

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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2013 Midwinter ALA conference in Seattle, Washington.
January 26 and 28, 2013**

Members present:

Peter J. Rolla, Chair
Dominique Bourassa
John DeSantis – (1/28 only)
Steve Kelley
Gayle Porter
Robert Rendall
Larisa Walsh
Bob Wolverton

Melanie Polutta, CC:DA Webmaster
Mary Anne Dyer, Intern
Sandra Macke, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:

John C. Attig, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
Dave Reser, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC (represented by Jay Weitz)

ALA Liaisons present:

Francis Lapka, ALA/ACRL/RBMS
Hikaru Nakano, ALCTS/CaMMS/CC:AAM (represented by Abby Dover 1/28)
Richard Hasenyager, Jr., ALCTS/CaMMS/CCM
Robert Maxwell, ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee
Adolfo Tarango, ALCTS/CRS
John Myers, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Randy Roeder, ALCTS/PARS
Elizabeth Marie German, ALA/ACRL
Richard Guajardo, ALA/GODORT
Min Zhang, ALA/MAGIRT
Robert C. W. Hall, Jr., ALA/PLA
Ken Wade, ALA/RUSA

Non-ALA Liaisons:

John Hostage, AALL

Dan Lipcan, ARLIS/NA
 Thomas Duszak, CLA
 Diane Hillmann, DCMI
 Jay Weitz, IFLA
 Amanda K. Sprochi, MedLA
 Tracey Snyder, MusLA
 Kelley McGrath, OLAC
 Kathy Glennan, PCC
 Cory Nimer, SAA
 Dorothy McGarry, SLA

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

ACOC = Australian Committee on Cataloguing

ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries

AJL = Association of Jewish Libraries

ALA = American Library Association

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services

ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America

ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections

ATLA = American Theological Libraries Association

BIBFRAME = Bibliographic Framework Transition Initiative

BL = British Library

CaMMS = ALCTS/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section

CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing

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
CDS = LC Cataloging Distribution Service
CETM = ALCTS/CaMMS/Continuing Education Training Materials Committee
CETRC = ALCTS/CaMMS/Education, Training, and Recruitment for Cataloging Committee
CILIP = Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals
CIP = Cataloging in Publication
CLA = Catholic Library Association
CoP = Committee of Principals
DC = Dublin Core
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
EURIG = European RDA Interest Group
FRAD = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Authority Data*
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
FRSAD = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Data*
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
HTML = Hypertext Mark-up Language
ICP = IFLA's International Cataloging Principles
IEEE LTSC = IEEE Learning Technology Standards Committee
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
ILS = Integrated library system
ISBD = International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISO = International Organization for Standardization
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA
LC = Library of Congress
LITA = Library & Information Technology Association
MAGIRT = Map and Geospatial Information Round Table
MAC = MARC Advisory Committee
MARBI = ALCTS/LITA/RUSA Machine-Readable Bibliographic Information Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MusLA = Music Library Association
NAL = National Agricultural Library
NASIG = North American Serials Interest Group
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.)
NLM = National Library of Medicine
NRMIG = Networked Resources and Metadata Interest Group
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
PARS = ALCTS/Preservation and Reformatting Section
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PLA = Public Library Association
PSD = LC Policy and Standards Division

RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RDA = *Resource Description and Access*
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = ALCTS/CaMMS/Subject Analysis Committee
SKOS = Simple Knowledge Organization System
SLA = Special Libraries Association
XML = Extensible Markup Language

Saturday, January 26, 1:00-5:30 p.m.
Westin Seattle Hotel, Grand I

1205. Welcome and opening remarks

Peter Rolla, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m., and welcomed committee members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1206. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives [[CC:DA/Roster/2013](#)]

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

1207. Adoption of agenda [[CC:DA/A/67](#)]

The **Chair** asked for a motion from the voting members to approve the agenda. **Wolverton** moved to adopt the agenda, seconded by **Rendall**. The motion carried unanimously and the agenda was adopted.

1208. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2012 Annual Conference, June 23 and 25, 2012: [[CC:DA/M/1180-1404](#)]

The **Chair** reported that there were a number of spelling and usage corrections to the minutes. The only substantial correction had to do with an exchange of questions about the Chicago Manual of Style and the editing guide to RDA. According to the minutes, Lori Robare asked Kevin Randall questions about the editing guide, but Robare believes she had the conversation with John Attig. The **Chair** asked if there were any objections to approving the minutes at they stand with these changes to be made later. With no objections, the **Chair** asked for a motion to approve the minutes from Annual 2012 as amended by subsequent editing. Moved by **Bourassa**, seconded by **Kelley**. The motion passed unanimously.

1209. Report from the Chair [[Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions July 13, 2012–October 25, 2012](#)]

The **Chair** stated that a lot of voting was done over e-mail after Annual ended, leading up to the JSC meeting in November, and asked for a voice vote to approve officially all of the votes taken over the Internet. The **Chair** noted that his report was added to the agenda on the CC:DA web site with a list of all the votes (almost 50 in total). If there were no objections, the **Chair** offered to summarize them, followed by a voice vote. There were no objections.

The **Chair** summarized the list of votes as follows:

Via e-mail between July 1, 2012 and Nov. 1, 2012 :

CC:DA approved four ALA proposals. These included a proposal from **Schiff** dealing with creators of hearings; one from the MusLA dealing with variant access points for librettos and lyrics of musical works; a proposal dealing with preferred names of places based on two different proposals that CC:DA received, one from AALL and one from CEAL. There were also two votes for proposals from the CC:DA Sources of Information Task Force that ended up being one proposal as well. There were a total of 7 votes and four proposals. There was a vote to modify one ALA proposal that had been approved at Annual from the Task Force on Governmental and Non-Governmental Corporate Bodies, but CC:DA voted to amend it on e-mail. This proposal was then sent to the JSC.

There were many votes authorizing the JSC representative from ALA to provide an ALA response for proposals from other constituencies. There were 14 proposals from LC, two from ACOG, five from CCC, eight from BL, two proposals and one discussion paper from the ISSN International Centre, three proposals from EURIG, a discussion paper from the IFLA ISBD Review Group, and one proposal from the International Association of Music Libraries, Archives and Documentation Centres. CC:DA also voted to approve a revision to the ALA-LC Belarusian Romanization table.

The **Chair** asked for motion to confirm approval of these electronic votes. Moved by **Walsh**, seconded by **Rendall**. The motion passed unanimously.

1210. Report from LC Representative: Reser

[\[Library of Congress Report, January 2013\]](#)

The **Chair** noted that we have a new Library of Congress Representative and expressed the need to recognize the work of Barbara Tillett and her contributions to CC:DA. Barbara Tillett was the LC rep for 19 years, and was instrumental in the writing and revision of RDA, and the **Chair** wanted to acknowledge her contributions to CC:DA officially.

Reser reported that Barbara Tillett retired in November, with a month's notice of the retirement. She had been with LC since 1994, and he mentioned her accomplishments, including her work on the 1999 installation of the first ILS, which she led, her work with IFLA and with the Virtual International Authority File. **Reser** reported that Tillett regrets not being able to thank everyone for all the support given to LC. He noted that the work she has done for ALA culminated in the Margaret Mann citation of 2004. Acting chief, Tom Yee, who was the assistant chief of the PSD, will also continue to be the acting chief of the Asian and Middle Eastern Division as well. He will now be acting chief of two divisions at least through March. Some of Tillett's administrative tasks have been divided up; some will be done by Yee, and Reser is the LC representative to the JSC for now. Kate James is serving as Reser's backup on the JSC. Tillett will continue to serve out her two-year term as JSC chair ending December 2013 with approval of the JSC and CoP. Judy Kuhagen will continue to be JSC Secretary. **Reser** asked for patience during the trying times ahead, and asked members to understand that documentation, training materials, and policy statements will not always be in sync.

Reser brought up the question of whether Tillett will be replaced. Beacher Wiggins, the Director for Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access, can nominate two positions to be filled in the fiscal year, and the two positions he has targeted for highest priority are the Chief of the Asian and Middle Eastern Division and the Chief of the Policy and Standards Division. Whether he will actually be able to post those positions is not yet known. **Reser** outlined some of the federal budget issues, noting how library funding may be affected by the automatic sequestration that could take place in March 2013, unless legislation is passed by Congress.

Reser gave an update on recent progress with the new Bibliographic Framework Initiative, stating how LC has released a high level model for BIBFRAME developed under contract by Eric Miller and Zepheira in November 2012. LC has worked with six institutions who experimented with the high-level model from October to December 2012, including the George Washington University, National Library of Medicine, Princeton University, OCLC, British Library and Deutsche Nationalbibliothek. Representatives of these institutions met at LC in October to get their marching orders, and came back in November with their results of experiments. While that phase is ended, experimentation is continuing, and it is expected to be an iterative process with many changes along the way. **Reser** announced that the LC New Bibliographic Framework Update Forum in Seattle will take place on January 27 at 10:30-12:00 in the Convention Center, Room 304, and said that they hope to videotape the session and make it available on YouTube. LC also released some BIBFRAME software code for experimenters in November. At the Forum update there will be a discussion of some of the mappings and services that will be released, along with details from the early experimenters, including work done at OCLC. **Reser** also noted that there is a listing of ALA Midwinter meetings on LC's Linked Data Service and/or BIBFRAME at the end of his report.

Reser discussed the change in title from Library of Congress Policy Statements (LCPS) to Library of Congress-Program for Cooperative Cataloging Policy Statements (LC-PCC PS) with the latest release of the RDA Toolkit. There have been three updates since Annual (August, October, and December) and the releases had 250 new, changed, or deleted policy statements, with 80 statements submitted for the next release of the Toolkit. There are still some things that have been deferred, but they hope to get to them in 2013.

Reser described the activities of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee. He noted that the committee, which had managed the testing process of RDA in 2010 and 2011, stayed on to monitor the recommendations made during the testing. On January 4, 2013, the committee issued its final quarterly update on the progress to meet the recommendations in the final report. The committee felt issues had either been accomplished or enough progress had been made for implementation of RDA. LC is on track for RDA implementation by the end of March of this year. It has about two months to complete training. It has trained about 400 people, starting first in 2010 and 2011 with a small group of 40-50 people. It has now trained another 400 and still has a ways to go. Major training started in June with about 60 to 90 people a month, receiving 36 hours of classroom training. All staff doing authorities and bibliographic records will be ready for implementation of RDA by the end of March, assuming there are no federal shutdowns between now and then. **Reser** did say that not everyone at LC will be using RDA, and there still will be staff using AACR2.

Reser mentioned work involving Janis Young, noting that the PSD has begun reviewing the Subject Headings Manual and Classification and Shelflisting Manual to make needed updates due to RDA.

Reser also outlined recent work on Romanization table development coordinated by Bruce Johnson, and stating that 2012 was considered a banner year for table changes. There was continuing work on Coptic, Persian, Tibetan, Urdu, Mongolian and Uighur tables.

Reser added a final reminder about the BIBFRAME update forum and video.

1211. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Attig

[\[Report on JSC Meeting, November 5-9, 2012\]](#) [\[Follow-up Actions for ALA Midwinter 2013\]](#)
[\[Proposed changes to JSC Chair, Chair-Elect, and JSC Secretary Positions\]](#)

Attig reported that the JSC met in November and dealt with a record number of proposals and discussion papers to which ALA had made a substantial contribution.

He mentioned that news regarding future updates to the RDA Toolkit will be announced later in the afternoon by Troy Linker. He described how in the December release, which included chapters 6, 9, 10, and 11, we saw for the first time the results of the rewording project by copy editor Chris Oliver. While **Attig** reported that he has not heard a lot of feedback yet, they are interested in people's reactions. One reaction received so far indicated that if you are looking for what changes were made, you need to compare the two versions of the texts to be able to see exactly what is different. He reported that it does seem to read more easily, if simply reading through instructions. **Attig** stated that the scope of the project was narrowly conceived, and they are hopeful that the results justified the effort it took. The next release of RDA will include at least Chapters 2 and 3, and all of the remaining chapters have been at least part way through the process. Chris Oliver has completed her rewording on all of the remaining chapters; the JSC has conducted its review, and is in the process of reporting back to Oliver. They are on the final stages with the rest of the rewording, which will be ready to be released possibly at the same time as the results of the formal revision proposals approved in November. **Attig** noted that Linker will provide more exact details on this during his presentation. Work continued on what is being characterized as the RDA data model, which will have a number of components and interrelationships. **Attig** reported progress including two discussion papers by Gordon Dunsire, decisions on some of his recommendations, and identification of follow-up activities. He also noted that the work is being held up by other things happening right now. **Attig** reported on incremental work with the Open Metadata Registry with RDA vocabularies and element sets, which are more or less being kept up to date with changes in content. A few additional vocabularies have been published, and **Attig** mentioned the difficulty in the process of agreeing to definitions and terms being published in RDA. The work has slowed down, but it continues to be a priority, and **Attig** stressed the goal of having a good solid data model under RDA and all things that are linked to it.

Attig reported on JSC discussions on organizational matters. He noted that most are covered in the paper he distributed, which represents the committee's notes on the discussions. The main recommendation is that the chair of the JSC will no longer also be a representative. **Attig** cited

the heavy workload for the individual holding those positions and reported that the CoP agreed it was worth finding resources to have an additional person to serve as chair. It was felt that the chair needs to have current knowledge of what's going on with RDA and therefore should be selected from among the current representatives. It was recommended that they should make the decision one year in advance, and when it is time to elect the chair-elect, it will be one of the current representatives. The constituency from which that person comes will have a year to find a new representative from that constituency. **Attig** described how in the report, there is also a short paragraph that discusses a new component of the support for RDA, under the heading Managing Editor. The CoP felt there was a need for someone to do various tasks between development activities and project management tasks. This position is currently under consideration. Based on discussions with ALA Publishing, the JSC felt that having the actual person be an employee of ALA Publishing gave everyone a lot of flexibility, including the ability to offer benefits and an HR structure. Additionally, it was thought that if there was not sufficient work for this person generated from the JSC, Linker and the staff maintaining the RDA Toolkit could provide more than enough work for this person. **Attig** stated that all these proposals are up for comments with a deadline of February 15 to get back with any comments ALA might have.

The **Chair** made a clarification that **Attig** wants comments by February 11. **Attig** confirmed that any comments not given to him today should be given to him by February 11.

Sprochi wanted to clarify that the JSC Chair will only be the chair and not a rep and the JSC chair, and that the chair-elect will be the chair-elect and still a rep. **Attig** confirmed that was the case, and there would be no duties attached for chair-elect. It was just to make the decision in advance in order to help with planning.

Tarango made the observation that based on how the selection process has been set up, there may not be a chair-elect for potentially five years. **Attig** confirmed that this is true. He noted that the chair-elect is for one year, the chair is for two years so there is a chronological disconnection, and there will not always be a chair-elect.

Maxwell commented with regard to the earlier report of the rewording changes in the RDA Toolkit and how the only way you can tell if they are better is to compare side-by-side but we are unable to view previous versions. **Attig** replied that the information is available, and suggested that Maxwell make that comment to Linker, since it is his decision as to whether we want those files available publicly or not.

Helen **Schmierer**, from the audience, discussed the new executive group and noted how for the first time someone from publishing is involved in content determination. She stated that the amount of input on the content that ALA Publishing has could be important, and there were bound to be some business issues associated with making changes to the RDA Toolkit. She thought it would be to everyone's advantage to have a clear statement of what the known limits are and a clear report on a regular basis of the managing editor where those limits are, particularly if they change. **Attig** agreed that it was a good point. He noted that AACR2 involved a product very different from the RDA Toolkit, and the lines between what we consider content and other aspects of the Toolkit may be easily blurred. He stated that they are trying to keep them clear, but they do have to deal with the whole. **Attig** thought it was a good point to make

clear what the lines of authority and responsibility are. He said that it was also valuable to have someone who can bring those two together.

The **Chair** asked for other questions or comments on proposed changes to the JSC structure.

Reser brought up the issue of whether this will affect the ALA representative, and if ALA needs to evaluate. He questioned if this timeline goes into effect, whether it will affect the terms of ALA reps to the JSC. They wouldn't want a situation where an ALA rep would have to give up a chair's job in the middle of the term because he/she was no longer an ALA rep, and this might be something that ALA needs to consider. **Attig** commented that he hoped that ALCTS and CaMMS would be sensitive to that issue.

Attig stated that his term as ALA rep ends at the end of the ALA meeting in Chicago. He reported that the process of finding a new ALA rep has begun and he was contacted for recommendations. He described how CaMMS will do the initial search and investigation of possible candidates, and it will report to the ALCTS Board, which makes the decision. ALA makes the actual appointment and it is an ALA level position. **Attig** said CaMMS Executive Committee members would welcome comments and recommendations.

The **Chair** stated that anyone with recommendations can give them to the CC:DA Chair and he will make sure they get passed on to CaMMS.

Attig summarized the revision proposals from the JSC meeting. He described how his report consists of the document form of the blog he made during the JSC meeting, and should contain all of the information about the decisions that were made. The JSC is in the process of finalizing actual revision texts. There are drafts for each proposal, but not final versions. **Attig** expects the final versions to appear as soon as they are finalized, but in advance of the actual publication in the Toolkit. These documents should be available possibly next March, in advance of the revision package. The bulk of the work is done and the process is well on its way.

Attig presented a brief summary of the JSC decisions on the ALA proposals.

6JSC/ALA/5, Revision of RDA 6.21, Other distinguishing characteristics of a legal work, and 6.29.1.33, Additions to access points representing treaties, etc.

Approved. This addressed the situation when more than one treaty was signed on the same day between the same parties. This issue was not covered by RDA or AACR2, but was covered by the Rule Interpretations, so the proposal was to adopt the Rule Interpretation.

6JSC/ALA/6, Revision of RDA 11.5.1.3, Recording Associated Institutions, and RDA 9.13.1.3, Recording Affiliations

Approved. This PCC proposal on recording associated institutions and recording affiliations proposed the use of preferred name when recording these two elements. In addition, LC proposed to delete the exception for recording an institution associated with a conference.

6JSC/ALA/7, Revision of RDA 2.12.8 and 2.12.16 regarding recording ISSNs

Approved. This proposal dealt with recording ISSNs for series and sub-series. The recommendation was to take the ISSN from any source, and the eventual decision was that there would be a hierarchy of sources.

6JSC/ALA/8, Revision of RDA 6.28.1.9, Additions to access points representing musical works with titles that are not distinctive

Approved, with minor wording changes.

6JSC/ALA/9, Initial Articles in Place Names (RDA 16.2.2.3)

Approved with wording changes. This proposal dealt with initial articles in place names. The proposal featured some slight substantive changes and revisions to be included in RDA.

6JSC/ALA/10, Revision of RDA 2.5.1.4, Recording Edition Statements

Approved. This was a proposal from OCLC to allow catalogers to supply edition statements.

6JSC/ALA/11, Revision of RDA 2.11.1.3, Recording Copyright Dates

Approved a compromise suggested by ALA. A number of comments had to be reconciled. This proposal resulted in two instructions that deal with what to do with multiple copyright dates that apply to the same aspect of the resource and for multiple copyright dates that apply to different aspects of a resource.

6JSC/ALA/12, Revision of RDA 6.15.1.3, Recording Medium of Performance

Withdrawn. The actual proposal was withdrawn because there isn't a need for an element authorizing the use of external vocabularies, as this is covered in the RDA introduction. Approved changes to 7.21.

6JSC/ALA/13, Revision of RDA instructions relating to librettos and lyrics for musical works (RDA 6.2.2.10.2, 6.27.4.2, I.2.1, Glossary)

Approved with wording changes.

6JSC/ALA/14, Revision of RDA instructions for arrangements and adaptations of musical works (RDA 6.28.1.5.2 and 6.28.3.2.2)

Approved in general. This proposal dealt with the clarification of instructions for arrangements and adaptations of musical works. There was also a suggestion that the definitions of adaptation and arrangement be added to the glossary, and they are working on that.

6JSC/ALA/15, Hearings in RDA 19.2.1.1.1

Approved with minor changes. This proposal dealt with creator relationships for hearings.

6JSC/ALA/16, Revision of RDA 3.19.3 for video encoding formats and addition of a new element for Optical Disc Characteristics

Withdrawn. This proposal dealt with encoding formats for video materials. There was a suggested new element for optical disc characteristics that was not approved. It was noted that some things in the RDA instructions are not actually correct and they will be working to correct the RDA instruction. There was a preference to use an external vocabulary rather than developing it themselves, in order to deal with the distinctions that RDA does not currently make. **Attig** noted that he needs to follow up with the JSC as to whose action this was.

6JSC/ALA/17, Machine-Actionable Data Elements in RDA Chapter 3: Discussion Paper

This is one of the things that we will need to talk about as it was a discussion paper. We will continue working on it.

6JSC/ALA/18, Proposed Revision of RDA Instructions for Government and Non-Government Corporate Bodies

Approved. This proposal dealt with the merging of instructions for government and non-government subordinate corporate bodies in Chapter 11. Some changes were proposed but very little has changed in applying these instructions. There is now one set of instructions to look at instead of two.

6JSC/ALA/19, Proposed revision of RDA 16.2.2, Preferred Name for the Place

This proposal was an endless discussion of place names, which included a number of pieces and which hasn't ended. The first piece dealt with federations. The JSC proposed taking Malaysia off the list and clarifying that the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia were no longer federations. The last piece of this was agreed to. The JSC wanted to consult with the Malaysia cataloging community before it deleted that. It is hoping to clarify with them that everyone understands the implications. This deletion may or may not appear in the revision. Malaysia wants to use the name of the state and the name of the country, the option that was proposed. The JSC is not sure if they understood that this was an alternative and not the rule, but they are very near to an agreement.

LC proposed a different way of excluding the Republic of Ireland from 16.2.2.10, and restricting the scope of that instruction.

There was an agreement to the alternative instruction to add the name of a "state, province, or higher-level administrative division" as part of the preferred name of place in addition to country.

The JSC agreed to delete the abbreviation for Virgin Islands from Appendix B and this was done with the fast track so it is already in the works. It supported ALA's offer to develop a proposal to remove all abbreviations for places from Appendix B. This is a potential action item for us to follow up on. The JSC also encouraged us to develop a discussion paper on dealing with names of larger and smaller places as relationships, whether part of names or place element or a separate relationship. We will need to look at all these issues.

6JSC/ALA/20, Proposed revision of RDA 2.1.2.2 and 2.1.2.3, Basis for Identification of the Resource

Approved with wording changes.

6JSC/ALA/21, Proposed revisions of RDA instructions on Sources of Information (RDA 2.2.2.1-2.2.2.4)

Approved with additions and wording changes. There was a preference for collective title and being able to use readable contents of the electronic resource instead of embedded metadata.

Attig felt in general that the ALA proposals did pretty well, and reported that some positive things were said of our willingness to take on difficult issues. He noted that we may go back to deferred issues but for right now we have a lot of follow-up actions. He asked for questions about any of the JSC decisions at the meeting.

Maxwell mentioned that the JSC will have to clarify scope regarding non-government bodies, if the intention was to retain it and not to change the scope? **Attig** noted that the JSC did not intend to extend it beyond where it already was and saw the need to clarify scope so it only applies to non-government bodies. The intention was to retain it with the scope it has in the current instruction, not to change the scope.

Sprochi asked if it was because of RDA that the decision was made not to abbreviate place names. **Attig** reported that was the proposal of the JSC. He said that the Virgin Islands, which has an ambiguous abbreviation, needed to be dealt with. While the JSC was considering this issue, the larger issue of abbreviations for all place names came up, which was on the deferred issues list. He noted that using abbreviations went against conceptual decisions made with RDA and the question was if it was time to deal with it. He added that Gary Strawn ran statistics on a number of changes, and his conclusion was that this was manageable. **Sprochi** noted that the fewer exceptions there are, the better.

Maxwell noted in RDA training how people have the most problems with abbreviations in the place of publication field. The **Chair** commented that we will try to remember that when we get to that issue.

Attig discussed that in commenting on the proposals from other constituencies, a lot of suggestions surfaced, and that these will come back. He noted that if you do not provide a specific proposal that can be acted upon, it will come back. He wanted to make sure we had the opportunity to consider whether we want follow up on the proposals. The **Chair** clarified what **Attig** said: some of the comments on the CC:DA wiki pages made last summer on the constituencies' reports included suggestions that could lead to action needing to be taken by CC:DA.

The **Chair** discussed how **Attig** provided a separate document, which was also at the very last page of the wiki report, of seventeen follow-up items. The **Chair** stated that this is on the agenda for Monday and asked members to review these items by then, noting that we will need to prioritize what CC:DA wants to work on next in regards to these issues.

**1212. Report from the Task Force on Relationship Designators in RDA Appendix K:
Lipcan**

[\[Task Force on Relationship Designators in App. K: Interim Report \]](#)

Lipcan reported that Kathy Winzer, the chair of the task force, sent her regrets that she was unable to attend and asked him to give the report in her place. **Lipcan** stated that the charge of the task force was to propose changes to the list of relationship designators in RDA Appendix K to enrich the vocabulary used to specify relationships between persons, families, and corporate bodies.

Lipcan noted that most of their tasks or recommendations from Annual 2012 have been partially completed, and that they did not discuss geographic names to be included in Appendix K, which ties in with one of the possible follow-up calls of actions on Attig's list (number 12). He reported that he attached the appendix that Adam Schiff provided from the Annual 2012 report and if it's appropriate for us to discuss here, we can do that. **Lipcan** stated that the recommendations that were partially completed included recommendation one: to identify where prepositions were needed and omit when deemed unnecessary; to include and label the reciprocal relationship at the end of the definition; and to nest or indent the hierarchical and/or narrower terms under the parent term. Recommendation two was to use gender specific terms for each of the currently gender neutral terms and nest those to show hierarchy was also partially completed. Recommendation three, which they have completed, was for terms in the K.1 general guidelines section, to enter specific definitions under the sections for the appropriate relationship. The goals of the task force for Annual 2013 are to complete recommendations from Annual 2012 and any recommendations that arrive today and to submit a full and completed Appendix K proposal for CC:DA approval at that time.

Lipcan said that the Task Force is looking for further advice from CC:DA today before it completes the work on the appendix. It is requesting feedback, suggestions, and recommendations focused on the following attributes of the proposal: formatting and layout, accuracy of term definitions, accuracy and appropriateness of reciprocal relationship terms, completeness of term lists for each subsection, the organizational logic of subsections, the quantity and appropriateness of examples, designators for geographic names/places and whether they belong in Appendix K or in Appendix L which is currently just a placeholder. **Lipcan** asked, if we were to add geographic name relationships to Appendix K, does this call for new subsections for K.4.3.1 General Corporate Body to Corporate Body Relationships and a subsection for K.4.3.2 Corporate Body to Corporate Body Relationships for Geographic Names?

Lipcan said he hoped that he represented the task force appropriately and accurately and asked for anyone on the task force to correct or add as they see fit. He then opened the floor for questions or suggestions.

Glennan said she had a couple of questions or observations for K.2.1.2 Person to Person Relationships Within A Family. One question involved the inclusion of the term step-child, when step-daughter and step-son are there. She noted that gender issue does not seem to be happening elsewhere and asked if it needed to be removed? **Lipcan** said that we should probably remove it, since they removed child and he noticed that we did drop some non-gender specific terms, like sibling, child, and spouse. So if that was something we can drop, he's happy to do so. **Glennan** feels that for consistency, we should either drop step-child or supply the neutral terms elsewhere. She also noted that under parental relationships, the terms father and father-in-law appear to have

been inadvertently left out. She mentioned that we did include mother and mother-in-law, so presumably we would want to add these terms. **Lipcan** agreed we want to include them.

Sprochi discussed how the term step-child may be useful when gender is not obvious, in cases where the name is not indicative of gender. She noted how in the area of genealogy in particular it may be very difficult to figure out, and gave the example of determining a relationship designator when the name of the individual was something like Pat. **Lipcan** replied that in the interest of inclusiveness we should probably add it.

The **Chair** asked for clarification in relation to terms like step-child. He noted that in the recommendations after Annual 2012, no.2 was to use gender specific terms for each of the currently gender neutral terms, nesting these to show hierarchy. He understood that to mean that you would have step-child, and then have step-son and step-daughter nested hierarchically and that step-child would still be included. He asked if that is not what was meant by nested hierarchically? **Lipcan** replied that he was not sure what was meant. The **Chair** asked whether the task force considered children, noting you could have step-children that were a boy and a girl and neither step-sons nor step-daughters would be appropriate. **Sprochi** added that technically speaking you would just have one name per entry. **Maxwell** asked about being instructed to put gender neutral terms back in, but hierarchically have gender specific terms as well. The **Chair** stated that he did not remember the discussion per se, but that was how he interpreted it. **Attig** noted that in regard to history, we can come up with good reasons why we should do both.

Glennan had a question about something that came up in K.2.3 and a related section for the reciprocal, noting there are two different relationships that talk about performing groups: group member and performer. She wondered if that is a good idea and if there are differences between a group member who is a person or participant in or a member of the performing group and a performer as a person who performs in a performing group. She wonders if we should just pick one term. **Maxwell** noted that group member does not only apply to performing groups and that perhaps performer is a more specific term that should be nested hierarchically. **Glennan** said that performing groups are the only type of group we are making a special case for, and she is not sure if that is what we want. **Maxwell** asked if we should exclude performers, but performer is a group member. **Glennan** said that if we are doing hierarchies it probably makes sense to have performer as a type of group member. **Snyder** noted that they are also available separately. **Maxwell** said that those were relationship designators for related corporate bodies and these are designators to relate persons to corporate bodies, and asked if they want them both to be available.

Glennan thinks that the same problem occurs in K.4 with group member of, and performer with, and we need to make a conceptual change in both places. **Lipcan** noted that the group has completed its work through K.2.2, and has not actually addressed the remainder yet. **Snyder** asked about a performer not always being a member of a group and whether the term is available elsewhere. **Attig** replied that the term is available in Appendix I, and **Glennan** noted that this appendix in question deals specifically with relationships of persons to corporate bodies. **Attig** questioned whether the term performer correctly conveys the relationship in this context, and suggested perhaps in this case just to go with “group member” unless a more accurate term can be found. **Maxwell** agreed, noting that the person does not perform the corporate body.

Kevin Randall, from the audience, reported that he noticed instances where the word “of” needs to be removed. He cited the cases “adoptive son of” and “adoptive daughter of” where the word “of” should be removed or else it gives the opposite meaning from what was intended. He also noted the need to correct “descendent of” in the definition of ancestor, where the reciprocal relationship is just descendent.

Hostage noted that in Attig’s JSC report there was some discussion on whether a verbal phrase is needed to express relationships. He said he thought any relationship needs a verbal phrase, e.g., “has son”, “is son of”, to make it clear. Otherwise it is hard to know which direction you are talking about. He also stated the need to get out of the MARC mindset. **Attig** agreed, and said that Gordon Dunsire has recommended that the proper way of labeling properties in RDF is to use a verb form. **Attig** stated that Dunsire was going to do a more detailed proposal for what that means exactly, but it is not clear to Attig whether that meant adding the verbs to our lists or to the relevant element sets. He noted this also brings out something from this morning about the need both to both specify relationship and to provide meaningful display text. They may be two different things and there is work in progress that may address this. He does not recommend going through the editorial work of adding verbs to all of these until the JSC has made it clear that this needs to be done. However he did acknowledge after having worked through Appendix J, it is easy to get confused about which direction you are pointing in and understands that the group may feel it helpful to add the verbs. **Lipcan** noted that more examples might help with that. **Attig** mentioned that he noticed there are no examples in Appendix I or J. **Lipcan** confirmed that there are not. **Attig** noted that the chapters pointing to the appendices have examples and wonders if that is more appropriate. **Tarango** also stated that for catalogers using relationship designators, figuring out the direction of the relationships has been a problem.

Reser had a question for Attig about whether the earlier rules that we were working under contained the original principle for some of these two other appendix terms. He did not know if there was ever any resolution about whether this is allowed. He also said that he would make a plea that we think about collapsing a number of things in the K.2.3 section person to corporate body. He also noted that there are words we will encounter in resources, but our definitions do not clarify differences. He mentioned terms such as administrator, leader, etc. with some identical definitions, and said he would be challenged helping people choose which term to use. **Attig** said the basic rule they were working from was that you cannot use the same term within the same vocabulary without a qualifier and it has to be unique within the vocabulary. He thinks it is still a valid constraint. **Maxwell** asked whether they are separate vocabularies or are all appendices one vocabulary. **Attig** replied that each appendix is a separate vocabulary. **Maxwell** asked if we could have the same word in more than one vocabulary without a qualifier. **Attig** said he thought so and was trying to remember if the elements in chapter 30 are persons to corporate body relationships or just related corporate bodies, and therefore we may have to qualify them. **Maxwell** said he thought we should go ahead and do what we’re doing but it would be helpful in the future to lay out what the rules are. He noted that there are rules that have been around for many years that maybe we should follow. **Attig** replied that unfortunately we are talking about different kind of rules, and acknowledged that we can be frustrated by the answers or the lack of answers.

Bourassa noted a small correction in the definition for mother, saying that it needed the word “parent” instead of “father or mother.”

The **Chair** asked Lipcan if there was something he was hoping to get from the meeting today that he hasn't gotten yet. **Lipcan** said it sounds like the group should continue doing what it's doing, and complete the work that it started in the way it understood it should be completed. The **Chair** said he agreed with that and said it makes sense. He asked if anyone felt differently.

Myers, reflecting on the last comment and earlier discussion on nesting terms parenthetically, noted how we have removed the definition for a parent for a lot of these parental relationships. He mentioned how this argues for reinserting gender neutral terms under which the gender specific terms would go. The **Chair** told Lipcan that this might be different than what we told you to do at Annual but it seems to be the consensus. We realize we do need the gender neutral term as a parent term to the gendered term. **Lipcan** asked if they should have the gendered terms nested under that gender neutral term. The **Chair** asked if anyone disagrees with that or does that seem like what makes the most sense. **Snyder** said she agreed with that but was there any kind of creative solution arrived at with the problem with niece, nephew, aunt, and uncle not having gender neutral term. The **Chair** suggested doing without. **Lipcan** added that some of those terms can get convoluted.

Rendall asked if there will there be instruction to prefer the most specific term. The **Chair** noted that in Appendices I and J there are nested relationships. **Lipcan** said that in the general instructions it says to record appropriate terms from the list below, and that the instructions can be changed to say the lists below.

Maxwell mentioned using the appropriate term and noted how he was worried about the tendency of getting away from cataloger's judgment.

Kelley said that further justification for having gendered neutral terms is that they could cover other situations, including intersex individuals or gender ambiguity.

The **Chair** asked Lipcan if he was ok with the feedback for the task force. **Lipcan** said he thought he understood and would consult with the rest of the task force. The **Chair** said if there needed to be a discussion on the list, to let him know and for anyone having comments or questions to send them to him and he will forward them on to Lipcan. **Attig** noted that we do not have a precise schedule for the revision process for next year, but it is unlikely to be that different from this year. He said that there may be follow up activities and having a proposal by Annual would allow us to finish by the deadline.

1213. Report from the Task Force on Instructions on Recording Relationships: Polutta [\[Task Force on recording relationships: Discussion paper\]](#)

Polutta presented the report on behalf of the chair, Nathan Putnam, who could not attend. **Polutta** reported that after online discussions and reviewing chapters of recording relationships, the task force was not able to find the principle to tell what to record where, especially in regard to structured descriptions, which was the area on which it focused its efforts. **Polutta** noted that the structured descriptions are what you need to include to get sufficient information across. The task force realized a need for a better definition of what a structured description is and what should be included in it. This led to the strawman proposal created by **Attig** that goes through the RDA chapters 24-28. The Task Force wrote up the possibilities of what it was headed toward,

which is a much more detailed definition for what is included in a structured description; a preference for more information; and the use of a relationship designator. **Polutta** also noted the inclusion of the unstructured description, which is a fallback position when there is not enough information to give a structured description. She noted a preference in recording a structured description for elements that have to do with identification of the entity. For works it would be the title, creator, and date of work, that is, elements that might be put in an authority record. **Polutta** said the Task Force is open to comments about the strawman proposal and also in general about what kinds of principles would help to express relationships.

Glennan said she did not understand something in section 25.1.1.3.3 of the strawman proposal on Structured Description of the Related Work. She noted that she is seeing examples that relate to manifestations in print and wondering how that works in identifying the work (p. 13). **Attig** suggested that it has to do with the fact that he did not revise all the examples and only revised ones specifically under contents of the work but not the ones under subject description or related works. If we went the way we seem to be headed, using work attributes or work level relationships, this is not the way it has been done with current examples. This will require much rewriting, so he limited his efforts to specific examples. **Polutta** wanted to clarify that he used examples already in RDA. **Attig** confirmed that and noted that as we get into revising these, we may find we can't push this to the bitter end: a strict separation of work, expression, manifestation, and item, may turn out to be limiting in ways we are not able to justify. If we agree on basic decisions, like recording preferred title and not title proper, we can start working out the details. **Polutta** noted that elements that identify a work may also identify a manifestation. **Glennan** noted again that the instructions refer to chapter 6 elements but the examples contain many elements from chapter 2. She also mentioned a similar problem in the example for 26.1.1.3.1 on p. 18, and noted a typo on p. 19, in the section on 27.1.1.3.1, at the end of the first paragraph. **Attig** noted the use of copy and paste. **Glennan** said it was not a judgment, just an observation. **Attig** replied that it was not an excuse for not getting everything consistently straight. **Polutta** suggested the need to include language to allow for the situation when you do not know exactly what the relationship is.

Tarango wanted to make sure he understood correctly the distinction on p. 14 in 25.1.1.3.3.1, contents of work, and p. 22 in 27.1.1.3.2.1, contents of the manifestation. He noted that the contents of the manifestation element seems to list contents of each chapter. He suggested an additional example, with a typical table of contents, would help. **Attig** said this is part of what we are trying to clarify, and what we currently do in AACR2 is what is shown under contents under manifestation. That is what the examples that are already in RDA show. **Tarango** asked about 25.1.1.3.3.1, contents of work, and the issue of preferred title. He noted in cases where you have a compilation, like of Shakespeare's plays, the preferred title might be wanted for access. But others may think this is the contents of the compilation and may be confused if title proper isn't the preferred title. There could be confusion when the preferred title is not the title in the table of contents. **Polutta** said she understood, but is not sure if there is an easy solution to it. **Attig** said that one of the things he was trying to account for is the fact that examples with the "contains" labels are in both chapter 25 and 27. He tried to figure out the difference and why you would use one versus the other. He believes that chapter 27 has what we normally do. He said we still have some thinking to do, and this is a way of structuring a structured description at the work level. **Attig** said his impression is that for most of what we do currently we would use chapter 27. He said that there are some serial examples of works contained within other works,

and noted something at the work level might be appropriate. **Tarango** noted again that the way a contained work is listed may not necessarily be its preferred title.

Maxwell commented about looking forward to working in an environment where you can create a description of the work and link to the descriptions of various manifestations of the work, because various manifestations may have different ways of showing the title. He also noted that in 25.1.1.3.3.1, the text says to record the relationship designator “contains (work),” but the relationship designator is not recorded in the example. **Attig** stated that examples of relationship designators in RDA do not include qualifiers.

Polutta asked for any other comments. **Attig** said that what they were looking for is whether this is useful and are they adding value by adding instructions. **Sprochi** commented that they did a great job. She mentioned problems with work and manifestation records in different languages, and said while it is a struggle because we are still in a MARC environment, it will be useful as we move forward to a different bibliographic framework and she appreciated the thought process.

Maxwell thought it was good to put this in an authority record for work. **Sprochi** agreed.

The **Chair** noted that Polluta’s question was unresolved and asked if this is what CC:DA had in mind when they authorized the task force. He posed the question of whether we want the task force to continue this work. **Maxwell** said that having instructions is important and is an improvement over AACR2. **Glennan** also said that it makes a great improvement, and described how finding contents notes in RDA was a problem. She stated that this makes it much more findable and being able to point to it in RDA is better.

Attig wanted to point out that on page 23, Accompanying Manifestation was invented out of whole cloth. He remembered when there was a report of no equivalent in RDA to 300 subfield e, which means that there is an ISBD element that RDA does not support. He said this is his attempt to address that. What they have set up here is a structure that provides basic instructions for recording relationships at the element level. He also stated that if there are other relationships that could benefit from enhanced instructions, so please let the task force know. **Sprochi** commented that medical titles have a lot of accompanying materials, so she is glad to have RDA addresses this. **Maxwell** stated that subfield e seems a little opaque if that’s what is intended. **Reser** discussed how this was a problem at LC as well, and they worked on a policy statement, with different carrier types. He also reported the difficulty of finding information on contents notes in the RDA Toolkit, and needing to advise people to bookmark the relevant instruction in the Toolkit. **Attig** noted that a benefit of adding this to the instructions is that the contents will be indexed and can be retrieved much more easily.

The **Chair** asked that this be taken back to Nathan and the rest of the task force and that he will be in touch with them.

1214. Report from the Task Force to Investigate Changes Affecting RDA in the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition: Dragon

[\[Task Force to Investigate Changes Affecting RDA in the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition: Report\]](#)

The **Chair** noted that Patricia Dragon had some travel issues and was not able to attend. Although two members of the task force are here, Hostage and Bourassa, he did not want to call on them since they were not prepared to report. The Chair said he thought we would just take a couple of minutes for any questions or comments about the report from the Chicago Manual of Style task force. The **Chair** noted that this is one on which we probably want to wrap up the work, and so he might be calling on people through e-mail over the next month to try and wrap this up.

Glennan said she looked at things identified by the task force as having high direct impact and consequences for the authority file. Those are issues the PCC would care about, and she was surprised to see only one of these situations highlighted in RDA A.29 relating to capitalization and normalization, which she thinks applies to many of the other situations. She said she was not sure why the task force thought normalization takes care of it in one of these situations and could move forward without a lot of retrospective work, and why that approach was not considered for other situations. **Glennan** reported how she contacted Gary Strawn, who after quickly looking at the report, performed a program to test the presence of hyphens in certain fields in the authority file. Gary's program looked at 4 percent of records identified by the server program, every 25th record: a total of 15,245 records. The program found 41,811 fields and of these, 22,918 were examined in detail. Of these, the program reported 6,359 hyphens being of potential interest. The report identified a small number of records that had spaces preceding hyphens, which may be due to the context of the language. **Glennan** said that Strawn sent her the spreadsheet of 6,382 reports, and that some of the things she looked at quickly might be issues for the task force. She noted how some things come out in titles, and in author title access points. She gave the example of capitalization in a title that starts with "Twentieth-Century," and the issue of whether "century" should get capitalized even though we would not normally do so in this case. She also does not believe the Chicago Manual of Style helps a lot with Romanized data: there are a lot of Arabic names that come up and she did not know if the same rules apply. Also Japanese place names were mentioned as having a lot of hyphens in them. The quick and dirty approach to the report did show there would be a lot of false drops in the first run. **Bourassa** commented that the Chicago Manual's rules for capitalization of hyphenated phrases do not cause a problem in the 245, but would be an issue in headings for corporate bodies. The task force felt that if we start capitalizing headings this way now, then eventually we can catch up, and that capitalization is not a problem for searching.

Attig asked if the Chicago Manual of Style claims to be applicable to all languages. **Bourassa** replied that it is for English. **Attig** said there are some cases where we are talking about English and this affects how easy it would be to manipulate these programmatically.

Glennan said part of her concern for this is that in authority records now we do not try to convey the language of a corporate body name or the title of an author-title access point. There is no way for a machine to figure out the language and know that it can ignore, say, a Japanese name, which makes it harder to solve the problem programmatically. In RDA we have already decided for description that there are places where we do not care about capitalization. Capitalization

does not affect comprehension, searchability, or retrievability and she wonders if this is really worth our effort.

The **Chair** said that he will confer with Patricia and John over e-mail to see what we want to do next. He thanked **Glennan** for her comments and said he will be in touch and asked for any other questions or comments.

Hostage noted that they were trying to report what the Chicago Manual of Style says and how it might differ from RDA. It is up to the JSC ultimately what happens with that information. The **Chair** asked if this was more of a discussion paper, rather than turning into a proposal. **Hostage** replied that he thought so. **Attig** said, no, but it is a possibility and the Task Force was going to have to talk about it.

1215. Report from the PCC liaison: Glennan [[PCC Report at ALA Midwinter January 26, 2013](#)]

Because she is making this report on Saturday rather than Monday, **Glennan** noted that she has fewer breaking news items from PCC, which is meeting tomorrow morning from 8:00-11:30 at the Grand Hyatt. She reported that she went to a PCC training meeting and that PCC is extremely busy in relation to working on RDA-related activities; there have been numerous task groups and much documentation for review. **Glennan** presented her submitted report, and wanted to point out that the information materials and documentation gathered by the RDA Training Materials Task Force and posted to the Cataloger's Learning Workshop remain as they appeared at the time they were created. They have the date associated with them but they have not been corrected to account for current understandings and changes in RDA, and so represent a point in time and recommended using your own judgment when referring to them.

Glennan also reported on yesterday's Program for Cooperative Cataloging Program training meeting. She reported that about 130 institutions have gone through the RDA NACO bridge training for name authorities right now. They expect additional participants as they progress beyond March 31. There is a plan to create a webpage on the PCC site of institutions that have become independent in RDA NACO creation. RDA BIBCO training in December is based on LC modules 1-4 and supplemented by webinars. **Glennan** noted that PCC is always interested in additional volunteers and individuals interested in being reviewers for NACO or BIBCO or becoming official PCC trainers. She suggested contacting the NACO or BIBCO coordinator at one's institution.

1216. RDA Music Joint Working Group and how it affects CC:DA: Snyder

Snyder gave an update on the RDA Music Joint Working Group and how it might affect CC:DA. She described how it had already existed as a joint group with much of the same membership of representatives from MusLA, LC, and the PCC, and it was made a JSC working group last fall. The chair of the group is Stephen Yusko of LC. He will meet with the JSC chair in February to discuss LC work to come and plans to revise the charge of the group to include EURIG representation, so that it will not have just a North American constituency. He will communicate issues that came up in the JSC November meeting and get the group up to speed in

determining the next issues to be working on. Yusko will also solicit input from music catalogers at LC for suggestions on RDA revisions.

Snyder discussed how Beth Iseminger, the Chair of the Bibliographic Control Committee of MusLA, outlined a new process for music proposals. MusLA or another constituency may identify an issue and will create a proposal. **Snyder** will coordinate, and if MusLA writes the proposal she will submit it on behalf of MusLA to the working group. If approved by the working group, Yusko will then send it to the chair of the JSC, and the JSC will make it available for review. Then at that point CC:DA would be able to review and comment on it after it has already gone to the JSC. **Snyder** noted this is the big change for CC:DA. CC:DA would still be expected to read and comment, then the JSC will review the comments and make a final decision.

The **Chair** asked the question, when MusLA notices an issue that needs to be addressed will it bring the issue directly to the working group, and not ALA? And will CC:DA therefore see fewer music-related proposals through CC:DA as ALA proposals? **Snyder** said both of these were correct.

Maxwell made a statement about being able to comment on whether we are in favor or not.

Rendall asked if this is an international group of music catalogers. **Snyder** replied that it was initially a North American group, but then considered adding European participation.

Snyder said it might be easier for CC:DA and might result in tighter proposals before we read them. The **Chair** said we will wait and see, and if CC:DA feels its voice is not being heard, we will bring it up.

Glennan noted that one of the reasons to have an international group is to help make sure groups are not working at cross purposes and to help prioritize solutions. She noted that even though valid and very different solutions may be reached by different constituencies, you might want a consistent approach across various chapters. This group is charged to address that issue.

Maxwell clarified that proposals are supposed to go up through ALA and can see how proposals could get funneled to this group first. **Glennan** noted that music proposals will not go through CC:DA. They will become JSC documents, and ALA may support the document or not during the constituency comment period, as we see fit. **Attig** said one of the main purposes is to make sure proposals for music are developed by experts in the field. The nightmare situation is if two groups come up with equally valid but opposite solutions and the JSC, which at the moment has no music experts, has to make the decision. **Maxwell** asked if it was a more appropriate approach for proposals to go through ALA or other constituencies and then to go through this music group before they go to the JSC. **Attig** noted that was an extra step. **Glennan** said it would delay the whole process and reminded CC:DA that the MusLA is independent of ALA. This music group is now a JSC working group and is charged to create proposals, but this is not preventing review and nor does it prevent members of CC:DA from identifying or working on music-related issues through Tracey. This was a JSC decision. **Rendall** noted that if American and Canadian music catalogers come up with a proposal together, requiring American approval is not appropriate.

Snyder brought up a recent situation in which our proposal had to articulate the awareness of other proposals by Canadian libraries, which complicated the proposal and response process.

Mark **Scharff**, from the audience, noted that this seems like an example of a community that has identified a way to work through stuff for themselves. He questioned if we envision other communities doing the same thing, noting that he was not making a judgment of this being good or bad, but was just curious. **Tarango** brought up the question of why the music community is being singled out for preferential treatment. **Glennan** provided background on the music community's discussion of proposals during RDA development, where some music proposals were controversial. Although music experts from various JSC constituencies tried to work through and resolve the issues, it was a difficult process and consensus could not be reached on all issues. This group rose out of that experience in 2008. Music catalogers were motivated to work on their proposals outside the constituency review process, so they could agree among themselves first. **Maxwell** said that other communities, such as serials, are special too, and that's what he feels is happening here. **Rendall** noted a concern if too many special interest communities bypass their national library associations, then it will be up to the JSC to resolve the problem. The **Chair** acknowledged Maxwell's and Tarango's concerns but stated that this is a JSC decision and we are not going to have an official response right now. But we might want to think about whether ALA wants to make an official response in the future. We will keep your comments on record and keep them in mind.

1217. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Polutta

Polutta reported that the new blog is now our home page. She reported that today she is looking for feedback on the website, issues such as: did it work for you and could you find what you needed. She said she would welcome comments because she has been working in a vacuum and since this group is using it the most she would like our feedback. The other question concerns the old website. She noted that there is a lot of old material going back to 1995 and not all has been transferred. She wanted to know how much should be transferred to the new website. She believes we can leave the old website there frozen as an archive site, or we can transfer the last 5 years of documents or whatever is most relevant to the current site. She needs to know what we want on the current site, as opposed to the old.

Myers said that the former site could use a link to the new blog site. He described how difficult it was to find the new site and that it would be helpful to add the link. **Polutta** noted that she would add to the old website a link to the new one. She asked if we want to keep it as a live site or a dead one. **Attig** said we could simply replace the whole site. He noted there are several archive sites, and they will coordinate that and make same decision for all of them. He said the more critical issue is if we want an archive site and a current site. **Myers** also noted that he realized we are probably coming up on recertification with ALCTS, and that the site is invaluable for the committee to gather material. He suggested that we should make it easier for whomever this task falls upon.

Attig said he noticed that some things on the agenda went to a document directly and some links returned a second page. **Polutta** reported that it has been changed recently in Wordpress software, which gives you the option. She noted that this Midwinter website does not have to be maintained by just one person, and that the Chair has had a role in adding material. **Polutta** said

that she put together a document that the Chair used, and would like to add that. She also would like to fix it so that a direct link will occur.

Tarango said he does like the new site and it worked very well to get the materials needed. As a negative, he questioned if he understood the potential for two archive sites and noted how he would hate that. He thought we should just have one site. He would suggest one site goes away, and we transfer documents possibly selected by the chair. **Polutta** said so we have one vote for everything being transferred and one vote for everything from the last five years or so.

Hostage suggested that documents could be left on the ALA website, or wherever they are archived now, and we could just have links to them. In that way we wouldn't have to move the actual documents and face the problem of changing URLs. **Polutta** said it would require link changes, but that could be done.

Hostage reported that when he brought up the CC:DA agenda, it was in very small print and he couldn't enlarge the print in the browser. The **Chair** reported that he and Polutta discovered that yesterday, and realized they should have made a document of the agenda or a PDF. He said if we do not change the style of the website, then they will try to add PDFs. **Polutta** agreed and said she figured out a solution that will solve it for next time. **Rendall** said he also found the print a little small. **Polutta** said it's on list of things she did not exactly like, and noted that it is hard to distinguish in the theme between the title of a post and the text of the post.

Myers said that as a chair who saw a couple of efforts in vain to migrate the website, he wanted to give his congratulations for her success to date and thank her for her hard work in this transition.

Attig noted that his frustration is that he first hasn't gotten used to where to find things on the new site. He also noted a need for him to use something offline so that was why he maintained the old site, which he could copy. The **Chair** said that maybe we could prioritize what is needed, and that things could be downloaded as PDFs.

German discussed sending out documents to people instead of links. She noted the order of things was difficult to find with the navigation aid on the side. She also said that having recent posts may not be that relevant since it's not a blog. **Polutta** replied that it was pretty much all documents, and asked if she was saying that pages should be above the posts. **German** said she thought pages should be above recent posts and noted how tabs at the top usually indicate different types of things and when using them as navigation it is hard to conceptualize. **Polutta** said she was not sure and may need to talk more.

The **Chair** wanted to repeat what Myers said and to thank Polutta for her work. He noted that Lori Robare, the former chair, was also applauding silently in audience. He said to send feedback to him and he will forward it to Polutta.

Lori **Robare**, from the audience, noted that at every conference during her term as chair, she promised the executive board to have the new website up by next conference so she said it was fantastic to see the new website.

1218. Report from the RDA Conference Forums and Programs Task Force: Abbas

Abbas reported on the RDA forums programs held at ALA annual. She noted that there was a one day authorities training preconference, “A Change in Authority: Authority work in the RDA Environment,” that received very positive feedback. There were 94 participants, and they were fortunate to have two Library of Congress trainers. The event featured a lot of hands on activity.

They also held four forums last year at Annual, including the RDA Update Forum. There were 240 attendees at the beginning of the session, representing a full house. **Abbas** noted they will be having the same forum with slightly different speakers tomorrow at 1-4 in the Convention Center, Room 606-607.

The forum of vendors last year was also well received and interactive, with attendees asking really good questions, resulting in a lively discussion. There were 180 attendees at the session, when the counts were taken in the middle of the session, and the attendance was reported to be pretty stable the entire time. It was a later session at the end of the day (4 p.m.-6 p.m.) and attendees stayed to speak with vendors. **Abbas** reported the Task Force is also planning another vendor session for Annual but with BIBFRAME looming out there it is unsure what it will include. Vendors may decide to wait and see what happens with BIBFRAME. It is pulling together vendors, and **Abbas** asked people to e-mail her with suggestions or names of people to contact.

Another session, “Transformation: Revenge of a ‘Fallen’ Code. Morphing our Current MARC Reality into a New RDA-enabled Future,” had 180-185 attendees. This session was presented by OCLC and focused on issues with multiple metadata schema and standards in play at the same time. It was well received. She noted the session was right after lunch but people were nevertheless engaged.

The session titled “The AIR We Breathe. Borrowing Lessons From RDA Development To Train For Your Next Triathlon” was a provocative session on the process of developing RDA, the process of beginning to train, and implementing lessons learned. It featured trainers such as Barbara Tillett, Chris Oliver, Nannette Naught, and Troy Linker. This was at 8 in the morning and there were still 80 people in attendance. **Abbas** reported that it was a lively session with overall good comments and experiences being shared by people going through the same process.

Abbas reported that task force members have also been doing non-ALA programming. She herself has mostly presented in Oklahoma. Chamyia Kincy has been doing sessions in California, Nannette Naught also presented in Oklahoma at the Oklahoma Library Association, and Barbara Schultz-Jones presented at the Texas Library Association. **Abbas** said she was trying to get the word out about activities in which task force members are involved.

Abbas said that there are a few sessions planned for Annual, including a pre-conference called “Back to the Basics RDA” training. This one day pre-conference will be more hands-on, and the Task Force is trying to catch people who may not have been concerned about RDA earlier. It is also a refresher course with hands-on work with trainers. It will also bring in an administrator’s perspective, and will feature representatives from OCLC and SkyRiver. There will also be an RDA Update Forum and a forum on implementation stories and strategies. It welcomes any other suggestions.

The **Chair** thanked **Abbas** for her report and asked if there were any questions or comments for June. **Abbas** noted she will be sending the chair a full report. The Chair thanked **Abbas** and encouraged everyone to attend the RDA Update Forum tomorrow.

1219. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Linker

Troy **Linker** from ALA Publishing presented his report. The topics covered by **Linker** included recent RDA Toolkit improvements, RDA Toolkit release schedule, planned improvements, RDA rewording, RDA print, and Essential RDA. **Linker** noted that this is roughly the same presentation that he will give tomorrow at the RDA Update Forum.

Linker discussed RDA improvements, noting that the policy statements were relabeled LC-PCC PS, with new logos. He reported that they put links to the Toolkit version of AACR2 back into Cataloger's Desktop, and stated that beginning in April users will need an RDA Toolkit subscription in order to read and access AACR2. Other improvements include the ability now to toggle things on and off, which Linker said is available with new links; updated RDA Fast-track and LC-PCC PS changes; RDA mappings are now freely available without subscription to the RDA Toolkit; the auto sync TOC function can be turned on or off, although the default is on; global and global sharing labels for workflows; and video help such as how to log in; advanced search, and tips and tricks. **Linker** noted that these will be promoted more.

Linker reported that the RDA Toolkit release schedule, which has up to now been haphazard, will now be on a bi-monthly schedule of even-numbered months on the second Tuesday of the month. It will include things such as fast track changes, RDA toolkit improvements, and LC-PCC PS updates. There will still be an annual update, tentatively scheduled for April, to match the JSC meeting. These changes will go in the revision history. **Linker** noted that fast track changes do not always go in the revision history, and the JSC decides which changes to include. It will be released on even numbered months with the exception of no February release this year, due to a contractual issue. They will postpone the February release and since the current site is stable it will not be affected by this. The RDA Toolkit Multilingual interface, the French and German RDA translations, RDA fast track changes, and LC-PCC PS changes that were scheduled for February will be delayed.

Upcoming improvements include: multilingual support, including French and German translations, which are expected to be in the next release; improved integration with the RDA Registry; adding policy statements; improved bookmark functionality; additional user preferences and improvements to online display. **Linker** said that if you want something added or done to send an e-mail, and that they want community involvement and want to be very transparent about those things.

In terms of RDA rewording, Linker said that the first group of reworded chapters (9, 10, 11, and 6) were released in December 2012. The remaining reworded chapters are expected to be released by mid-2013. A new RDA print accumulation, that will include all the changes and reworded chapters since the last print version of November 2010, will be issued when all of the reworked chapters are done. This is currently expected in mid-2013. It will include changes made to RDA up to and including the 2013 RDA update. Annual print updates are planned, to be released mid-year.

A companion to RDA was planned by the JSC. It will not use the “concise” title, but has a working title of *Essential RDA*. It will include basic instructions and core elements of RDA. **Linker** noted it will require some stitching together, and will require editors with expertise in RDA to shape it into a practical thing. It will be available in multiple formats, such as print and e-books, for individuals not interested in a subscription to the Toolkit. **Linker** reported that it will probably also be available in the Toolkit, but that is not the primary place for people to get it since it is designed for those who do not want the Toolkit.

Kelley asked what time the update forum was scheduled tomorrow. **Linker** replied that it was 1 to 4. This was confirmed by other members.

Lipcan asked to confirm if the new cumulation will be due in 2015. **Linker** answered that it is expected mid-2013, shortly after they release the last reworded chapters, so this is a bit of a moving target right now.

Attig asked if revisions from the November meeting will be included in the next update now or did that get pushed back? **Linker** said it was an open question, and they will have to decide; noting the JSC changes are a high priority. **Linker** described how rewording can be tricky, as some rewording was done in pre-change language and some reconciliation will need to be done. They hope to release them all the same time but there are several open questions and he is not prepared to commit one way or the other.

Kevin **Randall**, from the audience, mentioned an issue regarding documentation and local policies, and remembered how years ago Cataloger’s Desktop had a feature for sticky notes that led to some local notes in AACR2, but then went away with the new platform. He said how he would like to see something like that in the Toolkit, where you could overlay and put your own links to documentation. **Linker** said they have talked a lot about it and it could be done different ways. One way could be to put a link inside a bookmark, link to a workflow, noting that the bookmark has a note area. Another way is that bookmarks could be shareable among institutions, which lends itself to local documentation. Right now bookmarks are not editable, you have to delete them, but once they make improvements in the bookmark tool you can write long-form policy statements in RDA and make links to the long-form. **Randall** asked how you can see if there is a bookmark there. **Linker** said you can have it appear in the margin, the icon can toggle on and off. There should be an icon that lets you know there’s a bookmark. **Randall** asked if at the moment they are not shareable. **Linker** confirmed that you cannot share yet but they will make it institutionally shareable. It’s one of the things they’ve been asked to do. The developer has not signed off on it this year, but they are looking into it.

Wolverton asked if the price will be going up this year and if there are any thoughts on numbers. **Linker** said they haven’t done their budget yet, so he hasn’t run the numbers yet, but they are not seeing the level of uptake on Toolkit subscriptions that they hoped they would. He noted that this is an issue of concern, and that the Toolkit is running in the red right now. They did ask for and receive from the CoP permission to suspend paying royalties for a period of time until they are no longer in the red. He noted the need for people to subscribe to it. They do not want to put any roadblocks on implementation. **Linker** said he gets many comments from people that they can’t afford it but he said they are actually seeing an increase in numbers in the last few weeks. He encourages everyone to participate and hopes not to have a crisis, and they are hoping not to

have a price increase. **Maxwell** had a question about updates not appearing in April. **Linker** responded that there will not be a February update, and they have not said anything else. Depending on events they may or not be able to include the JSC update in April. **Maxwell** asked if they will include the November changes and the rewording at once simultaneously. **Linker** said they are still working that out. It may be daunting but also easier and they are hoping to have all of the reworded chapters released. While the ability to release the Toolkit is delayed, work on changes or rewording is not delayed but still continuing, and they hope to get caught up. **Attig** said that a delay allows more time for reconciliation to happen. **Linker** noted that some things can go forward but others require a process of iteration and improvement, so the situation is complicated. **Maxwell** asked Attig to confirm if he said the final documents will be posted when finalized. **Attig** said his understanding is that the final documents will be posted when finalized and probably as PDF files in advance of being added to the Toolkit. Only the text of the revision and not the entire chapters will be available, but for planning purposes there should be advance notice of what will be in the update.

Mark **Scharff**, from the audience, asked about the possibility of writing links in RDA to Chapter Z1 of the Descriptive Cataloging Manual. He said it was helpful in learning how to do authority work and a link to that would be useful. **Linker** said that the current policy has been to not provide links to other resources outside of the Toolkit. However, they always envisioned that they would provide links to external resources. He noted that as of December you can now link to other resources or turn off links to non-relevant resources you do not own. While he does not want a link farm and they need to have some evaluation process, the DCM sounds like a good candidate. **Scharff** said that chapter Z1 will be home for a lot of policy decisions about creating authority records. **Linker** said he was happy to take this note and that this is a perfect example of the community input they want. He said he will put it on the development blog and ask for comments, and this will help them prioritize what to tackle first.

Tarango asked since they are issuing a new compilation in print, if they were designating the print as a new edition. **Linker** said they needed to tell him if RDA was a continuing resource. **Tarango** said the online is but the print would be a new record and if so, he would appreciate an edition statement. **Linker** noted that he was nervous about that. The **Chair** asked if they will also distinguish the print from online since print and online will not be synced. **Linker** said he would post the title and copyright page for comment from the members first.

Maxwell asked when MARC mapping will be updated. **Linker** responded that the JSC just gave them the revised MARC mapping but it did not have an update process as other things do. This was the first real update for it, and since many files in the Toolkit are updated separately, they are working on a process to update once and use it many times. He agreed the Toolkit was out-of-date for those areas. **Attig** noted the uncertainty and that there is a need to provide it in some way, perhaps as a PDF, as a tool for people. **Linker** reminded everyone that they also have the capacity to make a map in the Toolkit. **Maxwell** brought up the issue of authoritativeness. **Linker** said it is on the priority list, but they will have to draw a line. **Maxwell** noted that it will need constant updating. **Linker** agreed, and said there was the expectation that there would be more frequent updates. He said he has requested information from the JSC on what things are impacted by changes, and ALA Publishing is trying to stay ahead of changes more than it has been.

1220. Report from the RDA Planning and Training Task Force: Chair

The **Chair** gave a brief update on the RDA Planning and Training Task Force. He noted that he is an ex-officio member, and that there were several webinars on RDA in the fall. He said to contact him if anyone needs more information and he will get to that on Monday.

The **Chair** announced that the next meeting will be at 8:30 a.m. on Monday at the same location, and recessed the meeting at 4:57 p.m.

*Monday, January 28, 8:30-11:30 a.m.
Westin Seattle Hotel, Grand I*

1221. Report from the MARBI Representative; discussion of CC:DA's role in/relationship with post-MARBI committees: Myers [[CC:DA/Marbi Rep/2012/2](#)]

Myers began his report by discussing the two MARBI sessions from ALA Midwinter 2013 and saying that Monday's MARBI session was cancelled. MARBI discussed and approved the following seven proposals. Proposal 2013-01 came from PCC and dealt with MARC Authority fields 672 and 673 for recording format for titles related or not related to the entity represented in a machine actionable format. The proposal was approved with amendments.

Proposals 2013-02, 2013-03, and 2013-04 came from MusLA. Proposal 2013-02 requested that MARC field 162, 462, 562 and 762 be added to the MARC 21 authority format and the proposal was approved. Proposal 2013-03 requested that the 250 field be made repeatable. This proposal was approved after discussion. Proposal 2013-03 was a proposal to allow a new value in MARC21 008/20 to accommodate new score definitions under RDA. The proposal was approved pending further work on code definitions.

Proposals 2013-05, 2013-06, 2013-07 came from the SAC Subcommittee on Genre/Form Implementation and dealt with LC Subject Headings. Proposal 2013-6 addressed adding field 385 for audience characteristics of works and expressions. This was approved with minor amendments dealing with subfield redundancies. Proposal 2013-7 requested that field 386 be added to record group categories for creators and contributors. It was approved with modifications, including that it cannot be used for named entities as it duplicates several 37x fields. The subcommittee will work in close consultation with the JSC representative to discuss any other overlap or vocabulary conflicts. 2013-08 requested additional subfields and indicators for MARC 046 and 648 to address chronological categories and dates of expression and works. This proposal was approved but noted that an analogous field is needed in the authority format. This new field will be presented in a new proposal.

Myers then proceeded to report on the discussion papers. 2013-DP01 came from the OCLC National Libraries Working Group and requested a new 042 code to identify resources located in national bibliographies. MARBI discussed it and agreed in principal and agreed to a new code for field 042. As no change to the format of the field is needed MARBI does not need to take further action. OCLC will submit the request to the MARC office to have the code added.

2013-DP02 originated from LC and the Canadian Committee on MARC and concerned adding subfield \$q to the 020, 022, 024, and 027 MARC fields for qualifying information. Most

discussion centered on the use in the 022 field as it is not repeatable. The discussion paper will be developed further and resubmitted.

2013-DP03 was submitted by the German National Library concerning adding a \$7 to the series added entry field to accommodate the German practice of handling series entirely in the bibliographic record. This will return as a proposal.

2014-DP04 came from the Canadian Committee on MARC concerning the display of RDA appendix J and offered possible solutions. MARBI discussion centered around a set of codes or leveraging the vocabulary registry. The paper mentioned the 787 field but discussion mentioned the possibility of other fields. This issue will be further developed and submitted as another discussion paper.

Myers moved the conversation to MARBI's demise. A proposal was made to hold a wake at Annual 2013, but no convenient time could be arranged for a formal gathering. A possible informal gathering may be arranged Saturday evening, but plans have not been finalized.

Myers has talked with Sally McCallum of LC and SAC Liaison Steven Hearn. The MARC Advisory Committee welcomes the continuing participation from CC:DA in the development of MARC and the reformulation of the committee. There needs to be a modification from a MARBI liaison to CC:DA to a CC:DA liaison to the new committee. This would need CaMMS Executive Committee approval. The **Chair** added that he spoke with the CaMMS Executive Committee and that all CC:DA needs to do is approve the liaison and give the Executive Committee a name. The Executive Committee will update the ALA database with the correct information and handle all the other administrative details.

The **Chair** discussed the history of Library of Congress' MARC Advisory Committee and ALA's MARBI Committee and that ALCTS/LITA has formed the Metadata Standards Committee. The Metadata Standards Committee may want a liaison structure. **Attig** added that any liaison decision will come from the CaMMS Executive Committee.

Myers noted that his MARBI liaison term ends at Annual 2013. He is willing to serve as the new CC:DA liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee position. The **Chair** opened up the issue for discussion about should CC:DA have a liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee. **Hostage** asked if the liaison would have to a CC:DA member. **Myers** answered that CC:DA would have to revise its documentation to include the liaison as an ex-officio member with approval from the CaMMS Executive Committee. The **Chair** stated it would not be his preference to have the liaison be a voting member as the member task force work may be too much for additional liaison duties. **Hostage** noted that his question was to clarify structure. No further questions. The **Chair** called for a motion to appoint a CC:DA liaison to the MARC Advisory Committee. **DeSantis** moved, seconded by **Kelley**. No further discussion. Motion passed unanimously. **Tarango** asked if the new liaison would be a member. The **Chair** reiterated that he hoped to amend the CC:DA document so the new position would a liaison only. **Maxwell** noted the possibility of adding a ninth CC:DA member with the liaison duty. The **Chair** noted that a ninth member would probably require approval from the CaMMS Executive Committee or changes to the CC:DA documentation. The **Chair** stated he would consult with the CaMMS Executive Committee on the next step to get the liaison approved.

1222. Presentation on RIMMF (RDA in Many Metadata Formats): Deborah Fritz

[RIMMF Program](#)

The Chair introduced invited speaker **Deborah Fritz**. **Fritz** introduced herself and noted that she and her husband own the company The MARC of Quality. They expect to be changing the company name to TMQ shortly. **Fritz** began her presentation of RDA data outside of MARC encoding. **Fritz** has created a prototype of an RDA input form in a program called RIMMF. RIMMF was created to assist in RDA training outside the impediment of MARC encoding. RIMMF is designed to be an educational tool, not a cataloging tool. **Fritz** noted that RIMMF has a wiki and a user guide. RIMMF includes links to the RDA Toolkit and is programmed with ISBD punctuation. **Fritz** then gave a live demonstration of RIMMF. When the presentation was completed, the **Chair** opened the floor to questions.

Attig stated that he has worked with RIMMF and it is great for showing relationships. The program forces a user to understand and make decisions about work-, manifestation-, and expression-level information. It is a great learning tool. **Myers** noted that the RIMMF identifier shows the lack of identifiers that are used system to system. **Attig** noted that RIMMF has internal identifiers, but like other administration information they are more for the system and not for universal use. **Sherman Clarke** noted that it looks good for testing non-book material and wonders if RIMMF is available for non-Windows platforms. **Fritz** answered that currently they do not have the skillset to make a Mac version and also currently there is not a web-only version. They did create a version that can be run off a flash drive. **Mark Scharff** asked about how RIMMF works with accompanying material, such as those found with sound recordings. **Fritz** answered that accompanying material is still under discussion in RDA. A user can add multiple 3XX fields to designate multiple content formats. A user can also create another work in RIMMF for the material but it is unclear how to note in RDA the most appropriate relationship between the materials. **Attig** added that sound recordings often contain multiple works that can be stated in a one-to-many relationship with the manifestation. **Fritz** added that RIMMF can help expose the decisions RDA requires you to make. **Tarango** asked if there was a way to generate additional access points automatically when there are multiple authors. **Fritz** responded that it is not a variant access point but rather another creator. This really comes down to how the data is going to be indexed and she assumed that all creators will be indexed and built RIMMF to do that.

1223. Future work of CC:DA; current ALA proposals and task forces; revision proposals that we want to take on

[\[Follow-up Actions for ALA, January 2012\]](#)

[\[RDA discussion questions arising from work with RIMMF\]](#)

Attig began his report by going through the follow-up actions from the previous meeting. Follow-up actions 1-4 were for him to take care of and they are completed. Number 5 is also for **Attig** but is incomplete.

Number 6 came from LC/21, which was turned into a revised proposal at the JSC meeting and **Attig** quickly sent it out for comments to make sure that ALA was okay with it. **Attig** reported

that two comments came in, one expressing concern that the instructions about leaves and pages were misleading. **Attig** thinks the instructions are not misleading. Another comment came from rare book catalogers about the need for instructions in regards to unnumbered sequences. **Attig** asked Lapka if the Bibliographic Standards Committee (BSC) wanted to pursue either of these. **Lapka** reported that BSC did not discuss comment 1 but did discuss comment 2 and the committee would like to proceed. **Attig** wanted to discuss where the work on revising the proposal would happen. **Attig** suggested BSC would do the work and submit the proposal from BSC to CC:DA and **Lapka** agreed. **Attig** opened comments to the rest of the committee. **Maxwell** was concerned that instructions regarding counting unnumbered pages for rare materials might not be the same for published items. **Lapka** acknowledged the concern and that BSC plans to create the proposal from the perspective of general catalogers and make secondary provisions for rare materials. **Attig** noted that the proposal would return to CC:DA for comment, and we would send it on as an ALA proposal, but that BSC would write the original proposal.

Attig discussed ALA follow-up actions 7-10. **Attig** based them on individual comments from the wiki. **Attig** noted that there have been no additional comments and asked the committee if it would like to proceed on any of them.

Hostage said AALL would be interested in pursuing action 10, about hearings. **Attig** noted one of the first actions would be to confirm that instructions are lacking. **Hostage** noted that it is unclear if further action is needed. **Attig** agreed to let **Hostage** know the results of the proposal and check to see if AALL wants to pursue it further. **Attig** was unsure who made the original comments.

Glennan discussed action 8. She noted that it should be fairly easy to move forward. The problem was that the instruction to give the most specific data possible was in the base instruction but was not extended to the sub-instructions. **Attig** agreed that it should be simple and possibly be fast-tracked and requested one other person to work with him on it.

Attig will look at action 7 and action 9 to see if he can send them on without further discussion. **Glennan** explained the PCC feedback around 7. The PCC is not sure what it means to make birth and death dates core and whether it extends to access points, if dates should be added when not needed for differentiation. The confusion centers on whether making an element core means that it will need to go in an access point. **Attig** will be in touch with her to see if the PCC wants to do anything about this.

Attig noted that actions 11 and 12 are separable actions from the proposal dealing with place names. Action 11 is primarily an editorial function. It would remove the abbreviations for place names and remove the instructions referring to the appendix on abbreviations, and also change any examples that have abbreviations for place names. **Attig** stated that it should not require a task force, merely him and one or two other persons to help complete the editorial work if we move forward.

Attig noted that action 12 requires substantive work and should be done by a task force. This item follows up on Hostage's point that many problems in chapter 16 could be solved if additions to a name were separate elements and not part of the preferred name. This idea had some support in the JSC but also some strong opposition. There is support for treating larger places as

relationships and adding instructions to support that. **Lipcan** asked if 12 would be an extension of the work being done by the Task Force on Appendix K, especially the work on relationships. **Attig** stated that the Task Force on Appendix K will remain separate but it can provide background information for a new task force. **Lipcan** stated that the Task force for Appendix K will finish its work and the new task force would go forward. **Attig** noted that the fact that places are group 3 entities complicates the matter and asked **Maxwell** to comment on subject implications. **Maxwell** reported that a SAC subcommittee is working on how to deal with the subject chapter of RDA and wants to have a discussion with CC:DA. **Attig** added that the SAC group is favoring replacing FRBR types group 1 entities with the FRSAD thema-nomen subject-name relationship. Place would be a type of subject and the current rules for place names actually should be for names of jurisdictions and should be moved to chapter 11. So this is all part of a broad set of issues that may take a while to work through. **Maxwell** commented that the Task Force for Appendix K should be thinking about how the rules and relationships of corporate bodies apply to places as jurisdictions. **Attig** asked for those interested in helping with editorial work on action 11 to let him know and noted that action 12 will require a task force decision.

Attig reported that the consensus of the Sources of Information Task Force on action 13 is that most of the issues had been resolved. Some problems may remain, but the consensus is to use the revised rules for a time to confirm there are still problems and then take this up again as a fresh task. The work of the current task force is done and the task force should be dissolved. **Mark Scharff** agrees. **Lori Robare** endorsed dissolving the task force as the most pressing issues have been resolved that we wanted to have in place for implementation. She agrees that using the revised rules will give us an understanding of what work still needs to be done. **Attig** wanted to acknowledge that Glennan and McGrath did a tremendous amount of work at literally the last minute to pull together proposals. He thanked the task force members for their hard work. **The Chair** officially discharged the Sources of Information Task Force and thanked it for its hard work.

Attig stated that a task force continues to work on action 14, although it has some leadership and membership issues that need to be addressed. **The Chair** added this task force to the list of possible task forces to be discussed. **Attig** noted that if we separate Extent of content from Extent of carrier then map vs. sheet is an issue, and likewise score vs. volume. The task force will therefore need cartographic and music backgrounds to make sure we make the right decisions. We can discuss membership after the meeting. **Attig** also noted that anyone can serve on a task force. Officially they need to be members of ALCTS, but we can appoint them as consultants if they are not. The chair of a task force, however, has to be someone at the table; i.e., a CC:DA member or liaison.

Attig stated that action 15 is old business. At the JSC meeting in 2011, ALA was asked if it would be interested in working on statements of responsibility, including the separate element for cast and performers. This is an issue of reconciliation with ISBD and an anomaly and should be addressed. ALA agreed to take on the issue but we were not in a position to do so at that time. OLAC and MusLA need to be involved. **Attig** thinks we should ask those groups to take the lead. On the other hand, we could set up a task force if other groups want to get involved. **Maxwell** noted that this matter may need a fresh point of view as those two groups may just want to continue their current practices. **Attig** responded that the groups are open to changing practices and that CC:DA can charge the task force with strongly looking at consolidating these elements.

McGrath noted that clearly they are the same type of information but there are historical reasons for the separation, specifically the display issue. While RDA is not about display, we have to make display work. Also the information has been mapped to the expression level but has also been quasi-transcribed at the manifestation level. **Attig** asked if the core requirement for statement of responsibility would have to be adjusted, because right now only the first statement is core. **Maxwell** asked if the two elements of cast/performers are core now. **Attig** said they are, and this is an issue that needs to be addressed. He asked if CC:DA should form the task force or leave it to MusLA/OCAC liaisons. The **Chair** asked for MusLA and OLAC input. **Snyder** said she was fine with either decision. The **Chair** stated that CC:DA will do as **Attig** suggests. MusLA and OLAC will take the work on and let CC:DA know if that is not workable.

Attig reported on the final two actions. The group working on preferred titles for parts of the Bible is still working on some issues. The issues do not need to be revived here but CC:DA needs to be aware the work is incomplete. **Myers** noted that the group has not had any communication since last ALA Midwinter. It had difficulties because in trying to fix one problem it kept finding other issues that needed fixing. The group tried to resolve small but pressing issues, but then had to deal with much larger issues of naming practices for the Bible where Anglo-American practices differ from international practices. The group also has not recently heard from the constituencies most concerned with the matter. **Lori Robare** clarified that this is not a CC:DA task force, but CC:DA asked its liaisons to take the lead on the issue. **Attig** and **Myers** will relook at the last group report and see if there are some straightforward and urgent issues that can be pushed through, and what else could be brought back to the CC:DA annual meeting for discussion.

Attig gave a reminder on existing task forces. The Task Force on Changes Resulting from the Chicago Manual of Style should be resolved in the next few months and will not be active after that. The Task Force on Relationship Designators in Appendix K is active and will present its final report at Annual. The Task Force on Instructions for Describing Relationships is active and will continue at least through Annual. We have two active task forces, a possible one on place names, and the possible continuation of the Task Force on Machine Actionable Data. One task force needs to be reconstituted and another task force needs to be formed.

The **Chair** called for questions and comments on task forces. **Rendall** stated that place names is important and should be moved forward. We should be aware it may not get approved in the end but will be interesting and valuable to work through and try to come up with practices that make sense. **Lapka** stated that the Task Force on Machine Actionable Data Elements should have a representative from the rare materials community. The **Chair** asked if he thinks the task force is worth pursuing and **Lapka** answered that it is. **Attig** noted that there would be disappointment if CC:DA did not pursue it. **Lipcan** added that someone from the art library community should also be on the task force. The **Chair** agreed to proceed with the two task forces. **Attig** stated that the existing task force can continue with a new chair and new members but does not need a new vote to reauthorize.

The **Chair** called for a motion to authorize a task force to deal with the continuing issue of place names. A motion was made by **Bourassa** and seconded by **Kelley**. There was no discussion. The motion passed unanimously. The **Chair** passed around signup sheets for members or people in the audience to express interest in working on either task force.

Attig turned the conversation to the issues brought forward by Deborah Fritz. Some of the things she wants to do may not need to be addressed directly by the text of RDA but could be handled by an application profile. **Attig** asked for additional comments about the question of multiple statements of responsibility. **Myers** noted that AACR2/RDA both address this: statements naming more than one person in the same function is a single statement; if more than one function are named then there are multiple statements of responsibility. **Hillmann** wanted to address issues she has been hearing about multiple times, and wants to move the discussion up a level. As a general comment, for many elements we cling to transcription because it provides some security, but have to deal with making this information data and not just text. Whatever solutions we come up with need to push us into the data world and away from the text world. She would love to see some activity about machine-readable application profiles including at the PCC level as their decisions will be ideal for creating an application profile. She would love to be a part of it. Her group is working on creating machine-operable application profiles.

Attig acknowledged that Fritz has helped identify gaps in RDA. He will talk with Fritz and report to CC:DA as well as create any applicable proposals, including some that could be fast-tracked.

1224. Report from the Chair on CaMMS Executive Committee meetings; other new business; reports from the floor; announcement of next meeting, and adjournment

The Chair stated he had no report from the CaMMS Executive Committee other than stating he had reported the committee's issues about the JSC proposed leadership change and the CaMMS Executive Committee responded positively.

The Chair called for other business and reports from the floor. **Lipcan** reported that the art library cataloging community has begun to meet to discuss RDA and its relationship to monographs and art catalogs. The community notes that RDA instructions are biased towards textual contributions as opposed to visual contributions such as art reproductions. The art community is discussing new conventional collective titles that include media terms, such as "Watercolor paintings. Selections." The community has been invited by LC to address these issues. The first task will likely be to address the LC-PCC PS for 4.25.1 and perhaps work on possibly getting an exception to the rule for artists' monographs. Part of the discussion revolved around whether an artist has an author or subject relationship with the monograph as the illustrations in the work are by the artist. They are also discussing if the community would like another element to note that the illustrations are reproductions of the artist's works. They are concerned about the form and value of some of the authority records being created for certain collective works. The art community may bring these issues to CC:DA at Annual 2013 or possibility to LC.

The Chair noted that CC:DA will meet at ALA Annual during the same general time period although he is working with Charles Wilt to add an additional 30 minutes. **Attig** noted that the meeting will need to make time for the task forces.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.