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
2016 ALA Midwinter Meeting in Boston, Massachusetts
January 9 and 11, 2016**

Members present:
Dominique Bourassa, Chair
Mary Anne Dyer
Elyssa Gould
Steve Kelley
Sandra Macke
Dr. Elizabeth Anne Shoemaker
Tina Shrader
Larisa Walsh

Richard Guajardo, CC:DA Webmaster
Heather McIntosh, Intern
Amanda L. Ros, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:
Kathy Glennan, ALA Representative to the RSC
Dave Reser, LC
Jay Weitz, OCLC

ALA Liaisons present:
Tassanee Chitcharoen, ALA/GODORT [Saturday only]
Felicity Dykas, ALA/ACRL
Peter V. Fletcher, ALCTS/CRS
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM
Matthew Haugen, ALA/ACRL/RBMS [Saturday only]
Jessica Hayden, ALCTS/MIG
Yoko Kudo, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/SAC
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons:
Robert Bratton, AALL
Thomas Duszak, CLA [Monday only]

Diane Hillmann, DCMI
Dorothy McGarry, SLA
Kelley McGrath, OLAC
John Myers, MAC
Diane Napert, ARSC
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:

      AALL = American Association of Law Libraries
      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
      BIBFRAME = Bibliographic Framework Initiative

CaMMS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
CC:AAM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:DA = ALCTS/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
CCM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
CLA = Catholic Library Association
CoP = Committee of Principals for RDA
CRS = ALCTS/ Continuing Resources Section
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
EURIG = European RDA Interest Group
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
FRBR-LRM = IFLA's *FRBR-Library Reference Model*
FRBRoo = FRBR-object oriented
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LC-PCC PSs = Library of Congress Policy Statements
MAGIRT = Map and Geospatial Information Round Table
MAC = MARC Advisory Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MIG = ALCTS/Metadata Interest Group
MusLA = Music Library Association
OCLC = Online Computer Library Center
OCR = Optical Character Recognition
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RSC = RDA Steering Committee
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SAA = Society of American Archivists
SCS = PCC Standing Committee on Standards
SCT = PCC Standing Committee on Training
SLA = Special Libraries Association
URI = Uniform Resource Identifier
WEMI = Work/expression/manifestation/item, the FRBR group 1 entities

Saturday, January 9, 1:00–5:00 p.m.
Boston Convention and Exhibition Center, 109AB

1338.   Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Dominique Bourassa, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members. She noted that one voting member would be unable to attend these meetings in Boston.

1339.   Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group [CC:DA/Roster/2015]

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

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

1340.   Adoption of agenda: Chair [CC:DA/A/73]

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

1341.   Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2015 ALA Annual Conference, June 27 and 29, 2015: Chair [CC:DA/M/1316-1337]

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.

1342.   Report from the Chair [CC:DA/Chair/2015-2016/2]

The **Chair** noted that there was a small typo in the online report in which July 16 should have been July 15. The online report lists the votes that CC:DA had taken via e-mail from July through December 2015. CC:DA voted to approve five RDA revision proposals and one discussion paper originally discussed at the 2015 ALA Annual Conference and subsequently revised.

In August and September, CC:DA voted to authorize ALA responses based on Committee discussion to 28 RDA revision proposals and discussion papers from other constituencies.

One task force was formed in July to review the draft of *Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Manuscripts)* on which the Committee was invited to comment. In December, CC:DA voted to approve the report submitted by this task force. All votes were passed 8–0 or 7–0. The **Chair** invited a motion from a voting member to confirm the preceding votes. **Shoemaker** moved; **Walsh** seconded. The motion passed 7–0.

1343. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Reser [Library of Congress Report, ALA 2016 Midwinter Meeting]

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 included:
- Personnel changes: Dr. James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, moved up his retirement to September; David Mao was named Acting Librarian of Congress. Roberta Shaffer returned to LC in October to become Law Librarian of Congress. LC has a Chief Information Officer again after four years without one; Bernard Barton began in September. Kathryn Mendenhall, long time chief of the Cataloging Distribution Service, retired in December. Ana Cristán, Cooperative Cataloging Program Specialist in the Policy and Standards Division of ABA retired in September.
- The new organizational structure discussed at the ALA Annual Conference in June took effect on October 1. The changes involved about 900 people.
- ABA has been approved to fill around 35 positions in the next year; 30 of these positions will be open to applicants from outside the library.
- Budget has been passed through October 1, 2016.
- A user survey to identify needs for future development and support related to *Cataloger's Desktop* is forthcoming. Suggestions can also be sent to Bruce Johnson at LC.
- One new romanization table for Deseret has been proposed and work continues on several others.
- The LC-PCC PSs were updated twice since the 2015 Annual Conference. Most of the additions have come from the PCC Series Policy Task Group. There were also many changes to the *Descriptive Cataloging Manual* Z1 relating to series.
- PCC RDA Authorities Phase 3B project is still on hold until testing is complete.
- The old interface to the Library's OPAC has finally been retired; all OPAC sessions now use https://catalog.loc.gov. A new interface is expected in the next few months.
- LC began the pilot project to experiment with BIBFRAME in September. For more information, see http://www.loc.gov/bibframe/

Discussion included:
- The **Chair** asked if there is a plan to add 667 fields to authority records for choreographic works before Phase 3B happens because at the moment there are over 21000 titles of choreographic works that look right but are in fact wrong. **Reser** replied that LC has no current plans to do this. Specifications for Phase 3B are set. Phase 3B was originally intended to be the last phase. But the PCC RDA Authorities Phase 3 Task Group has identified several other problems affecting relatively small groups of records. This will probably take a long time to clean up.
- The links to the LC OPAC in *Cataloger's Desktop* and *Classification Web* should point to the new OPAC interface.

1344. Report of the ALA Representative to the RDA Steering Committee: Glennan
[Report on JSC/RSC Activities, July-December 2015]

Glennan reported on the following topics:
- The JSC has officially changed its name to RSC: the RDA Steering Committee, effective at the close of the JSC meeting on November 6, 2015.
- All of the old JSC email and website addresses redirect to the new RSC website.
- The RSC's annual meeting will take place in Frankfurt, Germany, November 7-11, 2016.
- The JSC members issued and reviewed revised proposals in mid-October 2015 which allowed the work of the committee to move more quickly during the meetings. This will be the formal process in 2016 where revised proposals will be due 3 weeks before the RSC meeting.
- The JSC decided to extend its Working Principle (http://www.rda-rsc.org/node/229) through the next year, affecting the consideration and implementation of revision proposals that will impact sections of RDA that are likely to be revised based on the upcoming FRBR-LRM. 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.
- RDA Toolkit needs to be restructured in light of FRBR-LRM, additional languages, etc. A Working Group will be established soon to investigate changes.
- The JSC issued a moratorium on adding new relationship designators other than those already proposed during 2015 until the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group completes its tasks of preparing a general paper on designators and a set of guidelines for proposing new designators (expected in 2016).
- 6JSC/ALA/43 regarding the revision and expansion of RDA Appendix K was deferred due to the developing FRBR-LRM model. **Glennan** submitted Fast Track proposals on CC:DA's behalf for terms with (potential) agreement from all constituencies (17 new terms and 3 revisions proposed). The only rejected revision was changing the term "predecessor of split" to "split from". **Glennan** prepared a report for the RSC on the terms that were not eligible for fast track proposals to share with the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group.
- 6JSC/ALA/44 proposing new chapter 3 elements for optical disc data storage format and optical disc recording method: this proposal came from OLAC. It was rejected, but the RSC will consider adding the terms "stamped" and "burned" into the Glossary in April to address some of the issues raised in the proposal.
- 6JSC/ALA/45 on referential relationships was rejected. We were trying to create cross-entity relationships but RDA is not ready to deal with that. The cross-entity problem was referred to the RSC Relationship Designators Working Group and will be discussed by the soon-to-be created RSC working group on rare materials.
- 6JSC/ALA/Discussion 5 on machine-actionable data elements: there was general agreement that RDA needs to support both machine-actionable and human-readable data.

Additional work on this project will continue with an RSC working group to replace the ALA task force.

- Highlights of the other documents that the JSC reviewed: 6JSC/BL/26 on changing method of recording production statement (rejected in favor of developing a self-described vs. non-self-described approach; major revisions will need to be folded into the expected redesign of RDA); 6JSC/BL/Discussion 1 on conventional collective titles in RDA (no consensus); 6JSC/BL rep/2, Simplification of RDA 2.7-2.10 follow up (deferred); 6JSC/CCC/17, Recording the fuller form of name (9.5.1.1) (accepted with modifications including the use of "diminutive" instead of "nickname"); 6JSC/LC/32 Revision to instructions for devised titles in RDA 2.3.2.11 (accepted with minor modifications); 6JSC/LC/33 clarified revision to instructions for adaptations and revisions (6.27.1.5) (accepted with modifications to allow multiple creators); 6JSC/LC/34 regarding location of a conference, etc. (accepted; however the modeling issues regarding using "online" and "associated institutions" as locations will be investigated by the RSC Technical Working Group); 6JSC/AggreatesWG/1 focused on RDA and FRBRoo treatment of aggregates (the RSC Aggregates Working Group to continue investigating); CapitalizationWG/1 on capitalization instructions (generally accepted; the Capitalization Working Group will continue its work); 6JSC/FictitiousWG/1, Fictitious and other entities in RDA and the consolidated FR models (rejected due to the paper not conforming to the view of person in FRBRoo/FRBR-LRM); 6JSC/PlacesWG/1, Place as an RDA entity (the Places Working Group will develop relationship designators for places).
- **Glennan** had been charged with analyzing the use of *record* and *transcribe* in RDA Chapter 2 (ALARep2015Transcribe). The JSC noted that transcription only applies to manifestation elements and that it can only be used for self-describing resources. The conclusion was that some work needs to be done to make sure RDA is very clear, what elements should be transcribed, and exactly what that means.
- The JSC discussed the paper on gender as an RDA element. Several international communities felt that gender information is private and should not be included at all in RDA. Especially considering the planned adoption of RDA in more non-western countries, identifying someone as something other than male or female could be dangerous. An alternative was considered to make it an optional element, but was ultimately rejected. Two alternatives were considered: 1) deprecating the element and the vocabulary; 2) retaining the element and deprecating the vocabulary. The RSC agreed to this second approach. ALA will have an opportunity to create an extension list as a vocabulary source that will include "transgender".
- Volunteers from OLAC and MusLA are going to take the lead in resolving the following music/AV relationship designator proposals: casting director, DJ mixer, dubbing director, mixing engineer, music producer, producer (expression), programmer (music), remixer.
- The FRBR-LRM (http://library.ifla.org/1084/) draft should be available in the first quarter of 2016.
- Two new documents have been approved and published on the RSC website:

- o 6JSC/ROFWG/3, Guidelines for proposing new carrier and content categories and terms in RDA
- o 6JSC/ROFWG/3/Categories, RDA carrier and content categories

Discussion included:
- The moratorium on adding new relationship designators does not include those proposals submitted before the end of 2015. **Glennan** also added that everyone should keep additional designators in mind to add to the list for later review.
- Disagreement in relation to the nature of fictitious characters in FRBRoo and FRBR-LRM, specifically the rejection of fictitious authors is of concern. **Glennan** noted that we can register that concern as an individual or group response to the FRBR-LRM review, although she opines that it will have little, if any, effect. The Fictitious Entities Working Group has already eloquently raised these concerns. She stated that RDA has to be compatible with the FR international models, going back before FRBR-LRM and FRBRoo. CC:DA could either fight the model or work within the model. Another concern was put forth as to what the point of the worldwide review is if the FRBR Review Group is unlikely to change the model as a result of comments received. **Glennan** repeated that we can register concerns, and the more groups that register the concern, the more weight it will be given, but the biggest problem is our uniquely American view on the topic in an international community.
- Moving forward with fictitious characters: **Glennan** explained that part of the challenge is that FRBR-LRM has created super- and sub-classes whose inheritance properties must behave appropriately. She suggested a possible solution may come with FRBR-LRM's new Nomen entity. Many more things can be Nomens. There was disagreement as to whether the model itself is working. The Fictitious Entities Working Group seems to want the user to be able to find the works under the name that the user expects to find those works and no others. CC:DA discussed whether it really cares about underlying philosophy or just the result. The sentiment is that the philosophy leads to the wrong result: the problem in FRBRoo/FRBR-LRM is that the Agent has to be a human being. How can a name (Agent) be attached to a fictitious character when nobody knows who is behind that name (person?, corporate body?) Discussion ensued about the example of the whale song. **Glennan** added that the Agent is the highest level creator and the fictitious character can be connected to the Agent as the real author.

1345. ALA/40: Outcomes and Next Steps: Glennan/Chair

Revision Proposal (November, 2015) [6JSC/ALA/40 - Revision to RDA 3.1.4, Resources Consisting of More than One Carrier Type and RDA 3.4.1.3, Recording Extent] [Discussion]

The **Chair** invited **Melanie Polutta, former CC:DA webmaster,** to come to the table since she is a task force member who worked on the proposal.

Glennan explained that the goals of the proposal were to add something to 3.1.4 that deals with multiple carriers of the same carrier type so that the reference from 1.5.2 would not be

meaningless for such resources and to propose for discussion the addition of the concept of predominance to the guidelines for describing multiple carriers. This would make it possible to allow but not require instructions for accompanying material statements as one way of describing resources with multiple carriers.

The proposal was rejected based on lack of consensus. It prompted LC to initiate two fast track proposals to solve some of the problems. Wording was agreed on to update the reference in 1.5.2 that went to 3.1.4 to just 3.1. The more specific reference was only valid in parts with different carrier types. The second to last paragraph in 3.1.4 was removed, and a new paragraph created to replace it: "when preparing an analytical description for a part or parts of a resource consisting of more than one carrier, record information about another carrier as part of the description of the related manifestation; see 27.1". Any further revisions will have to be careful about the use of the term *part,* which can be ambiguous (physical component vs. intellectual component).

The proposal was rejected, largely because CCC identified additional issues to be addressed. Glennan committed ALA to work with CCC to resolve issues identified and create a discussion paper for consideration in 2016. The issues are as follows:
1. 2 lines in RDA 2.2.2.1 focusing on the treatment of accompanying material being contingent on choice of description: comprehensive or analytical.
2. The definition of accompanying material appears to be quite narrow.
3. Accompanying material does not impact the Mode of Issuance.
4. There are inconsistencies in defining resource itself.
5. If the accompanying material is part of the resource itself, does that mean that it is "a part" that makes the resource a multipart monograph?
6. The distinction between a non-predominant part of a resource and accompanying material.
7. Recording "2 volumes" versus recording extent for 2 volumes in MARC 300 $a and 300 $e.

The **Chair** noted that for several reasons, it might be best to discharge the task force that wrote ALA 40 and create a new task force that will be charged to work jointly with the CCC. **Polutta** agreed. The **Chair** passed around a volunteer sheet for the new task force.

1346. Upcoming CC:DA work: Chair

The **Chair** reported that there are currently three task forces in place. She subsequently discharged the Task Force to Investigate the Instructions for Recording Relationships in RDA and the Task Force on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K because their work has been assigned to existing RSC working groups. The Task Force on Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3 remains charged until the RSC creates a new working group that will continue the work of the task force.

Upcoming work:
● To approve the Deseret romanization table by January 21st.

- The FRBR-LRM should be released in the first quarter, and CC:DA will need to make an official statement. A task force to work on this will be created. The **Chair** passed around a volunteer sheet for the new task force to review the FRBR-LRM.

The **Chair** proposed a motion to allow either the chair or the webmaster to change the terms "Joint Steering Committee"/"JSC" to "RDA Steering Committee"/"RSC" in procedural documentation and archive the older versions. **Kelley** moved, **Shoemaker** seconded, and the motion passed 7-0.

1347. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo

Guajardo shared information on the maintenance activities that have been done on the blog, which is running Wordpress 4.4.1. There were a few minor changes like updates to plug-ins to enhance functionality such as making comments and getting emails. All CC:DA members should have blog accounts. If your email address has changed, contact the webmaster to update it. Proposals are being posted as early as possible to allow for the maximum number of comments.

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 get blocked by the software. If this happens, contact the webmaster and he will unblock it.

1348. Report from the PCC liaison: Robare [CC:DA/PCC/2016/01]

Robare went over her report, stating that most PCC work in the last months and coming year is driven by the strategic plan that was developed a year ago, and updated and revised in November. Their focus is moving from creating bibliographic records to helping the community advance its understanding of linked data and other data structures.

The SCS worked mainly on relationship designators the past year. Currently the group is working on a proposal giving PCC catalogers the option to record Creative Commons statements in MARC 540, updating the Cataloging FAQs, and focusing on relationship designator guidelines for authority records.

The SCT is working on series policy and training. LC-PCC PS 24.6 I has the most significant change where both numbered and unnumbered issues of a series are now treated as a single series. The group was tasked with doing an environmental scan of available linked data training resources and producing a report that is available at the PCC website. It has updated the RDA sample records and the series training manual, as well as evaluating LC's RDA refresher training that is available on the Catalogers Learning Workshop website.

Feedback is needed. It would be interesting to know whether this is an effective approach.

Discussion from the meeting included:
- Series training manual incorporates policy decisions that have been made in the last year or two.

1349. Revision Proposal for RDA instructions for the names of international courts (RDA 11.2.2.21): Bratton [CC:DA/AALL/2016/1]

Bratton noted that the proposal was developed because he and his colleagues realized there was an existing practice regarding names of international courts that had never been codified. No one had substantive comments about this proposal.

Discussion during the meeting included:
*   **Glennan** noted that proposals should go immediately to the RSC instead of waiting for the deadline. As soon as CC:DA passes the proposal, **Glennan** will send it forward.
*   **Glennan** suggested removing the term *record* from the background.
*   It was noted that **Bratton** should review 11.2.2.14.11 to see if he wants to update that reference as well before submitting the proposal.

The proposal will be voted on after **Bratton** makes the revisions.

1350. Changes in RDA Governance as They Affect ALA: Glennan [RDA Governance Changes: the North American Perspective]

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

*   In addition to the JSC officially changing name to RSC, the CoP was renamed the RDA Board. The new organizational chart was shared as part of the presentation.
*   There is a three-year transition plan for changing representation, moving toward representation by geographic region (UN regions). Each region will develop its own structure, and Europe is already well on the way. The North American region includes the U.S., Canada, and the following, should they adopt RDA in the future: Bermuda, Greenland, and Saint Pierre and Miquelon. Mexico is part of the Latin American region.
*   By 2019, there will be only one North American representative to the RSC. ALA will continue to have a representative until the new North American representational model is finalized. CC:DA must consider how to transition from the current model—with the ALA representative as one of three representatives from North America—to the new model with its single North American representative.
*   The North American representatives met in 2015 to begin these discussions and air concerns. One major concern from the Canadians was being overwhelmed by the Americans and not having their own voice.
*   The governance changes will require more reliance on working groups as a source of change proposals. Individual ALA members currently serve on various working groups, and Glennan encouraged CC:DA members to continue to volunteer for service on future working groups.

A new structure was proposed for the North American constituency. This is envisioned as lightweight layer between ALA and the RSC; effectively a North American JSC. This approach would allow for existing committees such as CC:DA, SAC, CCC, etc. to retain their current

function and representation. For discussion purposes, this was called NARDAC (North American RDA Committee). This committee would consist of representatives from the ALA, LC, CCC, and possibly the Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec. The RSC representative would be chosen from amongst the committee. Term limits for the various NARDAC representatives would be determined by the organizations they represent. The meetings would all be virtual (by financial necessity).

Discussion topics:
- The role of cultural heritage communities will be part of the wider community box in the main structure of the RSC.
- If specialist communities such as SAA seek a seat at the NARDAC table, this would trigger losing their representation on CC:DA, since no community should be participating in multiple layers of the RSC hierarchy. This would introduce a change for ALA, which has traditionally brought forward proposals and concerns from everyone at the CC:DA table. Other communities such as MedLA are unable to add any duties, especially duties that replicate those of the RSC representative, to their stretched membership. The more groups who want seats on NARDAC, the more complex the new layer will be. This change opens an opportunity for reconsidering the current structure of having multiple groups going through CC:DA as liaisons, although the chances of overwhelming the Canadians with all of the different American groups is greater.
- **Gordon Dunsire** explained that in Europe, EURIG already exists as an interest group and is preparing to take on the task of representing the European region.
- The **chair** asked who has the final decision about who will be on NARDAC? **Glennan** responded that the RDA Board has tasked her and the other North American representatives (currently LC and CCC) to come up with a solution.
- Communities within ALA, especially specialists, will be depended on by the RSC at the working group level, where they can make the most helpful input.
- Time pressures for deadlines.
- How to come up with consensus among NARDAC members.
- Succession planning and lack thereof.
- Possible livestreaming of future RSC meetings.

The **Chair** and **Glennan** encouraged representatives to take the information back to their organizations to see if they have any feedback, suggestions, or requests.

The **Chair** recessed the meeting at 4:51 p.m.

Monday, January 11, 8:30–11:30 a.m.
Boston Convention & Exhibition Center, 162AB

1351. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Dominique Bourassa, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members.

1352.   Presentation of the RSC Chair: Dunsire (RDA Data Capture and Storage**)**

Dunsire's presentation focused on where RDA is going, specifically how RDA works as a data management standard and the pathway where RDA is now and where it will hopefully be moving in the future. The single sentence to describe RDA is: RDA is a package of data elements, guidelines, and instructions for creating library and cultural heritage resource metadata that are well-formed according to international models for user-focused linked data applications. The Toolkit and Registry complement one another to achieve this.

The FRBR-LRM introduces entities *Place, Time-span, Collective Agent,* and *Nomen*, which encompasses identifier, authorized access points, variable access points, structured description, transcribed title, etc. A description of the related resource using RDA elements is presented in an order specified by a recognized display standard. There were originally three RDA database implementation scenarios, but looking to the future, **Dunsire** is pressing for a fully linked (global) scenario.

There are 2 techniques for obtaining data from the source: *Transcription* and *Recording.* Transcription as a technique for obtaining data can only be taken from a manifestation, and the result is "what you see is what you get". Digital imaging is the most accurate, quickest, easiest, and cheapest method for transcription, although there are problems with OCR software that people are needed to correct, possibly by crowdsourcing. Currently, the result of applying the RDA instructions is really recording, and not transcription. Recorded data supports all user tasks. The guidance and instructions on recording RDA data is intended to filter out information that is confusing and misleading such as typos, deliberate printing errors and fictitious entities. How can all this data be best accommodated in RDA?

Recording relationships can be done following a 4-fold path, 3-fold path, or 2-fold path (depending on the specific instructions) using a combination of identifiers and authorized access points. Descriptions (structured and/or unstructured) are also used for the 3- and 4-fold paths. **Dunsire** used the 4-fold path as an example. In order of increasing structure and machine-actionability, there is the (1) unstructured string, (2) structured string of delimited sub-values, (3) structured string, and (4) URI of entity, including Nomen. Unstructured strings can be populated through an exact transcription, through transcription using the RDA guidelines, or from data recorded from another string. All descriptions, whether structured or unstructured, may be treated as Nomen entities and assigned their own URIs. Structured strings of delimited sub-values contain access points and structured descriptions. The URI of entity including Nomen is the linked data path. Elements of the entity in focus can be described using unstructured or structured descriptions, including access points and identifiers. It just depends on a point-of-view (the focus). Each path or technique is appropriate for specific elements in a relative context. This

allows RDA to support data capture in a wide variety of environments and applications, from a static focus on local items-in-hand to a dynamic focus on local and related remote entities.

This opens up real and significant possibilities for generalizing the instructions and making them a lot easier to use. The RSC intends to develop RDA Toolkit to clarify and contextualize the techniques for capturing and recording RDA data in light of the FRBR-LRM by extending the current approach of giving general guidance and instructions before instructions for specific RDA elements. Not every path is suitable for every element; therefore specific instructions for specific elements will follow. There could be a 2-fold or 2.5-fold path for programmers and a 4-fold path for catalogers. At the same time, we need to develop the RDA Registry to make sure machine applications can use this thing. We can see the Registry as a method for defining the elements in which we store the data. While instructions (Toolkit) are about capturing and obtaining data, the Registry provides the means of cataloging systems to store the data in a way that make it useful.

Under the new entities, "Agent" could replace person, family, or corporate bodies. New relationship designators to refine the new elements will also be required. Many of these will apply between different entities; the new entities could serve as cross-entity designators for the current RDA entities. The FRBR-LRM Res (Latin for "thing") entity is a new "super-entity" of all other entities, used to simplify the modeling of relationships. It is unlikely to be required in RDA since Nomen is related to every other element.

The Element Set View tab in the Toolkit is outdated, dysfunctional, and must be replaced. In its place, the RSC wants to develop a set of Entity views in the Toolkit as a ready reference device, a kind of dictionary for accessing the elements, guidance, and instructions associated with each RDA entity. A draft of the Toolkit Entity Views will be sent out for review. Reorganizing the Toolkit could involve creating appendices and tabs, vocabulary encoding schemes, RDA Reference (entities, elements, and terms), glossary, translations, policy statements and application profiles, entity views, and relationship designators.

The RDA Board has approved a project to review and improve the organization and layout of RDA Toolkit over the next 2-3 years in synchronization with the development of RDA. Questions about reorganizing the Toolkit include:
- Should appendices be incorporated?
- Where should the vocabularies be placed?
- Should vocabularies be duplicated?

Some issues for RDA to consider are:
- RDA currently differentiates between the primary entities constituting a complete resource (WEMI) with secondary entities that act as access points to the resource, currently PFC but soon to be expanded with new FRBR-LRM entities. Is it useful for international, cultural heritage, and linked data communities for RDA to maintain this distinction?

- How much structure should there be in descriptions?
- How much should we specify in the sequence of access points?
- Different international cultures, different RDA communities have different ways of authority control. The Anglo-American way is not the only way of authority control.
- Would it be better to leave such specification to application profiles?
- The introduction of Nomens, which seems to be a kind of authoritative thing, is another issue to consider.

Discussion included:
- Clarification was made that Nomens are tied to everything but Nomens. Transcriptions are tied to manifestations.
- **Dunsire** said that they will provide instructions for everyone, including those without OCR scanning technology.
- Res is a potential extension device, more powerful as an abstraction than as an application.
- This presents an intriguing future, with a lot to think about, where the traditional bibliographic surrogate that serves multiple user tasks, would be replaced with a description and digital surrogate with the purpose of identification. It is a little intimidating and difficult to imagine from the standpoint of current technologies.
- Is there a need to map the statement of responsibility if users are seeing the statement of responsibility on the digital image?
- Current technology not efficient for capturing the data, making human transcription speedy by comparison.

1353. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Hennelly

RDA Toolkit points discussed:
- Fiscal year 2015 peaked with 3,100 subscriptions, but ended with 2,800, dropping by 10% from 2014. The renewal rate was 81%, and fiscal year 2016 renewals are currently at 95%. Users are up about 10% (8,500), based on 3-user subscriptions. Revenues were close to on target. There were 1.1 million sessions and 3.6 million page views.
- The print edition sales were 752 units (329 Spanish) and 8 ebooks. There will not be a revised edition produced this year due to production costs. There could possibly be a biennial edition dependent on revisions.
- *RDA Essentials* will be released in April.
- There were 3 Toolkit releases: the regular August and October releases and a special release in December for the Finnish translation.
- Future editions include the Italian translation in March 2016, and the Tagalog and Norwegian releases in 2016/2017.
- A new edition of DCRM will be released in 2016 or 2017.

- German policy statements translated into Italian and French have been requested by the Swiss.
- 35% of sales (50% of users) are international sales outside of the United States.
- There will be an added feature for administrators to control what is viewed on the website.
- Print translations in Slovakian and Vietnamese are planned, and talks are underway for an Arabic translation.

1354. Report of the MAC Representative: Myers (Report of the MAC Liaison (Preliminary)**)**

In the interest of time, **Myers** will upload the report for members to read. Points discussed:

- There were 2 proposals and 16 discussion papers.
    - Both proposals passed.
    - 1 discussion paper was converted into a proposal (gaming platform) and passed.
    - 10 discussion papers will return as proposals.
    - 2 will likely return as proposals after significant reworking.
    - 3 will be reworked as discussion papers.
- BIBFRAME pilot work being done with LC.
- Next meeting dates are June 24 and 26 in Orlando.

1355. Meeting location: Chair

The **Chair** discussed the problems with having the meetings in a conference hotel. She will request that we get meeting rooms in the Convention Center for the next meeting. Discussion included the difficulty in getting to the hotels the last time the conference was held in Orlando, the pull of the large group to get a more central location, and the proximity of hotels in the renovated Orlando convention area.

The next meetings will be held in Orlando, FL at the ALA Annual Convention on Saturday, June 25 and Monday, June 27, 2016

1356. Other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment: Chair

- **Snyder** is being replaced by **Mary Huismann** as MusLA liaison.
- The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at 10:35 a.m.