

Core: Leadership, Infrastructure, Futures
(A division of the American Library Association)
Metadata and Collections Section
Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**Minutes of the
2024 Midwinter Virtual Meeting
February 2 & 5, 2024**

Members present:

Amanda K. Sprochi, Chair
Kathy Glennan, Vice-Chair
Mary A. Burns
Brian Patrick Clark
Erin Grant
Jeanette Norris
Karl Pettitt
Amanda Zhishan Xu
Richard Guajardo, Webmaster (2/2 only)
Charlotte L. Cotter, Intern
Michael Bradford, Intern

North American RDA Committee Representatives present:

Robert L. Maxwell, NARDAC
Adam L. Schiff, NARDAC

Ex-officio representatives present:

Kate James, OCLC
Jenny Levine, Core
Melanie Polutta, LC (2/2 only)
Hank Young, PCC (2/2 only)

ALA Liaisons present:

Laura Doublet, RBMS-BSC
Vanessa Dwyer, CC:CYM (2/2 only)
Daniel Jergovic, SAC (2/2 only)
Cate Kellett, GODORT
Alyssa Koclanes, ACRL
Timothy Ryan Mendenhall, MIG
Timothy Ryan Mendenhall, LC Romanization Table Review Board
Robert L. Maxwell, LC Romanization Table Review Board
Sharolyn Swenson, CRCC (2/5 only)
Jia Xu, CC:AAM

Min Zhang, MAGIRT

Non-ALA Liaisons present:

Thomas M. Dousa, CLA

Keith Knop, MusLA/MLA

Kelley McGrath, OLAC

John F. Myers, MAC

Diane Napert, ARSC

Ryan Tamares, AALL

Rebecca Wiederhold, SAA

Notes:

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussions in the order in which they occurred. Material may have been rearranged to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. While recordings of the CC:DA meetings were made, the transcription process 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/liasons 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/liasons 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 “liasons” are used.
- V. Abbreviations and terms used in these minutes include:

3R Project = RDA Toolkit Restructure and Redesign Project

AALL = American Association of Law Libraries

AAP = Authorized access point

ABA = LC Acquisitions and Bibliographic Access Directorate

ACRL = Association of College and Research Libraries

AFOS = Acquisitions Fiscal and Oversea Support Division

AJL = Association of Jewish Libraries

ALA = American Library Association

ALAIR = American Library Association Institutional Repository

ALCTS = Association for Library Collections & Technical Services [Historical use only]

AP = Application profile

ARLIS/NA = Art Libraries Society of North America
ARSC = Association for Recorded Sound Collections
Atla = American Theological Library Association
BIBFRAME = Bibliographic Framework Initiative
BIG = BIBFRAME Interoperability Group
BSR = BIBCO Standard Record
CaMMS = Core/Cataloging and Metadata Management Section
CC:AAM = Core/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
CC:DA = Core/CaMMS/Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
CCC = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
CCM = Core/CaMMS/Cataloging of Children's Materials Committee
CIP = Cataloging in Publication
CLA = Catholic Library Association
COIN = Cooperative and Instructional Program Division
Core = merged division including ALCTS, LITA, and LLAMA [not an abbreviation]
CRCC = Core/Continuing Resources Cataloging Committee
CSM = Classification and Shelving Manual
CSR = CONSER Standard Record
CYAC = Children's Literature and Young Adults Cataloging
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
DCRM(B) = Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books)
DCRM(C) = Descriptive Cataloging of Rare Materials (Cartographic)
DCRMR = Descriptive Cataloging of RDA Materials (RDA Edition)
EURIG = European RDA Interest Group
Folio = See LCAP
FRBR = IFLA's Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records
FRBR-LRM = IFLA's FRBR-Library Reference Model
FRBRoo = FRBR-object-oriented
GODORT = ALA/Government Documents Round Table
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
IFLA-LRM = IFLA-Library Reference Model
ISBD = International Standard Bibliographic Description
ISBN = International Standard Book Number
ISBDM = International Standard Bibliographic Description for Manifestation
ISNI = International Standard Name Identifier
ISSN = International Standard Serial Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA (up to 2016)
LC = Library of Congress
LCAP = Library Collections Access Platform (a.k.a. Folio, LC's ILS)
LC/NAF = LC/NACO Authority File
LC-PCC PSs = Library of Congress Policy Statements
LCDGT = Library of Congress Demographic Genre Terms
LCGFT = Library of Congress Genre/Form Terms
LCMPT = Library of Congress Medium of Performance Thesaurus
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings

MAGIRT = Map and Geospatial Information Round Table
MAC = MARC Advisory Committee
MARC = Machine-Readable Cataloging
MedLA = Medical Library Association
MGD = Metadata Guidance Documentation
MIG = CORE/Metadata Interest Group
MulDiCat = IFLA's Multilingual Dictionary of Cataloguing Terms and Concepts
MusLA/MLA = Music Library Association
NAR = Name Authority Record
NHP = Non-human personage
NARDAC = North American RDA Committee
NASIG = North American Serials Interest Group
OLAC = Online Audiovisual Catalogers
OMR = Open Metadata Registry
ORDAC = Oceania RDA Committee
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
PoCo = PCC Policy Committee
PSD = Policy and Standards Division of the Library of Congress
RBMS = ACRL/Rare Books and Manuscripts Section
RBMS-BSC = ACRL Rare Books and Manuscripts Section,
Bibliographic Standards Committee
PTCP = Policy, Training, and Cooperative Programs Division
RSC = RDA Steering Committee
RDA = Resource Description and Access
RDF = Resource Description Framework
RUSA = Reference and User Services Association
SAC = Core/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SAA = Society of American Archivists
SCA = PCC Standing Committee on Applications
SCS = PCC Standing Committee on Standards
SCT = PCC Standing Committee on Training
SES = String encoding scheme
SHM = Subject Heading Manual
SLA = Special Libraries Association
URI = Uniform Resource Identifier
VES = Vocabulary encoding scheme
WCAG = Web Content Accessibility Guidelines
WEMI = Work/Expression/Manifestation/Item, the FRBR group 1 entities
**Find other abbreviations at: <http://www.ala.org/tools/topics/acronyms>*

Friday, February 2, 2024

*2:00-5:00 p.m. EST / 1:00-4:00 p.m. CST / 12:00-3:00 p.m. MST / 11:00 a.m.-1:00 p.m. PST
Online*

1605. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Amanda Sprochi, **Chair**, called the meeting to order at **1:00 p.m. CST**. She welcomed voting members, liaisons, representatives, and visitors.

1606. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

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

1607. Adoption of agenda: Chair

The **Chair** asked for additional changes to the agenda. There were no changes to the agenda.

The **Chair** invited a motion to adopt the agenda as issued. Motion to adopt the agenda by **Glennan**; seconded by **Burns**. Motion carried unanimously.

1608. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2023 Annual Meeting: Chair

[\[CC:DA/M/1586-1604\]](#)

The **Chair** had made some slight corrections to the minutes that had been sent by email. The **Chair** invited a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting as corrected. Motion to accept the minutes by **Glennan**; seconded by **Pettitt**. Motion carried unanimously.

1609. Report from the Chair [\[CC:DA/Chair/2023-2024/3\]](#)

The **Chair** reviewed highlights from the Chair's report for July 2023-February 2024. The full report is available online on the Core CC:DA Public Connect Space at <https://connect.ala.org/core/viewdocument/ccda-chair-report-midwinter-2024?CommunityKey=289a372f-3ec1-4cb0-8a75-902a1a18deb3&tab=librarydocuments>.

- The **Chair** reiterated CC:DA's charge.
- Since the annual meeting in July, the **Chair** has been continuing recruitment of liaisons from ALA units and non-ALA organizations where vacancies exist. Currently there are two vacancies: liaison to the Medical Library Association and liaison to the Public Library Association. The **Chair** will continue to reach out to these organizations to fill these vacancies. Other than that, CC:DA has returned to the usual complement of liaisons and representatives

- CC:DA members responded to a poll sent out by NARDAC and provided comments on “soft deprecated” elements in RDA. The RSC Committee was looking to replace certain terms with other terms because they were redundant or did not fit into the models in some way.
- CC:DA was asked by NARDAC to participate in planning a practical, hands-on preconference training at ALA annual. CC:DA is soliciting ideas from members on this training.
- CC:DA responded to requests for comments by RSC:
 - ReligionsWG/2023/1
 - ReligionsWG/2023/2
 - LanguagesWG/2023/1
 - PlacesWG/2023-2
- The **Chair** referred members to the RSC Annual Report 2023 [[RSC/Annual Report/2023](#)] for decisions and changes made in response to these proposals.
- The **Chair** reported on the three extant task forces at CC:DA.
 - The CC:DA Procedures Task Force, chaired by **Myers**, continues its work on revising CC:DA procedures. The Task Force is working on incorporating new aspects that have emerged since COVID, such as virtual meetings and voting virtually. CC:DA has also been moving toward a slightly different leadership structure. The **Chair** hopes that, with some small corrections, the report can be sent to Core for approval, before it returns to CC:DA for ratification.
 - The Documents Online Repository Task Force, chaired by **Guajardo**, was charged on August 14th with identifying a permanent online repository, reconstituting and locating historical CC:DA documents, recommending a retention cycle, and migrating and organizing historical CC:DA documents as appropriate. Members of this committee are **Glennan, Robert Rendell, and Amanda Ros**. Work is open ended and ongoing. The **Chair** asked members who have either print or digital documents to hold on to them until the task force decides how they want to handle them.
 - The CC:DA Task Force on Personal Names in Official RDA was charged on September 7, 2023 with submitting a proposal to NARDAC revising the RDA instructions for personal names. **Pettitt** is acting as chair, with members **Burns, Peter Fletcher, James, and Tina Marie Maes**. Work is ongoing, with an interim report expected.
- The **Chair** expressed intention to put together a task force to work on a welcoming document for new CC:DA members, however, this has been tabled until the procedures document is finished and approved.
- The **Chair** provided highlights on membership:
 - **Glennan**, long-time CC:DA member and former chair of the RSC, has agreed to be the chair-elect / vice chair, with her term starting after ALA Annual in the summer of 2024.
 - Procedures for appointing the vice-chair / chair-elect are still being finalized by Core.
 - The **Chair** welcomed CC:DA’s interns, **Cotter** and **Bradford**.
 - **Mendenhall** was appointed as the CC:DA liaison to the ALA Romanization

Review Board.

- **Levine**, CC:DA's ALA Core Staff Liaison is retiring. **Amber Robbin** will continue as CC:DA's ALA Core Staff Liaison.
- The **Chair** expressed that she will be contacting members of CC:DA who are at the end of their first term to see if they wish to continue to volunteer for a second term. The aim is to get a sense of how many open voting member slots there will be for 2024-2025.
- The **Chair** expressed that she will be contacting liaisons about reappointments through their nominating organizations or new appointments as necessary. The **Chair** reiterated that it is especially important that CC:DA has a full complement of liaisons and representatives after many liaisons and representatives lost touch during COVID.

1610. Report of the CC:DA webmaster: Guajardo

Guajardo reported that he has been working with the Documents Online Repository Task Force and that the task force will present their report later on in the meeting.

1611. Report from the PCC Representative: Young [[PCC Liaison Report for CC:DA, virtual Midwinter Meeting, February, 2024](#)]

The full report is online at

<https://connect.ala.org/core/viewdocument/pcc-liaison-report-midwinter-2024-1?CommunityKey=289a372f-3ec1-4cb0-8a75-902a1a18deb3&tab=librarydocuments>. **Young** addressed highlights

of the report of interest to this committee.

- The PCC Policy Committee Annual Meeting was held at the Library of Congress from November 2nd-3rd, 2023. The full meeting agenda with links to available background documents can be found on the [Outcomes Document](#).
- Upcoming PCC Events, including the PCC Participants' Meeting (Virtual) on February 15 and the PCC Operations Committee Meeting on May 2-3, can be found on the [PCC Calendar Website](#).
- The [PCC RDA Communications Committee](#) has been set up as one of the primary mechanisms for communication between PCC members and standards creators on issues dealing with RDA and its surrounding documentation. PCC invites all to participate and to submit feedback through the [RDA Communications Committee Feedback Form](#).
- The PCC Policy Committee has decided that the PCC will have a rolling implementation from May 1, 2024 to April 30, 2027 to allow institutions to transition to the official RDA toolkit when they are ready before the removal of the original RDA Toolkit.
- [The Steering Committee for Standards Policy Recommendations on Non-Latin Script Cross-Reference Special Coding Practice in the LC/NACO Name Authority File](#) was revised and approved by PoCo on August 9th. The PoCo has decided to delay implementation of the new Non-Latin reference practice, and to defer publishing the proposed revisions to the DCM Z1 and other documentation.
- Survey on the Purpose of the PCC OpCo (annual Operations Committee) Meeting was sent to the PCC community on July 6th and closed on August 21st. Survey results will be

shared in the fall.

- The PCC Task Group to Test the Official RDA Toolkit was charged to conduct a thorough test of the Official RDA Toolkit to ensure PCC catalogers can use the toolkit, related LC-PCC PSs and MGDs to accurately catalog materials in both MARC and BIBFRAME. More can be found in the [PCC RDA Test Documentation & Training Google Drive Folder](#).
- The charge for the [PCC Advisory Committee on Equity, Diversity, Inclusion, Belonging, and Accessibility \(EDIBA\)](#) was accepted.
- The charge for the [PCC RDA Implementation Task Group](#) was accepted. This task group is charged with developing a plan that outlines what implementation will mean for PCC members.
- The charge for the [PCC Consultation Group for Library Systems and Vendors](#) was accepted.
- Quarterly updates were sent to the PCCLIST in August 2023 and November/December 2023.
- There is a [public tracking spreadsheet](#) for determining the latest status of proposed changes to LC-PCC PSs and MGDs as well as responses to questions.
- The [PCC Task Group to Test the Official RDA Toolkit](#) issued its [Final Report](#), which summarizes the most frequently cited or most significant problems from the test and provides general recommendations.
- The Standing Committee on Applications (SCA), chaired by **TJ Kao**, issued the charge for [PCC Consultation Group for Library Systems and Vendors](#) and created an [experimental GitHub space](#).
- The Standing Committee on Standards (SCS), co-chaired by **Matthew Haugen** and **Honor Moody**, finalized the proposal for [Provider-Neutral E-Resources](#), revisited [Allowing the Use of RDA Relationship Designators](#) from Appendix K 4.3 (Relationship Designators to Relate Corporate Bodies to other Corporate Bodies) with Place Names (previously written by Adam Schiff), commented on [Draft BSR for Official RDA](#), and solicited comments for the following discussion papers: [Addition of Relationship Subfields in Fields 647 and 648 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format](#) and [Adding Subfields \\$0 and \\$1 to Fields 506 and 540 in the MARC 21 Bibliographic Format](#).
- The Standing Committee on Training (SCT), co-chaired by May Chan and Jeanette Norris, released the report of the [SCT Task Group on Linked Data Training](#).

Glennan noted that a couple of the links under SCS went to Google Documents that she did not have permission to view. She assumed that it was intentional and that the documents were working drafts for SCS rather than for public consumption, but she advised either taking out the hotlinks or preparing to field numerous requests for access.

1612. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Polutta [[ALA/Core Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access, January 2024, Library of Congress Report](#)]

The full report is online at

<https://connect.ala.org/core/viewdocument/lc-report-midwinter-2024-1?CommunityKey=289a372f-3ec1-4cb0-8a75-902a1a18deb3&tab=librarydocuments>. **Polutta** addressed highlights of the

report of interest to this committee.

- *Staffing changes:*
 - **Ava Brillat** was hired as a Senior Instructor at the PTCP.
 - **Paul Frank** is working 90% on LCAP as Change Management Lead and therefore not able to work on cataloging matters. **Tricia Mackenzie** is taking over NACO. **Heidy Bertoud** is now in charge of SACO.
- The Descriptive Cataloging Manual continues to be updated for authority work. Other updates relate to internal LC Documentation and therefore were not included here.
- After the July meeting, *Cataloger's Desktop* ceased to be offered, and the new subscription service, *Classification Web Plus*, became available starting August 1, 2023. It offers a searchable interface that will search all of the items hosted on the Library of Congress website. Continuous improvements have been made and are continuing to be made to the search interface. PTCP is no longer constrained by the *Cataloger's Desktop* quarterly update publishing schedule, and, as such, they are making documentation updates on a regular basis. A new web page on the LC website was created for summaries of [Updates to Documentation](#) over time.
- CIP work continued as normal, and they continue to catalog an enormous number of resources (over 143,000 print and e-books).
- The Romanization tables that are out for community input are: the Odia Romanization table and the Sindhi Romanization table.
- **Polutta** noted that both BIBFRAME and LCAP are works in progress. Many meetings are being held discussing how LC wants them to appear, and LC is working on what will be implemented on day one and what will be implemented later. **Polutta** shared that LC does not yet have finished statements about how BIBFRAME will be implemented in Folio or when that will happen. She directed members to the written report for further details.
- *Regarding RDA and the related documentation:*
 - PTCP has been dealing internally with the report and consequences of the taskforce to test documentation of the policy statements and the MGDs.
 - Due to the results of the report, the PTCP made quite a few changes to policy statements in almost all of the entities and most especially in the MGDs. Just in the past day, some of these changes will have shown up in the RDA toolkit. As manifestation elements require the most changes, the PTCP is still working on these changes and thus they have not yet been updated.
 - Several policy questions about whether certain elements will be actually implemented remain, one of which has been sent to the SCS. Once a decision is issued, the impact on documentation will follow.
 - Further updates to the policy statements (regarding adding and updating links to MGDs) will follow once the MGDs are revised.
 - Another aspect of ongoing work is in regards to policy statements that are “boilerplate,” i.e., they are repeated in a lot of different places. The PTCP has been discussing how to word them such that, when changed, the policy statements made sense in all of the different places that they applied. **Polutta** noted that PTCP hopes to implement these changes by early March.
 - Analysis of MGDs based on the report continues, and the PTCP hopes to treat this as a subproject in the near future, as they are larger documents that will take

greater time and effort.

- There are MDGs related to string encoding schemes, i.e., punctuation, normalization, etc., that are in development to replace the data currently in the community resources of the RDA toolkit. As these get updated, the PTCP will add links to policy statements in quite a few places.
- *Controlled vocabularies and classification:*
 - *LCSH:*
 - LC has continued to do quite a few special lists in the last six months.
 - The two biggest lists were the change of “Mormon” to “Latter Day Saint” and “Gays” to “Gay people.”
 - A smaller list that is almost complete is the change of “Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder” to “Attention-deficit disorder.” This was a small number of headings, but a more complex change since it involved the recognition that ADHD applies to adults as much as to children.
 - A current tentative list that is out for comment is one that is looking at cross-references that use form subdivisions and removing those so that they could actually be used as separate headings.
 - Future projects with special lists include: “Deaf” and “Hard of hearing people” put forth by the medical funnel; “Mughal Empire” headings impacted by the change of the NAR; “Multiracial” to replace “Racially mixed”; and “Berbers” to “Amazigh.”
 - The project for removing form subdivisions is still ongoing, however, the timeline is uncertain.
 - *Classification:*
 - LC has added the diacritic for Māori done programmatically in all locations in the schedule.
 - There is a new classification schedule for Ukraine, previously all in DK508 and now replaced by span DK5001-DK5995.
 - The next stage of the project to revise all countries under the “Former Soviet republics” section of DK classification will be Kyivan Rus and the Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania)
 - An LCGFT Advisory Group was officially formed and their first meeting took place in July 2023 and continues on a monthly basis.
 - The list process for LCGFT is officially split from the general LCSH/LCC process in July. Summary of Decisions and tentative/approved list announcements are issued separately.
 - As a consequence of the approval of the genre “Manga ” in LCGFT, several sub genres of Manga have been proposed and approved.
 - In addition, the “Anime (Motion pictures)” and “Anime (Television programs)” are now available for use.
 - LDGCT and LCMPT have had no significant changes over the past six months.
 - CYAC continues to examine automatically loaded headings and propose new headings to fill in hierarchy gaps as a result of that work. They also continue to produce new documentation.

James asked about the change from “Mormons” to “Latter Day Saints” in LCSH. She asked why the term is being done with a capital L and capital D with no hyphen, since the Church of Latter-day Saints prefers Latter-day hyphenated and the day lowercase. She noted that she looked in the 670s and that it is not justified except as a reference.

Maxwell answered that the term does not apply only to the Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter-day Saints. It applies to all the related denominations, and they did a check which revealed that the form most used was the form with capital L and D and no hyphen.

Polutta added that that particular question was one of the questions they had when the initial proposal to change it was made because all of the citations were specifically to the Utah-based denomination. LC did their best to reach out to multiple Mormon denominations. The term refers broadly to Mormon denominations and not only to the Utah-based denomination.

Maxwell said that while people can argue about whether it was the correct decision, the decision was based on usage.

The **Chair** asked whether LCSH is getting rid of the term “Deaf,” as she felt the Deaf community would be extremely upset about that.

Polutta clarified that “Deaf” and “Hard of hearing” are not the same thing. **Polutta** believes that it is primarily a change from “Deaf” to “Deaf people” and “Hearing impaired” to “Hard of hearing people.”

The **Chair** asked about application profiles, wanting to know whether application profiles were still in the works and whether LC is looking at doing it/them only through policy statements. The **Chair** noted that RBMS has taken DCRM(B) and created DCRMR, sort of an RDA friendly version of DMRCb that she thinks is very useful, asking whether LC is planning to do something like this.

Polutta answered that this is actually an LC-PCC question. LC itself has tried to tackle this itself, however workload issues have gotten in the way. Policy statements have been their priority. However, PCC has a Metadata Application Profile Task Force in action, and **Polutta** said perhaps they can be the ones to do it.

Honor Moody, Metadata Creation Manager at Harvard Library and current Co-Chair of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards, shared that there is an existing metadata application profile for the BIBCO standard record and that the [PCC Working Group on Metadata Application Profiles](#) task force was charged with updating that for RDA. The SCS has just completed its review of the task force’s draft and will be sending it back to the chairs, **TJ Kao** and **Nancy Lorimer**. She noted the inability to use the toolkit without a metadata application profile.

The **Chair** said that the Music Library Association has also issued a helpful document and that sometimes when she is cataloging, she will look at the DCRM and at what the Music Library

Association says for directions that are more easily understandable. She said that something like that for regular cataloging would be incredibly helpful. She recognized that this task is complex enough such that it seems like it would need to be someone's only job for a period of time.

1613. CC:DA Documents Online Repository Task Force (DOR TF): Guajardo [\[CC:DA/TF/Digital Online Repository/3\]](#)

The full report is online at

<https://connect.ala.org/core/viewdocument/documents-online-repository-task-fo-1?CommunityKey=289a372f-3ec1-4cb0-8a75-902a1a18deb3&tab=librarydocuments>. **Guajardo** addressed highlights of the report.

- The Task Force has been working since mid-fall 2023 on the charge of identifying a permanent online repository for CC:DA documents, recommending a retention cycle for CC:DA documents, developing best practices related to CC:DA documents, migrating and organizing the documents as appropriate to the platform chosen, and locating as many of the historical CC:DA documents as possible.
- Primary source is the [CC:DA blog](#) (hosted on an ALCTS web domain to be retired), which was active between 2014 and around the pandemic.
- Two chief sources of discovery are the Internet Archive for retrieving documents from [the CC:DA Wiki](#) of 2011 through 2014 and [an institutional website maintained by John Attig](#) representing documents from 2003 to 2013. Other earlier documents have also been found.
- To date, the Task Force has about 1,000 plus numbered documents. Some can only be found on only one of the previously mentioned sources.
- Task Force members have inventoried these documents in spreadsheets.
- *Repository*: The Task Force has looked at a number of options that have been suggested by Core staff, the Core Web Committee, and others.
 - *ALA Connect*:
 - We are currently using this to post documents including our agenda under the “Library” tab.
 - The Task Force looked at the possibility of ALA Connect being a repository for all of our documents.
 - Shortfalls:
 - Searching is rudimentary and often yields too many results.
 - At peak use times, documents are slow to retrieve.
 - *ALA Institutional Repository (ALAIR)*:
 - [Core's Metadata and Collection Section](#) has a document repository on ALAIR, and, among other documents, SAC documents have been posted there.
 - Searching is more precise than ALA Connect.
 - *ALA LibGuides*:
 - The Task Force does not think that this is the best place for a repository of documents.
 - It was unclear if it would be possible to be done and how it would be done as well as whether it would be possible to extract the files and the metadata

associated with them.

- The big question is whether they can move the documents and also the metadata associated with the documents, which includes comments on the blog, such as when there would be a discussion among committee members before an action on a particular proposal. **Guajardo** noted that for some reason the comments on the blog were hidden at some point, but he says he assumes the comments are there and they would just need to be made visible to extract them.
- The Task Force has relied on CC:DA's document numbering convention as a way to organize archived documents. Based on the numbering, there are several broad categories of documents:
 - Agendas
 - Meeting Minutes
 - Chair documents
 - Webmaster documents
 - Procedural documents
 - Documents from representatives and liaisons from various groups and organizations
- The Task Force is recommending that CC:DA does not archive several items:
 - CC:DA annual committee rosters
 - Earlier versions of revised agendas
 - Draft minutes
 - Earlier versions of documents that were reissued with only minor corrections
 - CC:DA's activity reports to a higher body, such as CAMS
 - Meeting room requests for in-person meetings
- The Task Force recommends that CC:DA archives CC:DA documents in the ALAIR. CC:DA would work with Core and ALA representatives to determine how to provide the best quality metadata with the least amount of effort given the volume of documents that are to be submitted. The Task Force is awaiting a response from the Core Web Committee about how the ALAIR might be able to handle a large volume of documents. The Task Force currently is lacking the technical details of how a move to the ALAIR would be accomplished.
- The Task Force proposes that CC:DA submits documents to the ALAIR at least twice a year, after each of CC:DA's semi-annual meetings.

Guajardo brought up questions the Task Force still does not have answered about how they would move forward:

1. Is it worthwhile to archive blog or Wiki discussions which led to official CC:DA documents?
 - a. Only members could post, however, members could post on behalf of someone else.
 - b. They are not visible right now on the blog, although at one point they were visible. The comments have been captured by the Internet Archive.
2. How should the contact information relating to Task Force rosters be managed?
 - a. Rosters include the name of the person, their specific job title, their full institutional mailing address, their telephone number, their fax number, and their

email address. For example see <https://alcts.ala.org/ccdablog/?p=2603>.

- b. When archiving information, how useful is this information given that this information has probably changed several times over, even over a short period of time? Is it useful to archive this information in regards to concern for privacy (of personal email addresses, etc.)?
3. Are there categories of documents in addition to what the Task Force has already identified that should not be archived?
4. Who is responsible for maintaining the CC:DA document numbering?
 - a. In some cases, it has been the Chair. In other cases, it is the Webmaster trying to follow an established pattern. In yet other cases, it has been the person submitting the document.
 - b. Do we have the procedures for this written down anywhere? The Task Force has not found one yet; if anyone is aware of said procedures, **Guajardo** requests that they contact the Task Force. If one does not exist, CC:DA may have to create one.
 - c. How do we deal with documents that have an incorrect document number? Should we retroactively apply the standard numbering pattern to the more recent documents that did not follow the pattern or do not have a number at all?
5. [Out of purview, however...] Does CC:DA want to create a new blog under the Core domain? If so, how would it be used in regard or in relation to ALA Connect Spaces?

Guajardo reiterated that the Task Force is still awaiting answers on outstanding questions posed to the ALA Web Committee and is still currently lacking the technical details of how a move to ALAIR would be accomplished. Finally, he asked whether there is a way to port a WordPress site to an institutional repository, which is something that he hopes the Web Committee will answer.

Guajardo and the Task Force posed the questions to the group in the ten minutes that were available at that time. The **Chair** noted that time to continue this discussion was also set aside for the meeting on Monday.

1. Is it worthwhile to archive blog or Wiki discussions which led to official CC:DA documents?

Maxwell said that it is important, because it is a record of how decisions were made. He frequently asks himself or is asked “why is that rule that way?” and it is helpful to know what people were saying when the decisions were made. If it is a possibility, it is a good idea to save that.

Myers echoed what **Maxwell** said. He notes that there is a tradition for CC:DA meeting minutes to go into (some would say excruciating) detail well above any standard parliamentary procedure guide would instruct, and the purpose of that was to record the thought process of the committee and to ensure that the JSC and then the RSC representative could point back to the foundation of where the position came from and how the committee wrestled with the issue at hand.

James recalled using that site with the comments back when it was visible. She said that she feels that it is an important part of CC:DA’s history and the development of RDA history, so if that

information can be captured, that would be important, but she also acknowledged that it might not be possible, so if it had to go, it would be okay.

The **Chair** said that she has had to go back to piece stuff together because of the gap because of COVID. She has been looking back at old agendas and documents to reorient herself with what CC:DA has done and where it is now. Therefore, she thinks that it would be nice to have the discussions saved. The **Chair** also said that it would be nice, from sort of a parliamentary procedure perspective, to get discussions out of the meeting minutes and into discussion transcripts or something that can be linked, so that this type of nitty gritty detail is not in the meeting minutes itself. Right now, even for in-person meetings, groups can record meetings to a transcript so that somebody does not have to type it all out, but the group can still have a written record in a PDF or something. Storage may have been an issue 10 or 15 years ago, but now storage is relatively cheap for things like a PDF document that do not take up much computing space. The **Chair** said that it is nice not only to have a record of why decisions were made, but also the problems that were brought up. So that sometimes when we ask why they did not do it a certain way, there may be documentation that points to the fact that they thought of that, but did not pursue it for x, y, or z reason or ran into x, y, or z problem. This helps people in the present not have to reinvent the wheel all over again or run into the same problems over and over again.

Kalan Knudson Davis wrote in the chat that with DCRM, such conversations take place as GitHub issues. Very often it is not the decision or cataloging instruction but preserving the discussion that went into creating it that is most important, so that we can understand why it was created in the first place.

The **Chair** reiterated that this is of course with the caveat that if the comments are gone, then the Task Force cannot retrieve them.

Glennan posed a question that she said they do not need an answer to now, however, she wanted to run it by the group. The Task Force's current proposal is based on documents since it was charged to capture documents. Wiki discussions are not exactly documents, and so she asked for thoughts on how to best capture, arrange, and provide access to what was essentially a living comment page at the time.

The **Chair** added that this will be an ongoing problem as CC:DA is meeting virtually through most of the year and operating using the ALA Connect Page (although that is somewhat backed-up), so she thinks that the discussion on "documents" refers to "documentation" in the loosest sense of the word, more like "documentation" than "documents."

The **Chair** tabled discussion of the rest of the questions until Monday during the free-period time.

1614. Discussion of IFLA ISBD for Manifestation Review Call: Glennan [\[ISBD for Manifestation - Summary of Current Status\]](#)

Glennan reported on highlights of a CC:DA Public Connect Space post she made on January

16th, 2024 regarding ISBD for Manifestation.

- In November 2019, a task force was formed to take ISBD into the linked data environment and to align ISBD with LRM.
- For now, it is restricted to the manifestation level, although there are longer range plans to expand beyond the manifestation level.
- The Task Force produced a new ISBD for Manifestation, that is, ISBDM.
- The Task Force held a [two-hour webinar](#) about a year-ago on ISBDM and has since implemented a [comprehensive review process](#) on [the first draft of ISBDM](#).
- ISBDM will not be a print product; it is envisioned only as an online product.
- The most recent [IFLA Standards Newsletter](#) has a specific article about the development of ISBDM for more background.
- CC:DA will have an opportunity to comment on IFLA ISBD for Manifestation during IFLA world-wide review, however, the review will be driven by IFLA's schedules and tends to be tight on turnaround.

Glennan stated that she believes it is appropriate for CC:DA to respond and that CC:DA should prepare to be ready when world-wide review opens.

The **Chair** asked about possibly charging a task force or at least having a task force ready to charge for when review opens so that CC:DA has members working on it. The **Chair** noted that it might be helpful to charge a task force now so that they can read and become familiar with the documentation.

The **Chair** took a straw poll on whether the ISBDM Review should be something CC:DA should be involved in and, if so, whether CC:DA should form a task force to review it, make recommendations to CC:DA, engender discussion, and then prepare an official response to submit to IFLA. Public opinion seemed to support CC:DA's involvement, and no one raised objections.

The **Chair** noted the importance of standardizing the layout of records, especially in a digital environment. When working with scripts one is not familiar with, the fact that things are laid out in a certain expected order helps in identifying different elements, such as the title.

Maxwell suggested putting a task force together right away because from what he has heard, comments will be asked for before CC:DA's next meeting.

The **Chair** said that the first webinar for all interested colleagues is planned for April 25, 2024, which is before CC:DA's next meeting.

The **Chair** invited a motion to form a task force to study and respond to the ISBDM. Motion to form a task force to participate in and provide a response to the IFLA ISBDM world-wide review moved by **Glennan**; seconded by **Pettitt**. Motion carried unanimously.

The **Chair** then called upon volunteers for the newly formed task force to express their interest as soon as possible so that the committee can be charged and start moving forward.

1615. Work and plans for CC:DA: Chair

The **Chair** reported on the work and plans for CC:DA for the next six months.

Membership terms:

- The membership terms of some CC:DA members are ending, therefore, members need to re-volunteer or CC:DA needs to find replacements.
- Voting members have two terms before they are term-limited out. Interns are yearly, so they will need to re-volunteer for the position through Core. Members are appointed not by CC:DA but by Core.
- **Amanda Ros** is rotating off of CC:DA as the past **Chair**, **Sprochi** will become the past **Chair**, and **Glennan** is the incoming **Chair**.
- A vice-chair should be selected from the CC:DA voting members.
- The Vice Chair / Chair-elect, Chair, and Past Chair structure, with the chair only serving one year, is recommended by Core to all of its standing committees. One reason that Core has adopted this model is to prevent leadership vacuums that occurred during COVID.
- On the question of how term-limits are affected by becoming Chair, the **Chair** reported that once a member is done being Chair, the member can return to be a voting member for the rest of their term. Someone can be a liaison and a voting member at the same time, too.
- Some liaisons are also coming to the end of their terms. For members who are liaisons to organizations outside of ALA, CC:DA will have to talk to their organizational executive committees to follow their procedures for re-nomination. For organizations without procedures, the **Chair** said that these members will probably have to go through the ALA process too.
- The **Chair** will be emailing members and liaisons whose terms are ending to inquire about reappointment
- The **Chair** reminded everyone that discussion posts, documents, soliciting of feedback, and responding to proposals should be posted to the CC:DA Public Connect Space, because CC:DA is an open committee. Any posts or documents can also simultaneously be posted to the separate committee-specific space. The CC:DA specific Connect Space is intended for in-house housekeeping details. The **Chair** asked everyone to ensure they are subscribed to both the Public Connect Space and the Committee Connect Space. Members must subscribe themselves to the Public Connect Space.
- *On responding to proposals:*
 - The **Chair** foresees that in the next year, there will be many more proposals to respond to, what she sees as the traditional business of CC:DA.
 - Often, there is a short turnaround time between when CC:DA is asked and when NARDAC needs a response, which is not ideal. However, NARDAC wants a coherent response paper from CC:DA, and CC:DA is intended to be the voice of ALA. The **Chair** asks all members to be actively engaged with this process. Hearing an affirmative response is preferred over having to assume that no answer means no objections.

- Regarding the RSC, the RSC's timeline and CC:DA's timeline are not synced, meaning that their call for responses will often happen when CC:DA will not be meeting for quite a while. Therefore, in many cases, CC:DA may not be able to discuss RSC proposals at a semi-annual meeting and a lot of communication will have to be on ALA Connect. The **Chair** may put out a call for volunteers to collate discussion points into a response paper. The **Chair** expressed intent to spread this work out so that it does not fall on one person. The **Chair** is open to suggestions on how to best go about doing so.
- **Myers** mentioned that this is actually a historical dynamic that had been going on even when it was the JSC. The main JSC meeting was in November and papers would usually be issued in the summer. CC:DA would conduct preliminary discussions at ALA annual, but the commenting period in July and August took place over the pre-ALA Connect CC:DA email list, which would then be condensed into a response in September to be submitted in October for the November meeting.
- **Maxwell** reminded everybody that it is no longer the case that proposals come in the fall; rather, they can come at any time of the year. Whereas previously CC:DA had the luxury of the full summer to respond to proposals, this is no longer the case because proposals can be discussed at any of the quarterly meetings. As the representative, **Maxwell** is committed to getting it to CC:DA instantly with the hope of at least a week or two to respond, but there will not be months like there was in the past.
- **Maxwell** said the proposals so far have been relatively simple since the end of 3R, but there are more coming, including one relatively complicated one on the extent statement.
- *On generating proposals:*
 - 3R is officially "over," and proposals are now being accepted by the RSC. The community is waiting on guidance from LC regarding application profiles and other matters. The **Chair** expressed wanting to see CC:DA return to generating proposals, which would mean liaisons will be asked to solicit feedback from their groups and bring issues back to CC:DA.
 - **Polutta** mentioned that the PCC Task Group to Test the Official RDA Toolkit produced a spreadsheet with changes to the RDA text which they sent to NARDAC, however, it is not NARDAC's job to produce proposals, rather it is NARDAC's job to work with groups on proposals. Considering the fact that they identified things that do probably need proposals to be produced in order to change the text, this might be a place for CC:DA to consider and possibly work cooperatively with the PCC on that.
 - **Maxwell** said that CC:DA is not the only North American group that can make proposals.
 - The **Chair** said that she was thinking in particular of CC:DA as a group with many liaisons, and because people may be sometimes reluctant to make a proposal or unsure of procedure, CC:DA can be a kind of conduit for that if it is helpful.

- **Glennan** pointed out that past practice has been that any group that is represented on CC:DA has their proposals go through CC:DA and they would be put forward as ALA policy. When NARDAC was created, there was no intent to change that. Part of that gives the proposing groups the background and experience that CC:DA can bring to vetting a proposal and ensuring that it conforms with what is expected. **Glennan** said that all of the Music Library Association proposals and PCC proposals that went forward during her time as ALA rep came through CC:DA.
 - **Maxwell** commented that the RSC has made no declaration that proposals have to come through CC:DA. NARDAC, for its part, did send the most recent spreadsheet back to the PCC asking it to make proposals, so NARDAC would accept proposals directly from PCC if they wanted to make them, but they are also fine with them coming through CC:DA.
 - The **Chair** said that CC:DA is happy to have proposals generated with CC:DA as a committee or have them come through CC:DA from other places if that is necessary. Mostly, she wanted to make the point that CC:DA can generate proposals as a committee or its constituencies can bring proposals through CC:DA if they choose to do so as well.
 - **Myers** said this discussion is helpful, as the last document the Procedures Task Force has to work on is the proposal process, so he is glad to hear there is a need for clarity around these dynamics. The Task Force will reach out to stakeholders and knowledge bases to document and provide clarity.
- **Glennan** said that there are a variety of ways that the RSC gets proposals. What is most important from the RSC perspective is that by the time the proposals reach the RSC, they are properly formed and applied to RDA and not some interpretive policy of RDA. She reiterated **Maxwell's** point that by design, the RSC accepts proposals at any time, and according to the documentation, a proposal will not necessarily be discussed at the next meeting. Rather, when it will be discussed is up to the Chair and the Secretary.
- **Glennan** emphasized that CC:DA should be paying very close attention to the developments of this AUQ model in relation to extent. She expects it to be intensive and extensive, as the previous ALA discussion paper was well over 100 pages. If CC:DA thinks it does not have enough time, it should appeal to **Maxwell** as the representative and ask for more time. However, **Glennan** hopes that the RSC will recognize that something this complex will need more time to begin with.
- *On CC:DA Task Forces:*
 - CC:DA has heard from the Documents Online Repository Task Force and it will hear from the Procedures Task Force on Monday.

- The **Chair** asked for clarification on what people should do if they come across a document that they want to refer to the Task Force, and **Guajardo** said maybe they will set up a Google Docs or a Dropbox or something, so the **Chair** said stay tuned for more on this. The **Chair** asked everyone to keep any CC:DA documents that they come across until CC:DA figures out whether the documents need to be saved.
- The Personal Names Task Force has been working since September, and they will present a report on Monday. **Maxwell** and **Schiff** said NARDAC does not have a timeline on when they need to hear back on this.
- The Procedures Task Force is still working because things are in flux. The **Chair** hopes that CC:DA will be able to vote to send procedures involving Core up to them, since they have to be approved at the executive level, and that CC:DA can move forward with wrapping up the work for this Task Force.
- The **Chair** expressed intent to look into forming a new Task Force to create a welcome package for new representatives and voting members. She welcomed feedback on what members would have liked to have known when they first joined and what they would have liked to have seen in a handbook meant to facilitate understanding of the committee's work. However, this is awaiting the finalization of the procedures document. The **Chair** also expressed interest in creating a Chairs' handbook on rules of order, meeting timings and requirements, how to set things up with ALA, report due dates, etc.
- The Task Force on ISBD for Manifestation has been formed and is looking for volunteers.
- *On RSC Updates:* The **Chair** went to the RSC Public Meeting the week before.
 - CC:DA had sent out a survey on the RSC's behalf through NARDAC on soft deprecation of some elements thought to be redundant or needing rewording or consolidation. They were talking about actually having a hard deprecation, but they have decided to postpone that for a future date, since they found out through the poll that many people did not realize those elements were being deprecated or were still heavily using them. Therefore, users can still use these elements, but there is a suggested upgraded term that is encouraged. The **Chair** reminded everyone to respond to these kinds of polls, because these polls do affect what the RSC decides.
 - The RSC decided that the countdown clock for the implementation of the Official RDA Toolkit is going to commence in May 2026 and that the Original RDA Toolkit will be completely removed in May of 2027. CC:DA and the wider community are looking at a couple of years to get up to speed with being able to handle the Official RDA Toolkit.
 - The **Chair** said someone asked whether the Original Toolkit was going to disappear. The Original Toolkit will not be in the Toolkit itself, but the old instructions will be in PDF files that will be available through the instruction archive. Users will be able to access the old instructions, but they will not be a formal part or linked into the Official RDA Toolkit.
 - If users want a Xerox copy or digital copy, it would be best to make one now

- **Elisa Sze**, the Education and Orientation Officer for the RSC, has been putting out a lot of information on how to use the Toolkit for those using it and for those using it to teach cataloging. There is a webinar called [Teaching RDA in the LIS Classroom](#) on the RDA YouTube channel. All of these materials can be found in the [RSC Annual Report](#).
- *On ALA Annual:*
 - CC:DA has been asked by NARDAC to sponsor and hold a pre-conference session, most likely on RDA, at ALA Annual in June.
 - The **Chair** encouraged all to participate in the discussion on ideas for this pre-conference session on CC:DA's Connect.
 - **Maxwell** said that the RDA Board is meeting in San Diego right before ALA Annual. NARDAC thought they could do something with them, so in the morning [of Friday, June 28th] there will be a pre-conference session in which the Board members will be discussing RDA around the world. **Maxwell** encouraged everyone to participate in this. He also expressed his hopes that CC:DA will want to participate with NARDAC on something, possibly more practical for the Friday afternoon session.
 - The **Chair** concurred that a pre-conference practical training session on the Official RDA Toolkit would be very well-attended given trepidation about its adoption and usage.
 - The **Chair** reminded all that the next CC:DA meeting will take place in person in San Diego at the end of June at ALA Annual.
 - Right now, ALA does not have the capacity to do hybrid meetings.
 - The **Chair** is trying to think of a way to virtually include people who cannot be there in person. She welcomes ideas from anyone who may have them.
 - **Grant** asked if CC:DA knows what time the meeting will take place. The **Chair** sent an email to Jenny, but she has not heard back yet. Historically, the meetings have taken place on Saturday afternoons and Monday mornings for about three hours each session. The **Chair** said she will try to maintain these times so that attendees who want to leave on Monday can do so. However, she cannot promise that these slots are guaranteed.
 - There is also the issue of "the intern bag," which has microphones and other equipment inside. It is very heavy, and the **Chair** is reluctant to make someone bring it due to weight restrictions and fees for bags on airlines and also doubt about how useful any of the equipment even is in this day and age.
- The **Chair** opened the floor for questions, of which there were none. She reminded everyone of the second half of the meeting to take place on Monday, February 5th at 11 AM CST.

The **Chair** recessed the meeting at 3:48 PM CST.

Monday, February 5, 2024

12:00 p.m.-3:00 p.m. EST / 11:00 a.m.- 2:00 p.m. CST / 10:00 am-1:00 p.m. MST / 9:00

a.m.-12:00 p.m. PST

Online

1616. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

The **Chair** called the meeting to order at **11:01 am CST** and welcomed voting members, liaisons, representatives, and audience members.

1617. Introduction of members, liaisons, and representatives: Group

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

1618. Report from the NARDAC Representatives: Maxwell and Schiff [[CC:DA/NARDAC Reps/2024/1](#)]

Schiff went through the NARDAC report, responses and decisions

November Fall Update Forum available on the NARDAC YouTube channel [[Link](#)] with presentations from the RSC Working Groups, the Chair of RSC, and the Chair of NARDAC.

NARDAC participated in MGD string encoding scheme drafts for various entities. Reviewed spreadsheet of feedback for PCC test and identified next steps. NARDAC had a discussion of whether there is enough representation from North American French speaking communities and suggested a reach-out to those communities, as well as adding a representative from the National Library of Greenland. Finally, there is planning for ALA Annual, and there is discussion of having a pre-conference outreach event with members of the RDA Board, also meeting in San Diego just before Annual. Also reaching out to CC:DA to co-sponsor/co-organize a Friday ½ day event.

Maxwell reviewed the makeup of the [NARDAC Committee](#) and [Regional Representatives](#) of the RSC. The October meeting was held in Vienna with a training event, co-sponsored with RSC: “RDA: Think globally, act locally”, which featured information about RDA implementation in Europe.

Since the last CC:DA meeting, there have been two more RDA Toolkit releases in July and September, which included look and feel enhancements to the website and a new alternative guidance menu. The French translation of RDA has been added to the website.

Maxwell briefly talked about the approved proposals:

- PlacesWG/23/1
- LanguagesWG/23/1

- PlacesWG/23/2
- ReligionsWG/23/1
- ReligionsWG/23/2

Maxwell discussed the establishment of an Examples Working Group. Current Working Groups continue to consider revisions in RDA in their particular areas. There will be a forthcoming set of proposals from the Extent Working Group on how Extent is recorded in RDA. **Maxwell** hopes that CC:DA is given more time to evaluate the proposals than in the past, due to their detail and complexity.

There were no questions for the NARDAC representatives.

The **Chair** reiterated **Maxwell** saying that there may be some positions open on RSC Task Forces and urged members to contact the individual chairs, if they want to get involved.

1619. Report of the MAC Representative: Myers [[CC:DA/MAC Liaison/2024/1](#)]

Myers reviewed the executive summary of the MAC report and presented highlights from MAC's meetings related to the proposals and five discussion papers listed below and highlighted:

- [2024-DP04](#) - add URI subfields to the 506 and 540 fields.
- [2024-DP02](#) - to explore mechanisms to address historical language, including transcribed elements, basically for non-book formats where the title is quasi-supplied by someone other than the cataloger. Most of the discussion at MAC surrounded questions on implementing the proposed solutions and other solutions brought up during discussion. It will return as another discussion paper that will further explore more options.

During the Q&A:

Maxwell asked with the recent proliferation of adding \$7 to MARC fields, is there a general thought that this will end up in all the fields? **Myers** responded that \$7 was approved for data provenance for all fields except where \$7 is already defined, such as in the 533. The specific alternatives to \$7 will be explored. To the degree LC/OCLC implements, are up to them.

Schiff noted that the proposal identified fields where it was needed, but not all fields.

Myers announced that this will be his penultimate year as CC:DA Liaison to MAC, expiring with ALA Annual 2025. Interested folks on CC:DA should reach out, if interested, to succeed John so they can shadow him and slot into place in 2025. The position is by appointment through Core. CC:DA has a seat on MAC. Individuals don't have membership in MAC, organizations do.

1620. Report from the OCLC Representative: James [[OCLC Report, Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access Winter Virtual Meeting, February 2024](#)]

James noted that this is her first report on OCLC activities to CC:DA. If the membership thinks there are things that are good to have in future reports, reach out.

The report did not include information regarding OCLC's proposals to MAC, because **Myers** would be discussing them in his report prior. Two proposals were approved and fast tracked for approval about adding \$1 and \$0 to Fields 082 and 083 for Dewey Decimal numbers ([2024-03](#)) and for adding \$5 to some linking entry fields ([2024-04](#)). There was a discussion paper to add \$5 to field 580 ([2024-DP01](#)).

OCLC has been adding things to WorldCat as a first step to moving more toward linked data. In December 2023, OCLC announced the addition of [WorldCat Entities](#) URIs for persons, places, and events to WorldCat records bibliographic records as \$1 links in fields 100, 600, 647, 651, and 700. There were some constraints on when they were added, so you will not see it added to every 100 and 600 fields.

The next phase was to add 758 fields to bibliographic records that added WorldCat Entity URIs for entity works in bibliographic records. Examples are provided in the report.

Example of 758 field, possibly \$i with relationship terms matching the language of cataloging. \$i is only being used for English and French bibs. The "has work" language = WorldCat entity Work (different from RDA definition).

FAST authority files in World Share and FAST in bibliographic records can be controlled only in Record Manager, not Connexion. They are controlled in Connexion behind the scenes, but not displayed.

OCLC webinars are free to attend and recordings are available afterwards.

James notes two separate programs being prepared for ALA Annual: a presentation on Transforming Metadata and the OCLC Cataloging Community Meeting.

[OCLC Community Center](#) launched last September, to login, use World Share credentials to access. Website has different discussion areas like a listserv. It is all self-contained on the website and has events on topics in those areas.

During the Q&A:

Schiff asked if catalogers are revising bibliographic records and changing access points, will the URIs be "regenerated" and **James** replied no, it depends on what is being changed. **Schiff** asked if the bibliographic record has an incorrect access point and **James** said there were no plans to repopulate. Subjects are more complicated. **Schiff**, then asked if the 245 was updated, such as adding a \$n or \$p, the 758 would not be the same anymore, since it no longer matches how the record had been revised. **James** responded that the 758s are still in progress and he could reach out separately.

Maxwell asked if this was a one-off project or will new bibliographic records have the 758s and **James** responded that the \$1 was a one-off project and another round of 758s are coming, but won't be an ongoing process. **Maxwell** stated he works on parallel records, such as provider

neutral records. Would it be okay to copy over the 700, including the \$1 information to the parallel record. **James** replied yes, as long as it was a 1:1 match and not a name-title.

1621. CC:DA Task Force on Personal Names in Official RDA: Pettit

Pettitt reiterated the Task Force's charge, especially regarding compound surnames. The Task Force was given broader charge to look at personal names, but the Task Force focused their attention on places where surnames and/or initials are dealt with under RDA Agent Entities and Person. There are three places in the RDA Toolkit where this came up:

- Agent
- Access point for agent
- Authorized access point for person

Pettitt discussed the Task Force's recommendations for conditions/options that currently exist, because they are dealt with slightly differently. They're looking to see if they can make a more coherent list of options for each of the conditions and catalogers going into each of the areas would not need different options based upon similar or exact same conditions. Keeping in mind, making this an international thing and not something pertinent only for North American libraries, but widely applicable outside of North America as well.

Hoping to apply options that already exist in the Toolkit more broadly, to these areas.

Hope to bring recommendations to the committee by Annual and then we can forward those to NARDAC.

Q&A: NONE

1622. CC:DA Procedures Task Force: Myers [[CC:DA Procedures Task Force Documents](#)]

The latest drafts were posted this morning. As mentioned in the post,

- Intern is being replaced with Associate Member and they will retain non-voting status.
- No substantial difference in the representation document.
- Minor editorial improvements to the International Standards document.

Feedback was sought in 2023 at the summer meetings and more recently on the Core CC:DA Public Space, which elicited some concerns around Vice-Chair, Chair, Past-Chair structure, with respect to the basic practicality of this approach for CC:DA:

- Who chairs the meeting if both the Chair and Vice-Chair are unable to do so?
- Variability of the voting status of the Past Chair, depending on the state of their existing eligibility under their term as a voting member.

Another question was raised as to what constitutes the CC:DA website, in light of our current

state of affairs.

Then the question was raised to the scope of constituency representation in the International Standards document.

Myers states he's not sure if we have good answers to these questions other than what has already been articulated in the documents. He acknowledges and echoes the concerns with the new leadership structure, which are valid concerns, but thinks the only way at this point to resolve them is to implement them and see how things play out or fall out or fail out.

Also:

- Given how the committee's roster is already articulated on ALA Connect, or already assumes that we have this structure.
- The website concern would be better addressed by our Webmaster or by the Online Documents Task Force.
- Feedback on more generalized language is welcome. Trying to avoid a CC:DA listserv to replace that with language along the lines of "electronic discussion platforms" and there might be more generalized terminology for the web page, notably the webmaster listed as is under responsible for the CC:DA web presence, rather than web page.
- Language in Paragraph 2 of the International Standards document about the committee makeup, supported by the Representation Document.

Proposals Document remains unaddressed and unresolved. Not yet in position to be finalized and acknowledges that CC:DA and the MARC representatives need a common understanding of roles, responsibilities, and workflows. The specifics, though perhaps indicated by the Friday discussion, seems to remain very much in flux and not entirely ready for codification. Best approach, right now, would be to have some sort of working document from which to base a future formalization.

The Task Force is down to three members. **Myers** advocates approval of the finalized docs and dissolving the Task Force and reorganizes a new group to deal with the future issues.

The **Chair** stated that these are our operating procedures and results need to be approved at the Core level.

Glennan recommended that in Contingency Planning, that a sentence be added to the Procedures Document (Section 2A.3) that voting members can decide who runs the meeting in the absence of the Chair or Vice-Chair.

In the past, **Myers** stated, that Core Executive steps in to name Interim Chair or offers options of what to do would be going ... down the rabbit hole to prevent committee members themselves naming an acting chair and in the online environment no one can call a meeting to order, where current members can actually act. Willing to consult with the Task Force Members to provide some sort of language.

Glennan suggested something along the lines that Voting Members will consult with Core about

how to proceed. Just so that we're not making stuff up as we go along. This is more likely to occur with an in-person meeting, say where people have traveled.

Chair stated that Core will want input. They want to be the appointers.

Maxwell commented that if both the Chair and Vice-Chair quit, resulting in a permanent vacancy, then Core needs to be involved, but if they are temporarily unavailable (an illness, travel issues, etc.), then the committee determines who temporarily runs the meeting.

Myers distinguished the difference between permanent vacancy in leadership versus a temporary one. The difference between an Acting Chair and Interim Chair, so an acting chair is basically would be someone covering the meeting in the absence of the Chair and Vice-Chair, as opposed an Interim Chair, which would be a permanent unavailability in either the Chair or Vice-Chair roles. The Task Force will look at adding language in the appropriate places.

In the case of an in-person meeting, with the loss of a Chair or Vice-Chair, it may be an instance of not having a presence of a quorum.

The **Chair** stated that in the absence of a quorum, you can have reports, but you couldn't vote on anything.

Myers thinks that officially, business cannot be conducted, however noted that there may be some flexibility, by having an informal session.

The **Chair** conducted a Straw Poll of the CC:DA Voting Members: "Are you comfortable with the Task Force adjustments discussed and re-issue the final draft to vote online before sending it to Core for ratification?"

Without objection.

The **Chair** instructed the Task Force to finalize edits and the Chair will distribute the corrected documents with an electronic vote for ratification in person at Annual.

1623. Continuation of any discussion from the previous meeting

The Documents Online Repository Task Force the following posed questions to the participants of the meeting.

QUESTION 2: How should the contact information relating to Task Force rosters be managed? Past rosters, both for the committee and for individual Task Forces, have complete contact information. While it is extremely useful for the life of the Task Force, it does include personal identifying information for extremely old Task Force groups.

Myers states that membership on a Task Force is not limited to constituencies at the table. Institutional affiliation may be suitable.

Maxwell recommends keeping the name/institution/and constituencies (when applicable). Lots of

extra work to edit out the contact information. Proviso that contact info may be incorrect.

Chair agrees with the name, affiliation. There would be lots of work to redact contact information. Some of that is already public. The security issue is a low-risk issue. Does low-risk equals high time spent? Going forward, it will be easier to remove such information. It's not even needed. Do we know rosters are saved elsewhere?

Glennan stated that the Task Force can revisit this issue. There was an assumption that ALA Connect should have that information, but it may not be correct. ALA IR/Archivist may have some opinions on this kind of issue.

QUESTION 3: Are there other documents that you are aware of that are associated with this committee's work that do not need to be archived?

There were no comments.

QUESTION 4: Who should be responsible for creating and maintaining CC:DA document numbering?

Glennan noted that there doesn't seem to be current documentation or a model to follow. May need to create one.

The **Chair** recommended that it might be a Past-Chair/Associate Member task, something to keep track of, however **Glennan** suggested that the possibility be a joint responsibility of Past-Chair and Webmaster. Useful to have two people covering this.

The **Chair** stated that it is kind of divided by Chairs. Accession numbering is (more or less) chronological, with **Glennan** saying the Task Force can provide principles so don't have to start from scratch.

Giving historical perspective, **Myers** stated that the old Attig website seemed decipherable as how things were numbered, however **Glennan** noted that there are inconsistencies in labeling. A long-named Task Force can result in a long file name. We are trying to model the behavior we want to see.

QUESTION: How to treat incorrect numbering (duplication or does not follow "normal" numbering scheme" – if we are going to archive by document number)?

The **Chair** recommends fixing it and maybe in document notation noting former numbering. In a stable repository, having accurate numbering and in order, is important with cross-references. **Glennan** harkens back to the earlier comments. How much past editing work do we want to do? This may be a place for the ALA IR/Archivist to have input.

QUESTION: Should we retroactively apply the standard to more recent documentation which does not follow the set pattern?

Myers does not want this to be an onerous task, but suggested that recent documentation should

be re-numbered. **Glennan** noted that the Task Force can evaluate and look within reason to see how much needs to be touched and how long it'll take. Within reason.

QUESTION 5 is out of the purview of the Task Force: We currently have two ALA Connect spaces, one for the public, and one for the committee. We also have an inactive blog space. Do we want a new blog space under the Core domain? Core may be able and willing to help us migrate ... useful as a supplement to ALA Connect space and what content would we want there, if we want a blog space as a supplement to the ALA Connect spaces?

The **Chair** notes that we post a lot to the two Connect and have to manage and deal with putting documents on two separate sites. While the **Chair** wants to make sure everything is on the public space, so that it can be discussed; she looks at the Committee space as our core repository, for now. CC:DA is the only committee that has this setup because its mission is specifically to liaise with outside committees and members. To maintain one more website is exhausting and the **Chair** does not know where the benefits are in that.

Noted by **Glennan**, that something posted in the IR, can automatically be cross-posted in Connect. A longer-term possible solution.

Stating past practice, **Myers** said that the Attig site was our repository, and the wiki was a commenting space. The blog was intended to be our committee IR and serve as a commenting space, replacing prior wiki offerings. If these functionalities are covered by the ALA IR, it's just figuring out if ALA Connect is sufficient for commenting functions.

As a user of the blog/Connect, **James** states agreement with the **Chair** about reducing the number of places to consult (Public site). It's good enough for the needs of the committee and confusing enough for people to figure out how things work.

The **Chair** gives a plug for responsibility of things like portability and upkeep. If we're on ALA Core, it's their responsibility to take care that things work and migrate. We wouldn't be responsible. No system is 100% perfect and Connect is working and functional enough with exception of it being a repository. We'll be using the real IR anyway.

Glennan recollects the Wiki would let you put comments in line where they belonged and the blog was like ALA Connect, and comments were (more or less) chronological and there is end users work to make it useful.

The **Chair** doesn't want multiple conversations going on in multiple places. ALA says Connect is where we need to have our business. A secondary place, like a blog space or somewhere else, is an additional forum that is split from the official one and you have cross conversations. Then **Glennan** recommends that this would perhaps be a Past-Chair Task: Best practices: what is to be posted in CC:DA internal vs. public spaces?

Myers provided historical background that the function of two lists was a workaround, where one list was read-only, and the other was read-write. Committee members/constituencies could only comment, and others would only be able to monitor. We don't have a lot of operational

experience in ALA Connect since the reorganization of RSC.

The **Chair** stated the opposite problem regarding commenting, in that it's been a time trying to get people to comment on proposals. Also, feels strongly against gatekeeping commenting from rank-and-file catalogers, rather than having to comment through their liaison or committee member. There's no reason for the chair to do all the work collating. It could be a volunteer activity or a role of the Associate Members.

Maxwell reiterates that NARDAC doesn't want comments, they want CC:DA to digest the comments it seeks, and come up with an official ALA response, that will inform NARDACs official position to send on to the RSC.

Glennan asked in response to **Maxwell's** statement. Should an official ALA response require an official CC:DA vote?

The **Chair**, in the past, has digested the comments and put a draft response up for comment, but usually did not call for a vote. With the recent proposals, we did not have a lot of time to comment, let alone try to hold a vote. We can try and change it, to require a formal vote, and discuss at Annual.

Glennan mentioned that the CC:DA/ALA position does NOT have to be unanimous.

1624. New Business

There was no New Business.

1625. Reports from the Floor

There were no Reports from the Floor.

1626. Announcement of next meeting and adjournment: Chair

The next meeting will be in San Diego, California at the ALA Annual Convention 2024. The following times were requested:

Saturday, June 29, 2024, 1PM-4PM

Monday, July 1, 2024, 9AM-12PM

Glennan moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by **Burns**.

The **Chair** adjourned the meeting at **1:48 p.m.** CST.

Respectfully submitted,
Charlotte Cotter, Intern
Michael Bradford, Intern