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 of the meeting held at the
2015 ALA Annual Conference in San Francisco, California
June 27 and 29, 2015**

Members present:
Robert Rendall, Chair
Dominique Bourassa
Mary Anne Dyer
Elyssa Gould
Steve Kelley
Sandra Macke
Tina Shrader
Larisa Walsh

Richard Guajardo, CC:DA Webmaster
Arthur Liu, Intern
Laurie Neuerburg, Intern

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

ALA Liaisons present:
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM
Matthew Haugen, ALA/ACRL/RBMS [Saturday only]
Jessica Hayden, ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group
Yoko Kudo, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee
Adolfo Tarango, ALCTS/CRS
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons:
Robert Bratton, AALL
Diane Hillmann, DCMI
Dorothy McGarry, SLA
Kelley McGrath, OLAC
John Myers, MAC
Cory Nimer, SAA

Elizabeth O'Keefe, ARLIS/NA
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:AAM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
   CC:CCM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
   CC:DA = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
   CIP = Cataloging in Publication
   CLA = Catholic Library Association
   CoP = Committee of Principals for RDA

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
ICP = IFLA's International Cataloguing Principles
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ISBD = *International Standard Bibliographic Description*
ISNI = International Standard Numerical Identifier
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
LRM = Library Reference Model
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
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM = National Library of Medicine
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PARS = ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PLA = Public Library Association
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RSC = RDA Steering Committee
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RDF = Resource Description Framework
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SLA = Special Libraries Association
WEMI = Work/expression/manifestation/item, the FRBR group 1 entities

Saturday, June 27, 1:00–5:00 p.m.
Parc 55 San Francisco, Embarcadero Room

1316. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Robert Rendall, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members. He noted that one voting member would be unable to attend these meetings in San Francisco.

The **Chair** invited committee members, liaisons, and representatives to initial a roster sheet and audience members to sign a separate attendance sheet.

1317.   Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Chair [CC:DA/Roster/2015]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

1318.   Adoption of agenda: Chair [CC:DA/A/72]

The **Chair** asked for comments, changes, or additions to the agenda. None were raised. The agenda was adopted as posted.

1319.   Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2015 ALA Midwinter Conference, January 31 and February 2, 2015: Chair [CC:DA/M/1293-1315]

The **Chair** explained that a draft of the minutes had been distributed to CC:DA prior to this meeting. Members' suggestions have been incorporated into the document. The **Chair** asked for additional changes to the minutes. None were posed. The minutes were adopted as posted.

1320.   Report from the Chair [CC:DA/Chair/2014-2015/6]

The **Chair** explained that this was his last year on CC:DA. He announced that voting member Dominique Bourassa will assume the post of CC:DA Chair for the next year.

The Chair's online report lists the votes that CC:DA had taken via e-mail from January to June 2015. CC:DA voted on three motions to approve Task Forces to review various documents and three motions to approve the reports of those Task Forces. All were passed 8–0 or 7–0. The **Chair** invited a motion from a voting member to confirm these six votes. **Kelley** moved; **Dyer** seconded. The motion passed 7–0.

1321.   Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Reser [Library of Congress Report, ALA 2015 Annual Conference]

Reser discussed highlights from his report posted on the CC:DA website. It covers selected initiatives with a focus on descriptive cataloging practices. A fuller report is available at http://www.loc.gov/ala/.

Topics discussed include:
   • Significant changes were announced to LC's information technology functions and activities, including realignment of the former Office of Strategic Initiatives. LC is evaluating candidates for a new Chief Information Officer position and hopes to fill it by September. A new service unit for National and International Outreach and a new Office of the Chief Operating Officer were established
   • Dr. James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, announced that he intends to retire effective January 1, 2016. It is unclear what situation will be in the interim.

- ABA promoted nine LC catalogers to section heads in the past few months. One new staff member was hired from outside LC as the field director to the Overseas Office in Nairobi.
- LC improved the *Cataloger's Desktop's* display and search functionality. A survey eliciting feedback on the changes is forthcoming.
- The Mande and Cham language tables were approved and the Uighur and Tibetan tables were revised. A revision of the Mongolian table is under development.
- LC has prepared a document to assist catalogers with the changes in the 4th annual update to RDA published in April 2015 (http://www.loc.gov/aba/rda/pdf/summary_rda_changes_2015.pdf).
- The LC-PCC PSs were updated twice since the 2015 Midwinter meeting. The February release focused less on content and more on aligning the LC-PCC PSs with the PCC CONSER Standard Record (CSR) and PCC BIBCO Standard Record (BSR). The April release was related to the annual update to RDA itself.
- Phase 3B of the PCC RDA Authorities Task Group was expected to take place during summer 2015. Work will include recoding all eligible LC/NACO Authority File records not yet coded as RDA and adding 024 fields for ISNI.
- LC has planned a pilot project to experiment with BIBFRAME. Training has begun and is expected to continue into July and August 2015.

The **Chair** invited questions. None were posed.

1322. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Glennan
[Report on JSC Activities, January-June 2015]

Glennan reported on the following topics:
- The JSC worked continuously from November through March to finalize the changes to RDA instructions arising from the 47 proposals and discussion papers considered at its 2014 meeting.
- The JSC website has moved to a new Drupal-based platform.
- The CoP agreed on a new governance model in late April 2015. Completion of the process is not expected until 2020. The model will support greater internationalization and representation from the broader cataloging, metadata, and description communities. The biggest impact for CC:DA must consider how to transition from the current model—with ALA representative as one of three representatives from North America—to the new model with its single North American representative.
- The JSC's annual meeting will take place in Edinburgh, Scotland, November 2–6.
- Due to the JSC's pragmatic working principle, proposed changes to RDA that are unlikely to be impacted by external factors will continue to be implemented. However, changes to RDA in areas likely to require significant review will be set aside or referred to a working group. This should inform CC:DA's strategy in planning proposals.
- The JSC refreshed membership for existing Working Groups. It created four new Working Groups: Aggregates Working Group, Capitalization Instructions Working Group, Fictitious Entities Working Group (majority of members from the CC:DA Task Force on Pseudonymous Corporate Bodies), Relationship Designators Working Group. In

the new governance model, the JSC should rely more on Working Groups than on constituencies.

- The JSC created protocols to facilitate communication with the ISSN International Centre and with the FRBR Review Group.
- **Glennan** reviewed FRBRoo, version 2.2. Since FRBRoo is designed to be compatible with the consolidated FR model, it offers insight into what that model will contain.
- **Glennan** shared on the CC:DA listserv (rules@lists.ala.org) a paper by Pat Riva and Maja Žumer titled, "Introducing the FRBR Library Reference Model." The paper offers a look at the road map for FR consolidation (http://library.ifla.org/1084/). Changes in FRBR will have to be reflected in RDA. Once the full LRM is available, CC:DA should create a Working Group to prepare a response.
- Documents the JSC reviewed include: PRESSoo; the proposed new CIP data block; the Statement of International Cataloguing Principles, 2015 Edition; and multiple drafts of *RDA Essentials*. The JSC also reviewed drafts of RDA elements and application profiles, instructions for how to prepare an RDA revision proposal, information for new JSC representatives, and statement of policy and procedures for the JSC.
- In response to concerns raised, the JSC decided to make the English-language version of the RDA index available as a PDF in the RDA Toolkit Tools tab. Maintaining and translating the index is an ongoing concern. As long as a print edition of RDA continues to be produced, an index will accompany it. However, pressure to discontinue the index will remain.
- An RBMS task force drafting RDA-compatible guidelines for rare materials cataloging initiated a discussion with the JSC to incorporate these guidelines into RDA Toolkit.
- **Glennan** submitted Fast Track proposals on CC:DA's behalf to: create or modify relationship designators in Appendix I, J, and K (most were approved as submitted); update the 3rd paragraph of 11.2.2.22.1, Armed Forces at the National Level, along with some related examples (mostly accepted, with changes); add "transgender" to 9.7.1.3 and to the Glossary (deferred, see below); add the ability to use "another concise term or terms" to 3.4.3.2, particularly in regard to music terms (approved); modify examples in 3.22 and add examples to 2.21, regarding item notes (deferred); clarify the definitions for 3-D and 2-D moving images in 6.9.1.3 and the Glossary to address 3-D video games, regarding stereoscopy (approved).
- The JSC deferred action on the Fast Track proposal regarding the term *transgender*. Issues under consideration include the impact of recommending a specific vocabulary on the international, cultural heritage, and linked data communities; extensions of vocabularies for local communities; and updates to the RDA Registry to accommodate the RDA/ONIX Framework. The JSC welcomes reports on these topics.
- **Glennan** was charged with analyzing the use of the terms *transcribe* and *record* in RDA Chapter 2. She prepared an ALA representative report with help from volunteers. The usage of the terms *transcribe* and *record* is probably fine when RDA is read linearly, but may be problematic when a user jumps into a specific section. Language cleanup is needed so that both terms are used consistently.
- July 17, 2015 is the last day for CC:DA to vote on proposals and discussion papers originating from ALA. September 18, 2015 is the last day for CC:DA to vote on ALA responses to proposals and discussion papers from other constituencies.

Glennan invited questions and concerns. None were posed.

1323. Proposal from the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Lapka/Hillman

Revision Proposal (June, 2015) [CC:DA/TF/Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3/6] [Discussion]

Lapka noted that the proposal is an outgrowth of the discussion at the 2015 ALA Midwinter meeting. New sections have been added to flesh out aspects of *extent of the carrier* and to introduce *foliation* and *dimensions*. Minor and major changes were made to sections already introduced at Midwinter. **Lapka** opened the floor to general questions. None were posed.

Question 1. Does CC:DA agree that Pagination and Foliation should be treated separately from extent of volume units and subunits?

Lapka explained that one of the most significant suggestions of this report regards what we traditionally call extent of text. It involves statements of pagination and foliation that have to do with how a resource represents itself, rather than a true count.

The **Chair** noted that several comments on the CC:DA blog support the proposed distinction.

Discussion covered the following topics:
- What is the difference between the existing extent of text and the proposed pagination and foliation? **Lapka** replied that pagination/foliation is what we currently record as extent of text. The proposed extent would instead represent the actual number of physical pages in a volume, for which there exist different methods of determining.
- It may be a burden to catalogers to determine a total number of pages. What is the benefit? **Lapka** replied that it satisfies a need for logical consistency. Extent is a measurement, but pagination and foliation are not.
- The possibility of simply using carrier type as the unit of measurement for extent. **Lapka** replied that there is a connection between carrier type and extent.

Question 2. Does CC:DA agree that the number of volumes should always be recorded, even if there is only a single volume?

Lapka noted that comments on the CC:DA blog were generally supportive.

Discussion was supportive. **Sprochi** commented that this is already the practice for online resources. It is not a burden to catalogers and it is easy for users to understand. **Maxwell** noted that this was the original proposal for RDA and that he concurred both then and now.

Question 3. Does CC:DA agree that the distinction between numbered and unnumbered pages (etc.) should be made in Pagination and Foliation, but not in extent?

Lapka reminded that Questions 3 and 4 assume a separate element will be created for Pagination/Foliation distinct from Extent.

Discussion covered the following topics:
- If the Pagination/Foliation element is to capture how a resource represents itself, shouldn't unnumbered pages be excluded from its scope? **Lapka** replied that it is also intended to capture when a resource decides not to represent itself.
- **Glennan** commented that if Pagination/Foliation is to be core, then recording unnumbered pages in the Pagination/Foliation element would allow catalogers to continue existing practice.
- The goal is to label the data being recorded (Extent) or transcribed (Pagination/Foliation) clearly.
- The **Chair** asked how blank pages fit into the proposal. **Hillmann** commented that there are different types of blank pages to consider, such as blank pages included for a user to write his/her own notes and pages intentionally left blank. **Lapka** noted the task force will consider the issue.
- If we follow the primary instruction and use the last numbered page as Extent, sub-sequences could lead to an inaccurate value. **Lapka** explained that this instruction allows a convenient way to approximate Extent.
- The proposed Extent element will only be useful if it contains accurate data. Therefore, the instructions should be flipped. **Glennan** expressed support for flipping the instruction in order to prioritize accuracy. The alternative could even be not to record an Extent value.
- The instructions should adopt a normalized definition for the Extent value and then provide a range of options for obtaining that value. There should be an instruction to specify which option is used in each instance.
- Cataloging practices regarding extent and pagination have varied drastically over time. Extent and pagination data have been recorded in the same field. This has led to difficulties in de-duplication. If the data is not machine-interpretable, these efforts become more difficult. It is critical that each element clearly defines what it purports to contain.

Question 4. Does CC:DA agree that numbering in terms of columns should be recorded in Pagination and Foliation but not in extent?

The proposal suggests that recording columns is important for Pagination/Foliation, but not for Extent. **Lapka** invited comments. No objections were raised.

Question 5. Where is the most logical location for the instructions 3.4.1.12.2, if not in Extent of the Carrier? Does RDA need an element for Location within the Larger Resource -- something functionally similar to 24.6 Numbering of Part?

Lapka explained that these instructions have examples that point to, for example, "side 1 of 1 audio disc." The task force suggests these do not logically belong under Extent. Glennan posed a question regarding identical content, specifically in 3.4.1.6. Since the concept of content is

separate from carrier, it is necessary to clarify the definition of *identical* and to examine what this term means in the context of carriers.

Question 6. Where should Pagination and Foliation be associated (i.e., what are closely related elements)? Extent of Carrier (3.4)? Layout (3.11)? Numbering of Serials (2.6)?

Lapka said that this question may be more appropriate for JSC technical staff. Comments on the blog leaned toward associating Pagination and Foliation with Extent of the Carrier.

Discussion included the following points:
- Associating Pagination and Foliation with Extent of the Carrier may cause confusion. They must be clearly distinguished.
- An objection to associating Pagination and Foliation with Numbering of Serials was raised (2.6). **Glennan** inquired why the task force considered this section, since it is in a different chapter. **Lapka** replied that Pagination/Foliation is about how a resource represents itself and is therefore a transcribed element. This is a characteristic it shares with Chapter 2, but not Chapter 3.
- Questions were raised concerning the application of Pagination/Foliation rules to gatherings, signatures, folio, and other notations in rare book cataloging. If Pagination/Foliation are related to these elements, then it belongs in Chapter 3. Otherwise, it may belong elsewhere.
- If the point of Pagination/Foliation is identification, then Chapter 2 is logical.

Question 7. In the second part of x.6, when pages or leaves are missing from both the first and last part of the volume, would it be more helpful to the user to record (*incomplete*) within the Pagination and Foliation?

Lapka explained that this instruction seemed ripe for revision to make it more user-friendly. The comments on the blog seem to be supportive of the proposal.

Glennan noted that this issue affects unique resources. For common resources, it is typical to describe the complete resource and then make a note for a library's incomplete copy. She added that under RDA and AACR2, if material is missing only from the first part of the volume, the incompleteness is not noted. Glennan agreed that if it is known that an artifact is missing material, it makes sense to note the incompleteness.

Question 8. Does CC:DA agree with implementation of the table of syntactic patterns for recording dimensions as a string?

Lapka explained that a table of the most commonly used patterns for recording dimensions has been included at the top of the instructions to reduce the repetition of language in the Dimensions section. Comments on the blog agree. No additional comments were posed.

Question 9.
   a. Several formats (i.e. cartridges and audiocassettes) use the term *length* in a sense that's synonymous with *width*. Is there justification for this variation from the norm? These

formats also vary by recording length x width (in dimensions as a string), whereas height is recorded first everywhere else. Is there justification for the variation?

   b. Width of tape or film is varyingly recorded with the terms *width* and *gauge*. As the terms are synonymous, is there justification for maintaining the inconsistency?

Lapka explained that these questions are geared toward specialist communities. For Question 9b, we recommend using *gauge*, as it is the commonly used term. For Question 9a, there is no standardized practice to justify deviating from recording height first.

Discussion covered the following topics:
   • These sorts of carriers typically come in standard sizes. Legacy data are likely amenable to automated processes for retrospective conversion.
   • *Width* rather than *gauge* should be used in order to maintain consistency and because the term *width* is more understandable to inexperienced users.
   • No conclusive opinions were received that *width* and *gauge* have any difference in meaning. As long as both terms are searchable and cross-referenced, user needs should be satisfied.

Question 10. Should the proposal amend the instructions for maps and still images (3.4.5 and 3.4.6) always to record the part measured?

Lapka explained that this question regards the ambiguity in existing practice as to whether the recorded dimensions of still images and cartographic resources are those of the sheet or of the pictorial area. The task force recommends always explicitly indicating what is being measured.

Discussion included the following topics:
   • **Glennan** suggested that the instruction may assume a default practice of measuring carrier size. A note would only be necessary if the recorded dimensions are of the pictorial area. **Lapka** agreed that this is a logical method, but cautioned that legacy data may cause confusion if the dimension type is not always noted.
   • To aid machine-actionability, it would be preferable always to state explicitly the type of dimensions measured.
   • If exceptions to the rules are made for cartographic materials and still images, it will be necessary to justify them.
   • Historical practice can lead to ambiguity about what data is presented. There is a cleanliness in the proposal to record carrier dimensions with machine-actionable data consistently.
   • **Glennan** noted that the thrust of RDA development is toward a logically consistent framework. Regarding textual resources, this proposal intends to allow for the recording of both Extent of Carrier (in volumes) and Pagination/Foliation in separate elements. Logically then, we should also create opportunities to record both sheet dimensions and image dimensions in different elements.

Lapka noted that the task force deferred incorporating substantial revisions to instructions for still images to a future proposal.

Question 11. If the fundamental difference between 3.5 and 3.21.3 is that the first records the dimension of primary importance, and the second those of secondary importance, is this sufficient reason to continue recording functionally equivalent data in separate elements -- where the latter (the note) can not benefit from the option of machine-actionability?

Lapka welcomed questions and comments. None were posed.

Question 12. Should *items* be used as extent term for both carrier and content, and if so, can it be used unqualified? If a distinction needs to be made, what terms does CC:DA recommend? Perhaps *items (carrier)* and *items (content)*?

Discussion included the following topics:
- **Glennan** expressed concern about using the term *item* in any way that is different from its FRBR definition. No suitable alternatives presented themselves. Qualifiers may be a good way to avoid confusion.
- **Lapka** commented that it is often in the context of archival description that extent may be measured in terms of items. *Items* can refer to physical pieces as well as intellectual pieces. How would the archival community feel about distinguishing between those two senses?
- The sense of *item* referring to physical pieces may be more prevalent. More research would be needed to answer this question.

Question 13. Does CC:DA prefer use of the single term *duration* for measurement type, or should we specify different kinds of duration?

Lapka explained that we have the option to define specific types of duration, such as playing time or running time. A notable comment from **Snyder** pointed out that performance time is another example. Currently, these types of duration are not defined in RDA.

Discussion included the following topics:
- There was Committee support for distinguishing between specific types of duration, but for some types of films, variation in playing speed could affect the actual experienced duration. For those media it is more accurate to measure the length of tape.
- Why were the terms *performance time* and *playing time* removed from the RDA instructions when those instructions were revised? **Glennan** replied that the entire structure of RDA 7.22 mentioned these types of duration but lacked an overarching instruction to unite them under the term *duration*. CC:DA cleaned up the instructions and clarified the associated examples.
- **Glennan** explained that the instructions could use the generic term *duration* as the default while offering specific types as options.
- Are these specific terms really types of measurement rather than types of duration? **Glennan** pointed out there are also differences between duration of carrier and duration of content stored on the carrier.
- There are two types of data under consideration: what the resource's duration really is, and what the resource's duration may be based on an estimation, how the resource

describes itself, or even what the resource recommends. It is imperative that the metadata clarify which type of information is recorded.

Question 14. How should the examples in 7.22.1.6 be treated? Should those that primarily concern the carrier be moved to Chapter 3?

Lapka explained that most of the examples in this section refer exclusively to duration of the carrier. Should these examples be moved to somewhere in Chapter 2?

Glennan replied that it will be necessary to review the lengthy JSC discussion on this point. Under discussion were efforts to deal with duration instructions in Chapter 3 as part of the ALA proposal to restructure 7.22. The JSC did not accept the Chapter 3 components of the proposal. In order to move forward, CC:DA will have to study the rationale of JSC's decision on that proposal.

The **Chair** asked for thoughts on next steps. **Lapka** said that the Task Force will continue to work towards the goal of a "fuzzy" complete revision proposal.

1324. Microphones/CC:DA meeting format: Chair

The Chair explained that CC:DA has experienced issues with acoustics at past meetings, and that there has been difficulty in ensuring that the Committee has an adequate number of microphones. The Chair invited CaMMS chair Melinda Reagor Flannery to speak to CC:DA about factors affecting these issues.

Flannery discussed the following points:
- **Flannery** explained that ALCTS is in a negative budget situation and is seeking to cut expenses. An ALA policy dictates that there be no more than three microphones at any meeting. Any additional microphones must be funded by the division. For the past several years, ALCTS has been able to provide additional microphones to CC:DA, but will not be able to sustain this practice.
- **Flannery** agrees that CC:DA has a legitimate need for more than three microphones. She will advocate for CC:DA at the ALCTS board meeting on Monday, June 29. She considered two arguments in favor of CC:DA:
  1. The committee's meetings include representatives from 7 other ALA groups and 13 non-ALA groups. The meetings deserve support at the ALA level because the committee does work that affects all of ALA. This is likely the stronger argument. CC:DA may be able to elicit a formal exception for itself to the microphone policy.
  2. The three-microphone policy makes it difficult for individuals with hearing disabilities to participate in CC:DA meetings. This argument may be less likely to succeed.

Discussion from the committee in response included the following topics:
- **Glennan** noted that past meetings had been held in less acoustically friendly spaces. Would it be possible for CC:DA to secure more spaces like the present one consistently?

> **Flannery** asked if smaller rooms would obviate the need for more microphones?
> **Glennan** replied that more microphones would still be needed in smaller spaces.

- Microphones are needed to facilitate audio recordings for minute-keeping. The minutes and audio recordings are used by the Chair and the JSC to understand CC:DA's intent.
- Other sessions at ALA Annual frequently enjoy more than three microphones, even when the meeting format did not involve a back-and-forth discussion style like CC:DA. Could ALA redirect funds from those sessions to meetings like CC:DA with a discussion format? **Flannery** explained that the number microphones does not always correlate with spending. At those other sessions, it is possible that only one microphone was requested but more were available in the room. Increasing from three to four microphones is a major price point due to the hardware required.
- **Flannery** asked whether CC:DA has changed the number of seats that it requests. During the peak of RDA development circa 2007, CC:DA requested 100 seats for the audience. In more recent years, its meetings have not drawn more than about 30 audience members. The **Chair** explained that typically ALCTS resubmits the requests from previous years. The number of seats requested likely has not changed in recent years.
- Comparisons were drawn between CC:DA and other meetings, including the big heads meeting and the Subject Analysis Committee.
- **Flannery** explained that there are union regulations that apply when there are more than three microphones. In particular, it necessitates having a technician and soundboard. ALA is careful to observe these regulations. In addition, CC:DA must not supply its own equipment. Even using mobile phone apps may be questionable.
- Would be possible to use cordless microphones? They would obviate the need for a separate microphone for the audience. **Flannery** promised to explore this possibility.
- Seating liaisons in the audience, as suggested during an e-mail discussion with the ALCTS Board, is untenable as the liaisons contribute to the work of the committee as full participants and require table space. **Flannery** agreed.

Flannery introduced the incoming CaMMS Chair Bobby **Bothmann**. **Flannery** and **Bothmann** will both advocate for CC:DA at the ALCTS Board meeting.

1325.   Proposals from TF to Investigate the Instructions for Recording Relationships in RDA: Nathan Putnam

a. Revision to 3.1.4, Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type
[CC:DA/TF/Instructions for Recording Relationships/8] [Discussion]

With this proposal, the Task Force is suggesting changes to RDA 3.1.4 dealing with resources consisting of more than one carrier type. In CC:DA's work with Chapters 24 through 28, we found inconsistencies with instructions dealing with resources with more than one part. RDA 3.1.4 is limited to resources with more than one carrier type. It does not cover resources with parts or the same carrier type. The instructions do not allow catalogers to record information distinguishing between predominant versus accompanying parts.

The Task Force received several helpful comments on the CC:DA blog about this proposal and is still working on incorporating them in the proposal.

Putnam invited questions and comments:
- Some of the proposed section titles under 3.1.4 are identical to titles in other sections of Chapter 3. **Putnam** relayed a response from **John Attig**, who stated that it should be clear from context that the sub-instructions in 3.1.4 clearly refer to the element definitions in that instruction. Even without a precedent for duplicated instruction titles in RDA, the practice is not necessarily invalid.
- Is it possible simply to eliminate RDA 3.1.4? **Putnam** replied that the Task Force considered eliminating the section but decided to modify it instead.
- Is it possible for the proposal to present multiple options: one to eliminate 3.1.4, another to revise it? **Glennan** confirmed that is absolutely possible.
- While this proposal cannot be contingent on the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA's proposal, it is worth thinking about how the two proposals may impact each other. 3.1.4 blends together a wide variety of concepts. It contravenes the spirit of the work of the Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA, which attempts to separate out those concepts. **Glennan** agreed that there is a good deal of overlap between the two Task Forces; however, each proposal must be self-contained.
- **Glennan** suggested the idea of 3.1.4 as simply a pointer to other sub-instructions about specific issues such as media types, multiple carriers, etc.

Putnam stated that the Task Force will proceed to work on the table of contents option.

b. Additional instructions in Chapter 27 for Structured Descriptions of the "Contained in" and "Container of" Relationships [CC:DA/TF/Instructions for Recording Relationships/9] [Discussion]

Putnam explained that this proposal builds on work from 2013. The Task Force concentrated on instructions for contents notes. This proposal includes: separate instructions for structured and unstructured descriptions in Chapter 24; a revision of the definitions and descriptions of structured descriptions (24.4.3); and the inclusion of basic instructions for recording relationships as identifiers, authorized access points, structured descriptions, and unstructured descriptions in chapters 25 to 28.

There were many editorial comments on the blog. The Task Force will work to incorporate these. Other comments, such as those concerning expression versus manifestation level issues, will require further discussion.

Discussion at the meeting included:
- Should the Task Force proceed with its proposal before seeing the results of the JSC Aggregates Working Group? The Task Force suggests that the proposal goes forward to the JSC to decide on a course of action.
- JSC Aggregates Working Group may take a long time to complete its work. Since this Task Force has been working for several years, it is time for this proposal to move forward.
- Some clarification may be helpful regarding the *Contained in* relationship as analytic description and the *Container of* relationship as comprehensive description. **Glennan**

replied that these relationships are defined in the appendices and are used as examples in RDA 27.1.1.3.

- There is an unanswered question regarding the function of these relationships at the *Work* versus *Manifestation* level. **Glennan** replied that tables of contents are about how a resource presents itself. Relationships are recorded in other ways.
- **Bourassa** asked for a response to questions on the blog about *Expression* versus *Manifestation* levels. **Putnam** replied that the Task Force largely disagreed with those comments. **Glennan** commented that both the JSC and CC:DA had, in the past, resisted being too rigid about defining contents notes for specific FR levels because they may not fit well into the FR model.
- It may be useful to communicate with the MARC community about revising indicator definitions or labels for the MARC field 505. **Glennan** replied that since MARC is not tied to RDA, it might not be appropriate to request an RDA-specific language change.
- Task Force member Melanie **Polutta** commented that the way contents notes were recorded in past practice was fuzzy. It cannot have a principled parallel in RDA. The proposal is designed to allow more flexibility for a slightly less principled approach. A single relationship designator should be followed by a single entity. Multiple entities would be served by repeated elements. **Glennan** replied that in RDA there are four distinct ways to describe these relationships: (1) identifiers, (2) authorized access point, (3) structured descriptions, and (4) unstructured descriptions. Only the first two are machine-actionable. If we are concerned here with the structured and unstructured descriptions, then the function is merely one of display for the user. She added that the proposal's separation in Chapter 24 for structured versus unstructured descriptions is a very good idea.
- The term *structured description* is a bit of a misnomer. The term *structured* implies that the element is capable of some machine-actionability. This is not the case. Should we consider banning structured descriptions, as they are not very well structured at all?
- One function is that the language tells the cataloger whether to expect a specified syntactical pattern. The **Chair** questioned whether RDA should specify these patterns.
- The structured patterns are still merely strings, and should not be dictated in RDA.
- **Polutta** stated that there are only three ways to describe these relationships. **Glennan** remarked that the JSC currently has the four methods, including structured descriptions. To change this framework would require a separate proposal or discussion paper. JSC Chair Gordon **Dunsire** commented that the JSC Technical Working Group is examining this issue. CC:DA should await the outcome of that work before spending too much effort here. It should be either a threefold or even twofold path.
- **Glennan** presented two options for moving forward: CC:DA could present the proposal as is or it could wait for the outcome of the JSC Technical Working Group. She noted that if there is a high chance of rejection, it may be advisable to convert the proposal to a discussion paper.

The **Chair** called for a straw poll to decide whether the work of the Task Force will go forward as a proposal or a discussion paper. The **Chair** counted 17 votes in favor of a proposal and 9

votes in favor of a discussion paper. Therefore, CC:DA will ask the Task Force to move forward with a proposal.

1326.   Proposal from RBMS: Haugen

Proposal: References to Descriptions [CC:DA/RBMS/2015/1] [Discussion]

Haugen explained that the intent of this proposal is to focus on the relationships most commonly recorded for rare materials references. Significant changes will have to be made before this proposal can move forward. It will be necessary to expand the scope of the proposal because of the implications for other WEMI entities.

Both the cross-entity relationships and the negative relationships (*not* references) seem to be significant departures from what is currently found in RDA Chapters 24 and 26. **Haugen** asked if this proposal is likely to succeed in light of these departures.

Discussion included the following points:
- **Glennan** remarked that the problem is that this proposal regards a particular community's need. It is an important need and CC:DA should address it.
- The **Chair** asked about the timeframe that RBMS would like to pursue. **Haugen** replied that RBMS could have a revised proposal ready in time for the deadline. **Glennan** remarked that Haugen would be committing to a major reworking of the proposal within the next weeks.
- **Glennan** asked how the committee would like to proceed. The **Chair** said that if RBMS does not meet the deadline, work will continue on this proposal over the next year. **Glennan** reminded all meeting attendees that comments are welcome.

1327.   Proposals from the JSC Representative: Glennan

a. Create RDA 2.17.14, Note on Identifier for the Manifestation [CC:DA/JSC REP/KPG/2015/3] [Discussion]

Glennan reported that no one had substantive comments about this proposal. She developed the proposal because there are notes that she currently makes even though nothing in RDA allows her to do so. The proposal is modeled after the notes on copyright date. It is placed sequentially in RDA where the notes on identifier would go. It uses the boilerplate language and has a couple of examples.

There were no additional comments.

The Chair invited a motion to approve proposal JSC/REP/KPG/2015/3. **Kelley** moved to approve the proposal, and **Shrader** seconded. It passed 7-0.

b. Create new sub-instructions in RDA 2.17 for: Other Information Relating to Numbering of Serials (RDA 2.17.5.6) and Other Information Relating to a Series Statement (RDA 2.17.11.5) [CC:DA/JSC Rep/KPG/2015/4] [Discussion]

Glennan thanked the committee for some minor corrections on numbering. There were some helpful suggestions about the examples. She reminded members that the examples editor will make the final decisions on examples, and any examples given in the proposal will be merely suggestions.

Discussion during the meeting included:
- A question about the example "Second series statement from the publisher's website" in 2.17.11.5. It might introduce some ambiguities because it is not clear what "second" refers to. **Glennan** stated that she is open to suggestions.
- A question regarding the example "Subtitles of series varies" in 2.17.11.6.2: Is Chapter 2 about transcription or is it about creating authorized access points? Shouldn't this note belong to an authorized access point? The **Chair** responded that it could be a multi-volume set, and different subtitles appear on different volumes. It is the same for serial issues. Another member commented that interchangeable use of "of" and "for" and other prepositions is possible.

Bourassa moved to pass JSRep/KPG/2015/4; **Walsh** seconded. The proposal passed 7-0.

The **Chair** recessed the meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Monday, June 29, 8:30–11:30 a.m.
Parc 55 San Francisco, Embarcadero Room

1328. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The **Chair** opened the meeting at 8:33 a.m. He welcomed the members and audience to the second of two meetings, and he thanked everyone for coming.

1329. Engaging with RDA: Governance and Strategy: Dunsire
[http://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/RDA-Gov-Strategy.pdf]

Dunsire presented an overview of the new governance structure for RDA and its new strategy.

This is a brief overview; the CoP is still filling in the details. Given the growth of RDA and the increasing number of translations, last year the CoP decided to review the situation: it initiated a worldwide consultation and looked at how other international standards are governed. The CoP has now agreed on a new governance structure that is intended to have greater international community involvement in the development of RDA. It wants the process to be completed before 2020. The transition will be completed in stages over the next five years. The principles behind the decision of the CoP are flexibility, more effective structures, and care that the committees don't become too large. It will be a better reflection of the communities that use RDA. The use of working groups will continue and there will be possible contractual work.

Dunsire showed charts of the proposed model. The CoP will be renamed the RDA Board, and the JSC, the RDA Steering Committee (RSC). The RSC will have six permanent members representing the six United Nations world regions. The Chair, Secretary and Examples Editor will serve on the RSC as executives to support its work. The chair of the RDA Board and the ALA Publishing representative will be ex-officio members. There will be three specialized members: one to liaise with the Technical Working Group, one to represent the Translations Teams, and one to focus on wider community engagement and outreach. Members will have four-year terms. In total, the RSC will have twelve regular members and two ex-officio members. The working groups will be split into two types. There will be permanent standing working groups on technical issues and translations. Other working groups will be under the same governance structure as now: their charges will be reviewed on a yearly basis and when they run out of tasks they will be dissolved. As one of these, a new Archives Working Group will be set up to address one of the strategic targets of the new plan.

The two pillars of the new strategy for RDA are recognition and adoption of RDA at an international level and a sustainable business model. Three new communities have been identified for RDA expansion: international, wider cultural (archives, museums) and linked data. In the international arena, FRBR, ICP, ISBD are three standards that will be under heavy review, so RDA will be affected. To support internationalization, there will be a new translations working group and a capitalization instructions working group. In the cultural data sphere, there is a need for a common standard or common framework that allows standards to interoperate. The new archives working group will assist in this area. In the linked data sphere, we have the RDA Registry and RIMMF. The RDA Registry is already multilingual and multiscript, has semantic version control and supplies multiple RDF flavors. RIMMF complements the Registry as an RDA data editor and has online tutorials. After the presentation, **Dunsire** opened the floor for questions and answers.

Discussion from the meeting included:
- It is problematic that the UN regions for the new model are not proportional to the number of RDA adopters in those regions. **Dunsire** responded that the JSC is aware of this. The six geographic positions on the RSC will not all be filled at once. The CoP will monitor sales of the Toolkit and that will trigger establishment of those posts.
- The constituencies that come up with the actual content of RDA will have less power than the governing body, which makes the money from RDA. Should we consider moving away from the traditional national organizations and towards an international body like IFLA? **Dunsire** answered that ALA, CLA and CILIP will still be represented on the RDA Board as the owners of RDA. The general consensus is that there should not be a closer engagement with IFLA at this stage.
- How will the existing JSC constituencies provide input for RDA revisions under this new model? **Dunsire** responded that the CoP expects the RDA Steering Committee to develop that process. It will not have to follow the same model in every region. It will be a difficult balancing act to ensure that all communities are served. The JSC wants feedback about how best to go about this.
- CC:DA is a large group and could be a counterexample to the assumption that when groups become too large, they become ineffective. **Dunsire** responded that while

working groups should be as large as they need to be, too many people in a group are unwieldy and ineffective for decision-making.

- How will the Archives Working Group be filled? **Dunsire** said that the JSC is in the process of looking for international representation on this and other working groups. He stated that a subgroup of the RDA Board is currently surveying the field to see what organizations are active in this area; he is aware that the archives community does not currently have commonly agreed on standards, but he thinks that it realizes that a neutral standard going forward might be useful. He welcomes membership suggestions.

- Is it too early to begin discussion with ALA higher-ups regarding the changes? **Glennan** said she is committed to doing whatever she can to make sure that, as we move forward, ALA still has an opportunity to be as actively engaged as we have been. But she cannot make commitment on behalf of ALA. She wonders how we negotiate set-up structure within this massive structure that is ALA. **Dunsire** advised that the discussion be started immediately.

- Is it correct that the CoP is open to each region setting up its own process for representation? **Dunsire** answered that the CoP will monitor what kind of representation is needed for each region. The JSC will begin discussing details at its November meeting. He hopes that improved representation and communication will lead to RDA being updated far more frequently and being more responsive to the needs of catalogers.

- Mexico is geographically in North America, but the UN considers it part of Central America. Has the level of discussion resolved that? **Dunsire** said no. There will be similar boundary issues elsewhere.

- It is important for the JSC to define which countries are in each region. **Dunsire** said he is making a note of that.

- At what level within ALA do discussions about the transition happen? Is the reconfiguration done at the level of ALCTS, CaMMS, or ALA? **Glennan** answered that her appointment is at the highest level, ALA.

- Question from the audience: Has the CoP considered that the cost of the RDA Toolkit is already prohibitive for poor countries and even poor libraries and museums in this country? Dunsire said that the CoP is relying on expertise of the co-publishers for this issue. The CoP would like it to be free and large portions are free, but it does have expenses to cover.

- It might be a good idea to look at the structure of EURIG to see if there is something to learn from it. **Dunsire** suggested that the chair of EURIG be invited to talk to CC:DA.

- **Dunsire** concluded by saying that he would be available to answer any future questions from the Committee, and Glennan would be as well.

1330.   Report from ALA Publishing Services: Hennelly

Hennelly reported that the statistics that he is providing for the RDA Toolkit are through May 2015. There are slightly over 3,000 active subscriptions, and 8,200 active users, that is 2.2 users per subscription. The rate of new subscriptions has slowed a bit. The renewal rate is holding steady at about 83%. ALA Publishing Services expected 90%, and it is looking at ways to improve that. It is a bit behind on expectations for new subscribers, but it is on track to meet targets for revenue. Part of that seeming contradiction is that the pricing model changed last year. The five-year projected budget needs to be revised for a new pricing model. There was about an

8% increase in page views and number of sessions, so that is good news. ALA Publishing Services sold 474 copies of RDA in print, and 7 units of the e-book, which is an increase. The e-book has not been updated since 2013.

Another revenue source that does well is RDA training and online e-courses. Three have already been offered in 2015: one on RDA cataloging, one on RDA implementation, and one on RDA cataloging for music. These three courses sold 357 units total. It is a very positive revenue stream. ALA Publishing Services would like to add more courses. If anyone has suggestions for topics or would like to teach, contact them. ALA Publishing Services is also interested in adding Spanish versions of the courses.

The new 2015 print revision of RDA should be out by the end of the summer. *RDA Essentials* has completed editorial review by the JSC and gotten acceptance. It is moving into production now. It will likely be available early next year.

There were RDA Toolkit releases in February and April (plus a bonus release in March to get Spanish out as soon as possible): the February release included the fully integrated version of the *MLA Best Practices for Music Cataloging*; the April release included the update from the proposals approved at the 2014 JSC meeting. Future Toolkit releases are expected in August and October that should include Fast Track changes, updates to policy statements, and updates to translations. German will be current with English in August; Spanish will be current with English in October. French is behind, but it will be caught up to the same schedule as other languages by February 2016. His goal is to see RDA updates come out in April and translations updated by August.

February, April, August, and October releases are planned for 2016. It is possible that Italian and Finnish translations may be added by February 2016 (current through English April 2015). RBMS policy statements might also be added to the Toolkit.

Improvements are planned for the administrative interface. Currently it is only possible to change an e-mail or login. ALA Publishing Services is going to add an interface to allow managers to set layout preferences for the Toolkit. It will be possible to personalize view preferences. There will be revisions of the element set view as well.

ALA Publishing Services have been working with the Registry on several development projects. One is the synchronization of the Toolkit and the Registry. Right now they are synced, but it is a laborious manual process. ALA Publishing Services is building a tool to automate this so there will be a single input for changes to element definitions, scope notes, etc. that will be published in both the Registry and the Toolkit. It is also working on internationalization of the Registry, to include aliases to provide human readable links across languages, and building a triple store for RDF in the Registry.

Italian and Finnish translations are in the works. ALA Publishing Services is close to a final agreement for a Catalan translation. It is nearing agreement for a print translation for Slovakian and Ukrainian. It is also developing agreements with Iceland, Sweden, and others to develop a reference translation. The reference translation includes only the glossary, elements and their

definitions, vocabularies, and scope notes. These go into the Registry. Communities with a reference translation can use the RDA instructions in English but have access to the translation in the Registry that allows them to build applications that have labels in their own languages. This seems a promising model for some smaller language communities. It is affordable and faster. Finally, there are ongoing discussions with the Arabic, Russian, and Japanese language communities.

Discussion from the meeting included:
- For those who are confused by lexical aliases, there are technical guidelines on the RDA site explaining these registries. **Hennelly** said that they are working on a primer for the RDA Registry for nontechnical folks that will be ready in a few months.

1331. Report from the PCC liaison: Robare [CC:DA/PCC/2015/02]

Robare stated that her written report talks about standing committees and phase 3B of the authority file. There is a good explanation in the LC report on the authorities project. It will be a heart transplant for the authority file.

Feedback is needed on the NUL CSR 2015 draft. It would be interesting to know whether this is an effective approach.

The PCC is working on RDA refresher training materials and bringing training materials up to date. They would like to advance the understanding of linked data.

Discussion from the meeting included:
- For those libraries that have been postponing local cleanup of their authority files, is the end of Phase 3B a good opportunity to do that? The response was that Phase 3B involves no changes to 1XX fields, but 3.5 million records will have ISNIs added.

1332. Report from the MAC representative: Myers [CC:DA/MAC/2015/2/Final]

Myers stated that there were three proposals, one discussion paper, and one informal paper. All of the proposals passed and the discussion paper will return as a proposal. The informal paper was invited for exploratory purposes, but now the matter rests largely in PCC's hands.

1333. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo

Guajardo shared the maintenance activities that have been done on the blog. There were a few minor changes for font and background color. A new tab was added for Task Forces. The number of tabs is being kept at a minimum. Some items on the right side of the website on a PC have been reordered; on a mobile device, those should be shifted to the bottom.

There is a filter in place to keep spam out of the comments. Various rules have been set up to catch spam; thousands of spam comments have been filtered out.

Sometimes a post will be sent to Guajardo for approval. This should not happen often, but when it does, he will try to get to it and approve it as soon as possible. This is the first year that accounts were set up in advance for all members for posting. When a new account is set up, the first post will need approval. Occasionally, updates to the site will cause the first few people who post after the update to require approval for their posts as well.

The latest plug-in added is a widget that allows notifications to be turned on when comments are made to a specific post.

Guajardo thanked the outgoing chair for his excellent stewardship.

Discussion during the meeting included:
- How do members get notifications of updates for a specific post? **Guajardo** responded that there is a checkbox to click at the bottom of the post. There is no need to post a comment in order to receive the notifications.

1334. Encouraging feedback, next steps: Rendall, Bourassa

The **Chair** gave a reminder about the conversation on this topic from the last meeting. **Bourassa** shared that she did a nonscientific survey of comments on the blog on Saturday. There were nine proposals, and Glennan was responsible for many of the total number of comments. With only around 15% of the Committee contributing comments, there is room for improvement. It is okay to comment with a simple "me, too." One good thing about the former wiki was a question roundup that collected all questions in one place for people to review. **Bourassa** will create a similar roundup for items under discussion this summer.

Discussion during the meeting included:
- Regarding proposals from other constituencies requiring CC:DA's response, is it preferable to ask members to review a few big groups of many proposals or more frequent but smaller groups? One member prefers more frequent but smaller groups. Another member prefers the way the Chair grouped proposals from other constituencies by topic. **Bourassa** said she is planning on doing that.
- **Bourassa** asked for suggestions on increasing efficiency regarding voting by e-mail for straw polls. A member suggested SurveyMonkey. **Rendall** said that because we have an open-meeting policy, straw polls have to be public.
- **Bourassa** reminded liaisons to send proposals to their organizations for review directly. Do not expect them to go to the JSC website themselves. Also, explain to them what the proposal is about. **Glennan** noted that all the JSC proposals now should contain a one or two sentence abstract. That is an easy way to explain proposals to constituency members.
- **Bourassa** asked for suggestions about virtual meetings. It is daunting to plan virtual meetings when people may not even make the effort to comment on the blog. There is a need to agree on times to meet and make local room reservations. **Glennan** responded that ALA's open meeting policy is much more relevant for virtual meetings than it is for straw polls. If we did virtual meetings, we would have to conform to ALA policy. The conclusion was that virtual meetings are time-consuming and cumbersome, and it was

preferred that members focus their efforts on making blog comments without the additional burden of virtual meetings.

1335. Proposal from TF on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K: Maxwell

Proposal: RDA Appendix K Revision and Expansion [CC:DA/TF/Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K/6] [Discussion]

Maxwell said that the Task Force will take into consideration the comments on the blog, but the comments have not been incorporated yet. Suggestions for new designators will no longer be added to this proposal, but can be incorporated into fast track proposals later. **Glennan** agreed that this proposal should focus on the current designators. Any new suggestions could be discussed at the JSC November meeting or at a subsequent meeting.

Maxwell gave some background:
- In the section about person to person, many terms for family relationships were made gender-neutral. This was necessary because the relationships need to be one-to-one. There is no parent to son or daughter; there is parent to child. That leads to some unwieldy things like aunt/uncle because there is no gender-neutral word in English for that.
- There is a separate section on p. 3 called "Relationships within entity descriptions" to introduce a new concept of being able to tell relationships between names instead of entities, such as earlier name and later name, or religious name and secular name (K.3.4).
- The task force believes that any name can be related to any other name. It should be ablo to relate variant names to other variant names. This is not possible in the current MARC structure. This proposal was written for the possibility of some other structure, while keeping in mind the current structure.
- The attributed relationship is not a relationship between a person and a work; it is a relationship between two persons: a person who has pretended to be another person and the person whom the other is pretending to be.
- Deferred issues that the task force feels are important include alternate identity/real identity, relationships for jurisdictions, fictitious characters, and protagonist.

  Discussion during the meeting included:
- There is the issue of willful impersonation and false attribution not being the same thing. **Maxwell** replied that perhaps the wording should be tailored to make clear that the pseudo case is not included here.
- The proposal is very well done and useful in moving RDA forward. The complexity of it may distract from getting the basic parts of Appendix K in place. **Maxwell** added that in the introduction, the Task Force is trying to say to the JSC, "Whatever you think of the structure, we really need the terms. Accept as many as possible." The proposal is taking into account some of the relationships that are already defined in the FRBR model but not currently in RDA. **Glennan** added that this is an issue that CC:DA was previously asked to address, because these FRAD relationships were not in our former proposal.
- This paper pushes the boundaries of the structure of Appendix K in a number of ways. A lot of those are also tasks of the Working Group for Relationship Designators that the

JSC has already set up. **Glennan** said that there is some overlap in membership between our task force and that working group. There is a need for this task force no to hold off another year. If the JSC decides that this work needs to be referred to the Working Group, so be it.
- **Dunsire** said that the most practical way is to carry on with this current proposal.

The **Chair** called for a motion to approve the proposal. **Walsh** moved; **Kelley** seconded. All voted in favor, and the motion passed 7-0.

1336. Proposal from OLAC: McGrath [CC:DA/OLAC/2015/1] [Discussion]

McGrath stated that the goal of the proposal is to fill in some gaps in RDA regarding optical discs. OLAC proposed three new elements for inclusion in RDA. Last summer, there were no major objections to this proposal. It was asked to put vocabulary in the Open Metadata Registry, which has been done. It was pointed out that some tweaking was needed to address some inconsistencies, but the first step has been taken. OLAC lost its technical expert because he took another job.

Discussion during the meeting included:
- The first aspect that we are trying to bring out is the physical type of the disc, e.g., if it is a CD, DVD, a Blu-Ray disc.
- The next aspect that we are trying to bring out is the method that is being used to record data on the disc. An issue is whether the recording method should be its own element versus being a subelement of method of production. It does not fit under method of production because it is really about describing a type of disc and not the way the things get on the disc: if it is a DVD-R, CD-ROM; if it is stamped, or mass produced. **Glennan** asked how the physical type of disc relates to the 33X fields. The method of production may be more logical for a general audience. **McGrath** said OLAC is not committed to either position. It will defer to whatever CC:DA wants to put forward.
- **McGrath** discussed the usefulness of telling the difference between different types of discs, e.g., burned, pressed, stamped. **Glennan** said that there may be a precedent. A parallel she can think of is that once the instructions for color contents were reworked, specific terms like sepia and gray scale, were moved to the details of color contents and are present only as notes rather than as controlled vocabulary. The real question is how important it is to provide a controlled vocabulary for this in RDA.
- This issue may come up over and over again. There will need to be a way to point technically to external vocabularies. It must be done well technically. There are many specialist communities. As far as obsolescence of formats, libraries will still need to describe and provide access to obsolete materials.
- **McGrath** asked: "If the vocabulary is maintained external to RDA, is there a method to alert RDA users that there is this external vocabulary?" **Glennan** answered that the optional addition could indicate use of an appropriate term from an external vocabulary.
- It needs to be clear to RDA users what vocabulary can be used, especially to non-OLAC members who would not otherwise know to go to that external vocabulary.
- Are there other instances in RDA of pointing explicitly to a specific external vocabulary? **Glennan** responded that this has been turned down in other cases, for example, medium

of performance. Instead it has been assumed that vocabularies can be specified in an application profile specific to institutions. See the Alternative in 7.17.1.3, which only vaguely references the use of terms from a substitute vocabulary.

- The **Chair** asked if a straw poll would make sense at this point. **McGrath** said that the desirable options are to have the vocabulary maintained within RDA or to keep it externally, but if the latter it would have to be very easy for people to find.
- **Glennan** stated that there could be multiple options in the proposal itself, or a preference. She could write into the background section the framework that informed CC:DA's decision, making that transparent so other constituencies can comment and respond.
- **Dunsire** said that the JSC is likely to go the application profile route. There is that blanket instruction in Section 0 that says whenever a vocabulary is specified, you can use one of your own. We cannot pepper references to specific non-RDA vocabularies throughout the Toolkit. That could become untenable and confusing. As far as the proposal itself, Glennan's suggestion of prefacing the proposal with a background section is a good idea. The end result of all of this is to provide a term that can be put into catalog data for the edification of the user. Underneath that, there is a much more rigid ontology that is for machine-actionability and to produce certain catalog functions. The JSC would want to preserve that powerful device. There is a guidance document in the pipeline on how to construct labels with surface, human-readable terms and supplemented by machine readable elements underneath.
- **Glennan** recommended following the model of color content and explaining the thinking behind it.

    The **Chair** did not recommend voting at this time, as this will be an ongoing discussion. **Glennan** reminded the members and liaisons that McGrath will need feedback and insight.

1337. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting; and adjournment: Chair

The Chair announced that everything on the agenda had been discussed except for Glennan's third proposal, which will be followed up via email. Voting members Sandra Macke and Mary Ann Dyer have accepted reappointment. Beth Shoemaker is joining as a new voting member. **The Chair** turned over the floor to the incoming Chair to announce the next meeting. **Bourassa** stated that the next meeting will be quite early in January. The **Chair** asked whether any liaison terms were ending. Tarango is ending his term. Weitz is ending his term as IFLA liaison, although he will still be participating as OCLC liaison. The outgoing **Chair** thanked everyone for coming. He adjourned the meeting at 11:34 a.m.