide additional issues, as it is a different kind of language than the ones that currently exist in the Toolkit.

Hennelly noted that translation work continues, with Chinese, Japanese, and Italian in the works. An Italian glossary will be included, possibly in the February 2014 release. ALA Publishing Services is currently in discussions about Arabic and several other translations.

Hennelly concluded his report and invited questions. Questions included:
- Numbers for users: the numbers were for all users, with 30% international.
- Additional translations: a Korean initial translation is in progress.
- Complimentary access to the RDA ebook for CC:DA: this could be worked out, as long as CC:DA provided what format the members wanted and how it could be delivered.
- Updates for the ebook version: it will be updated yearly, the same time as the print, but the ebook would need to be purchased anew.
- Creating links for institutional or personal instructions for RDA: a "Find URL" button in the right-hand corner of the RDA Toolkit was added in the November 2013 release. It acts like a bookmark, and can point to a specific paragraph.
  - Making institutional bookmarks visible outside institutions. This would be technically feasible, but there are concerns about cluttering the page with too many bookmarks. The Policy Statements were designed to simultaneously make the RDA Toolkit not cluttered and provide guidance on the instructions.
  - Bookmarks for consortial instructions: it would be possible to share bookmarks within a consortium, even though this isn't "local."
  - Availability of bookmarks for trainers: it would be useful to leave the bookmarks "behind" with the group being trained. This capability would have to be worked on.
- An update on *Essential RDA*, a planned companion to RDA: they are behind schedule with this publication. Thomas Brenndorfer from the Guelph Public Library has agreed to write it, but a contract still needs to be signed. The *Essential RDA* is meant to be RDA's version of *Concise AACR2*. It will be a print or ebook version of RDA that includes the basics of what is needed to catalog in RDA, and is meant for the infrequent cataloger. The book could possibly be available in the Toolkit and would be fully reviewed and signed off on by the JSC. ALA Publishing Services will look into the ability for other countries to translate the *Essential RDA* instead of translating the entire text of RDA.

1264. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta

Polutta reported on the addition of commenting capability by CC:DA members to posts on the CC:DA blog. As a result of this addition, a brief "Comment policy" statement was added to the blog, located on the blog's sidebar here. **Polutta** read the policy, which basically states that only CC:DA members and liaisons can post comments, and that the first comment of every person

who registers needs to be approved by her. **Polutta** explained that she needs to moderate all first-time comments in order to protect the blog from spam.

Polutta said that the commenting on the CC:DA blog was meant as a test for a replacement for the CC:DA wiki. Ensuing discussion included:
- The inability of the blog to allow for comments on specific areas of the documents: **Polutta** said that you can respond to specific comments in a thread, but it is hard to comment on a specific part of the document. Software that enables commenting on specific parts of a document comes at a cost. However, when discussing complex documents (such as JSC documents) or finalizing documents, it is more helpful to have comments associated with a specific instruction or section instead of at the bottom of a document. The wiki is more useful in these situations.
- Possibility of using a message board as an extension of the blog site: **Polutta** will look for an example of an existing message board to see if it would add the wiki capabilities to the blog. A message board could potentially be added to the blog in place of the commenting area and the wiki, to provide only one place to look for conversations.
- Exploring other platforms for posting and discussions: PBworks, another wiki format, was suggested, but unless the PBworks wiki could be made visible to the public and commenting privileges be for only CC:DA members and liaisons, it might not be in line with ALA's open meeting policies. **Polutta** said that moving away from a wiki would be easier for ongoing maintenance. A concern was expressed over the proliferation of ways in which CC:DA gathers comments about proposals (email, blog, wiki, message board…). **The Chair** reminded CC:DA that the goal is to simplify communication, with an eventual goal of eliminating the wiki.
- Google Docs has a way to comment line-by-line: Google Docs poses some problems – the document has to be associated with one Google profile; the possibility of Google eliminating their Google Docs service; and confusion resulting from individuals having more than one Google account. The positive aspects are that the Google Docs could be shown to the public, have commenting abilities limited to specific people, and better integration of comments.

The Chair emphasized that CC:DA is experimenting with different methods until the best method is found. He encouraged feedback on the different methods tried. **Polutta** asked that the members share Wordpress plugins that could be useful for commenting to be used on the CC:DA blog.

Polutta reminded the group that her term ends in June and she is not planning to renew. **The Chair** asked that anyone interested in being the webmaster contact him.

1265. Update from the TF on Place Names: Glennan and Rendall

Glennan informed CC:DA that the JSC had formed a place names working group. CC:DA's work in this effort was greatly appreciated, but a larger community needs to be involved in order to reach a consensus on how to move forward. This JSC working group was charged with

revising RDA's instructions for place names and includes members from ALA and other affected groups. See the working group's charge on the JSC website for details.

Rendall said that until the JSC's November 2013 meeting, the task force worked on the assumption that they would finish one or more drafts and share them with CC:DA. The work was complicated by changing rules in RDA and JSC decisions. **Rendall** agreed that the best way forward is for the JSC group to coordinate this work. Half of the JSC working group is comprised of the original CC:DA group (along with British, German, and Swiss members).

The Chair reminded CC:DA members and liaisons that because of the JSC action, there is no ALA action that needs to occur.

1266. Recording duration: Snyder [Discussion paper]

Snyder introduced a plan for a new short proposal on duration. Snyder read the document regarding RDA 7.22, Duration. RDA 7.22.1.3 contains instructions for duration for AV resources, abbreviations for time, and recording approximate time. The three instructions that follow (RDA 7.22.1.4, 7.22.1.5, and 7.22.1.6) deal with duration for other types of resources and do not contain as many instructions or as much detail as the previous rule, which creates confusion for music catalogers. This new proposal suggests that policy statements be created for RDA 7.22.1.4, 7.22.1.5, and 7.22.1.6 to clarify that the instructions in RDA 7.22.1.3 regarding approximate time be carried into the following rules. However, Glennan had previously suggested that a proposal be submitted that suggests including new instructions for 7.22.1.3 and renumbering the following rules so that everything falls under the basic instructions, in a similar structural organization as RDA 3.5, Dimensions. **The Chair** asked if the group wants to take on this endeavor. The aspects discussed included:

The similarity of this work with leaves, plates, etc.: a concern was expressed that this proposal could introduce a greater issue. There is a problem with describing the extent for these resources with RDA, and that it might need to be handled as a whole instead of as type-by-type. It was decided that this proposal was suggested as a restructuring of the intention of the JSC, as the content and intent are not changing.

The possibility of two proposals for RDA 7.22: one from the TF on machine-actionable information, and this proposal. These would need to be consolidated for the JSC to handle as one. Lapka replied that this proposal is a relatively simple fix that wouldn't necessarily affect his TF's work. While **Snyder** suggested that she and McGrath finish their work and have Lapka's group look at the proposal, t**he Chair** felt that this proposal was for a small issue and could be handled separately.

Clarification over the issue at hand: as the issue seems to arise over performance time, **Myers** asked how "approximate" time for a performance is possible. It was clarified that approximate time for a performance is dependent on the publisher who says that there is an approximate (about, circa, etc.) time. The issue with RDA 7.22.1.3 is essentially a problem with the example, which shows transcription when the instructions say record. The contradiction is the problem.

CC:DA spent time determining the path forward for this proposal. There was some discussion over whether this could go forward as a fast-track proposal or should be folded into the work of Lapka's TF. Glennan stated that she would like to wait to see what the other group is doing, and would not decide until Annual what to do. If, at that time, the two proposals overlap, they will be reconciled because the JSC only needs to address an issue once. As this proposal regarding duration is part of Gordon Dunsire's view of extent of expression, this could be part of Lapka's group's charge.

Snyder said that she and McGrath would write their proposal and share it with Lapka's group. **McGrath** said that if she and Snyder give Lapka the structure and his group changes the content of the instructions, Lapka's group could work their changes into Snyder and McGrath's restructure of the instructions. **Snyder** said that the existing example in RDA would be fixed through this proposal. **The Chair** summarized that Snyder and McGrath would write the proposal and give it to Lapka's group; closer to Annual 2014, CC:DA would help determine whether the two proposals would be best submitted as one or two proposals.

1267. Update on discussion paper from OLAC/MusLA on technical and performing credits: McGrath and Snyder [Original discussion paper]

McGrath gave an update on the discussion paper from OLAC/MusLA that had originally been presented to CC:DA at Annual 2013. She and Snyder had been asked to investigate the inconsistencies of the instructions for recording technical and performing credits. After talking to their respective communities, McGrath and Snyder found that there is a desire to continue to have both ways of providing information about people related to the resource being described: continuing to have options for both a transcribed statement of responsibility and a non-transcribed note field would provide more flexibility in presenting information, and remove the requirement to take the information from the same source as the title proper. For example, if the information is on the same source as the title proper, and the cataloger wants to take information from the title frames, the rules as written would prevent a cataloger from taking information that would have been on that same source from somewhere else.

As a reminder, the previous solution was to introduce something in RDA Chapter 2 as a note related to the statement of responsibility. The theoretical challenge with this solution is that what ties the statement of responsibility to the manifestation is the transcription element.

Another way to address this issue is to get RDA out of the business of telling the cataloger what to record where and making this a mutually exclusive option. **McGrath** and Snyder think this could be accomplished by removing the references in RDA Chapter 2 to Chapter 7, which says "if this situation occurs, go to Chapter 7." By not having these hard mutually exclusive categories, catalogers could either use the statement of responsibility or choose to put the information in notes. Communities of practice, policy statements, or local needs would guide catalogers on how to record information.

RDA Chapter 7 has another glitch with the credits related to artistic and technical credits. The elements in RDA Chapter 7 are split into those elements that are related to the work, and those elements that are related to the expression. A small header at the beginning of each section

highlights this distinction between work and expression elements, and section 7.24 "Artistic and/or Technical Credit" appears in the section for elements of the expression. In traditional practice, however, notes relating to moving image credits have not been limited to the roles that RDA has mapped to the expression level. There is a conflict then, since the instruction is in the expression section and the examples include roles that RDA has associated with the work, such as writers and directors of photography. The only way around this is to introduce an additional parallel instruction in the work section of RDA Chapter 7 for "artistic and intellectual credits associated with the work." Both of these could be mapped to the MARC 508 field. There is a general desire to continue the flexibility that existed under AACR2. **McGrath** believes there is a mismatch between the worldview of materials being cataloged and the worldview of ISBD and RDA. This is the best alternative **McGrath** and Snyder have been able to come up with that would meet the needs of their respective communities.

Snyder added an example for music materials. The flexibility required comes into play with classical music recordings. In this situation, all the performers are entered at the expression level, but they and their instruments are named in French. A cataloger would want the flexibility to include the instrument names in English in a MARC 511 field note. For popular music, on the other hand, the exception in RDA 2.4.4.1 seems to require the cataloger to go to RDA Chapter 7 for instructions on recording names of people who are only associated with the expression. This causes a problem with, for example, a Miley Cyrus album, by seemingly preventing catalogers from including her name in a statement of responsibility.

The Chair thanked McGrath and Snyder for their summation. **Snyder** reminded the group that the purpose of this discussion is to represent the resource in a fair way. **The Chair** asked for comments on this presentation, which included:
- Concern over the mindset used for this discussion: it was noted that this problem cannot be approached from a MARC mindset but rather in terms of transcription and the FRBR terms of work, manifestation, expression, etc. The community cannot be constrained by MARC when the future holds things like BIBFRAME and Linked Data. The community cannot be swayed by what the current systems are capable of doing, and should instead approach this issue without being constrained by such systems. **McGrath** said that the issue has to do with transcription versus recording, which occurs regardless of the system.
- Concern over transcription versus recording: **Mark Scharff** asked that the transcription versus recording issue be kept in mind and a solution not limit the amount of transcription available to the cataloger. **Snyder** responded that she feels this proposal would actually help clarify things, because it would allow catalogers to always transcribe, and therefore not leave information out.
- Concern over forcing a solution to fit the current mindset: the group was encouraged to ask "why not?" because the solution does not always need to occur in the same way it has been done before. **McGrath** commented that for media, there is much less of a strong connection between the language of the potential user and the language of the item. Statements of responsibility in the language of the film, or the language of the publisher, or the language on the CD are not always helpful for the user. **McGrath** acknowledged that she and Snyder could bring out the examples of why this would be helpful in their discussion. **Snyder** reminded the group of her earlier classical example, and that those

individuals were contributors to the expression, so any statements of responsibility that would name them would be presumably subsequent to the composer statement of responsibility, which is at the work level, and are therefore not core statements of responsibility. **Maxwell** provided examples of statements that say "transcribed by so-and-so" is at the expression level as well, but there is not any problem stating "transcribed as" in the record.

- **Glennan** said that it is interesting to throw the AV and music problems together, as they are very different problems. The AV problem comes from having many people as creators involved in a single work. The music community problem mostly arises out of compilations. These related problems come from different situations and can create confusion in trying to apply FRBR correctly and trying to create a one-size-fits-all solution.
- Concern over the granularity of contents notes, especially with aggregates: how much information about individuals related to specific parts of an aggregate should be included in contents notes? The Task Force on Recording Relationships is looking at what associated information can be included in a contents note.
- Desire for explanatory instructions: the group was encouraged to look at things from the teaching perspective of "this is why we do what we do."
- Concern over a potentially wide impact: **Maxwell** asked that they consider that this solution could potentially affect many other situations. **Snyder** clarified that they would not do anything that would disallow further statements of responsibility.

The Chair asked that CC:DA bring any helpful examples to Snyder and McGrath on this topic. He also asked if CC:DA wants to support the continuation of this work. Snyder and McGrath indicated that they were willing to continue and write a proposal. As there were no objections, **the Chair** charged them to do so. **The Chair** thanked Snyder and McGrath for their work.

1268.   Fast track proposal on Appendix J: Chair

The Chair checked in with CC:DA members and liaisons regarding the Appendix J work done by himself and Snyder, which is a fast-track proposal and does not need official CC:DA approval. However, he wanted to garner unofficial approval of the proposal and asked if CC:DA had any questions. No objections were heard from the group. **Snyder** noted that she added many comments to the blog based on suggestions from the [rules] email list. The updated version will be put on the blog so that everyone can comment on it.

Snyder asked for feedback on her blog comments. Her blog comments included:
- Complimentary and derivative choreography relationship designators
- Derivatives for librettos would be moved to the adaptations bracket
- Musical variations and arrangements are intended to be used the same way as libretto will be used
- "Adapted in verse as" instead of "versified as"
- "Dubbed version" will be left as-is

Feedback included:

- **Deborah Fritz** mentioned that there is an RDA Toolkit technical meeting on January 28, 2014 where these relationship designators will be discussed. She asked that Snyder provide an updated version, which **The Chair** said that he could provide.
- **John Attig** said that some of these issues come from a desire to establish a consistent semantic pattern for relationship designators. He said that some of the examples are tricky in the English language, and asked for counter-examples of things that cannot follow the standard pattern because of the language. **John Attig** asked for the committee to provide examples of what they consider to be the "best" patterns for phrasing.

The Chair said that this proposal will be sent out via email and on the blog before being sent to Glennan. **Glennan** said that her next fast-track deadline is not until just before Annual, so this proposal does not need to be rushed.

1269.   Report from the Chair on CaMMS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

The Chair reminded the committee that it needs to deal with issues regarding two of Glennan's earlier-discussed proposals.

KPG-2013-04, on multiple publication, etc., statements, needs additional examples. Maxwell and Tarango offered to get examples to Glennan. **Glennan** said that she came up with three ideas, and asked if Maxwell and Tarango and anyone else would help her think through these ideas in an unofficial task force. Her goal is to make sure it is clear that the "cascading vortex of horror" is not required and to nail down the language to do so. **The Chair** asked if a task force was necessary. **Myers** noted that an investigation in a small context would be the best place to start; if further action is needed, then a task force could be implemented. **The Chair** agreed with Myers' suggestion. He asked that anyone interested talk to Glennan.

KPG-2013-02, or the issue of leaves and plates, could be folded into the TF on Machine-Actionable Data's work.
- Forming a specific task force: a separate task force had been recommended to handle this issue, but it was asked if CC:DA needs a task force *at this time*. Suggestions were made that this issue falls into the same category as Snyder and McGrath's work, where a small group could work something up and then feed it into Lapka's group. **Lapka** responded that this plan sounds fine, but this issue would be a slightly bigger fix than Snyder and McGrath's work.
- Defining the issue: the proposal is complex with many moving pieces; specifically, the contradiction that occurs between the first and last paragraphs needs to be resolved. The issue of leaves and plates isn't about how to record, but whether to record, which is a different issue than Lapka's TF is handling.
- How to handle the task: **Glennan** said that if a small group comes up with new wording for the contradiction between the first and last paragraphs, a task force is not necessary. Otherwise, a larger group might be needed. It was suggested that since a specific issue can easily have many tentacles, the group should try to tackle the specific issue first without looking at a bigger issue.

The Chair held a straw man poll to ask if the group thought this should be handled now or at some point in the next year. The vote was 25 to 1 in favor of handling this issue in the next six months to one year.

The Chair and **Glennan** volunteered to work on the KPG-2013-02 issue together, and asked if 2-3 more people would volunteer to work with them. **Sprochi** and **Myers** volunteered.

Myers announced that *Maxwell's Handbook for RDA* is available. The group congratulated Maxwell on his work.

The Chair reminded the group that individuals are needed for two task forces, as well as to work on KPG-2013-04. He will also send out an email call for volunteers and will form the task forces in the next few weeks.

Myers noted that the current Chair is term-limited as of Annual 2014. Anyone interested in serving as chair of CC:DA should talk to Rolla so he can pass names along to the incoming chair of CaMMS, who is the appointing authority for CC:DA. Along those lines, **The Chair** asked that if anyone knows of someone interested in filling vacancies on CC:DA, to have those individuals fill out the ALCTS volunteer form and let the Chair know those individual's names.

The Chair noted that the CaMMS Executive Committee also discussed making minutes briefer in order to distribute them more quickly. **The Chair** explained that the back-and-forth discussions traditionally transcribed in CC:DA minutes are not required, just general discussion descriptions, votes, and actions taken by the committee. CC:DA will continue to provide some of the back-and-forth for memory and historical benefit, but will scale back in order to make the minutes available at an earlier date.

The next meetings are June 28 and 30, 2014 in Las Vegas, NV.

The Chair adjourned the group at 11:15am.