

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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

**Chair's Report on CC:DA Motions and Other Actions
July 1–December 31 2005**

The following is a record of motions made and votes taken between July 1, 2005 and December 31, 2005.

- A. 5JSC/Chair/5, CC:DA/ARSC/2005/1, CC:DA/ARSC/2005/2, CC:DA/AALL/2005/1 (original and revised), CC:DA/ARLIS/2005/1, CC:DA/MLA/2005/1, CC:DA/ATLA/2005/1, CC:DA/ATLA/2005/2, CC:DA/TF/Early Printed Monographs/6, CC:DA/GODORT/2005/1, CC:DA/TF/CLA/2005/1, CC:DA/AJL/2005/1; 5JSC/Chair/5/ALA follow-up [“Call for proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules” and responses by specialist associations to that document; July 25, 2005]:** 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was to authorize the ALA representative to JSC to formulate an ALA response to 5JSC/Chair/5, based on the proposals submitted to the chair, the results of discussions among representatives submitting proposals about areas of disagreements, and the CC:DA email discussions of those proposals. This was a complex matter for a couple of reasons, with the major reasons being a difference in interpretation among the various specialist groups as to what the result would be if rules were eliminated, and the fact that in some cases there was more than one specialist organization commenting on the rules, with some differences of opinion among the groups. The resulting document from the ALA Representative to JSC is entitled, “Call for proposals to simplify AACR2 Ch. 21 special rules;” it is structured with separate sections for each type of publication (e.g., “Art works;” “Musical works;” etc.).
- B. 5JSC/LC/2, CC:DA/CC:AAM/2005/1, CC:DA/AJL/2005/2, and 5JSC/LC/2/ALA response [“AACR3 Area 4 Example of Simplified Rules;” July 26, 2005]:** 7 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was that the ALA representative to JSC formulate an ALA response to the LC document, based on the comments in Confluence and any email son the CC:DA list concerning 5JSC/LC/2. The resulting document is, “RDA Area 4 simplified rules (5JSC/LC/2);” it notes ALA’s continuing idea that it is necessary to differentiate between “published” and “unpublished,” and then moves on to comments on specific rules suggested in LC/2.
- C. 5JSC/LC/3, CC:DA/SAA/2005/2, CC:DA/SAA/2005/1, and 5JSC/LC/3/ALA response [“Rule proposals for archival and manuscript resources” and**

- responses to that document; September 13, 2005]:** 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was that the ALA representative to JSC formulate a response to *LC/3*, based on comments from SAA, comments posted in Confluence, and any CC:DA discussion on the list; the response was to state the options for action put forward in SAA's document, and was also to recommend a compromise based on Option 2. The resulting document is, "*5JSC/LC/3: Rule proposals for archival and manuscript repositories;*" the document is based on all sources as noted in the motion, plus the CILIP response to *LC/3*. The document notes that both of LC's objectives – suggesting a concise set of general rules for describing archival and manuscript resources that is consistent with archival principles and practice; and the incorporation of procedures from the manual, *Describing Archives: A Content Standard* (DACS) – while excellent are problematic for various reasons. The thorny decision is whether to refer users to DACS, or to abstract information either from AACR2 or from DACS. This document recommends that JSC take the route of unambiguously noting in an as yet unwritten portion of RDA the existing documents in the archival world for description of these resources, and also including in RDA improved rules from AACR2's Chapter 4, for those situations when an agency chooses to try these resources bibliographically rather than archivally.
- D. ***CC:DA/TF/DCRM(B)/3 and CC:DA/Chair/2005-2006/1 [report of Task Force to Review Description Cataloging of Rare Materials (Books) (DCRM(B); August 31, 2005]***: 5 votes yes, 0 votes no, 2 abstentions. The Task Force report – dated August 22, 2005 – was passed by CC:DA and a report sent on to the appropriate body by the Chair.
- E. ***5JSC/ACOC rep/1 and 5JSC/ACOC rep/1/ALA response [“Levels of description, access, and authority control;” September 7, 2005]***: 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was that the ALA representative to JSC formulate an ALA response to the ACOC document, based on comments in Confluence to the date of the motion (September 5) and any emails on the CC:DA list concerning this document. The resulting document is, “Levels of description, access, and authority control;” ALA agrees with the general concept of levels in the ACOC document, and lists: its answers to questions in the document; discussion of ALA's general concerns on this matter; and comments on and suggested revisions for specific rules.
- F. ***5JSC/AACR3/1/LC response, CC:DA/MLA/2005/2/rev, and 5JSC/AACR3/1/LC response/ALA response [“AACR3 – Part I – constituency review of December 2004 draft,” and comments on that document, on rules C1.5B2.2 and glossary definitions, by the Music Library Association; September 8, 2005]***: 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was that the ALA representative to JSC write an ALA response to *5JSC/AACR3/1/LC response*, specifically concerning the rules under C1.5B2.2 and the Glossary definitions suggested in *5JSC/AACR3/1/LC response* that relate to music, and using the CC:DA document

- (*CC:DA/MLA/2005/2/rev*) and email discussion to write the response. The resulting document is, “Comments on *5JSC/AACR3/1/LC response*.” ALA proposed revisions to some of the rules, but the bulk of the document (four pages out of five) is comments on proposed Glossary terms and definitions.
- G. *CC:DA/TF/Technical Description of Digital Media/2005/3* [“Status report of Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media;” September 12, 2005]:** 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The Task Force on Rules for Technical Description of Digital Media was charged to propose revisions to the rules for technical description of digital media in the draft of Part 1 of AACR3. The draft of Part I would not be available until December; the Prospectus for RDA does not cover the technical description in sufficient detail, and leaves open some fundamental questions about the nature of the data elements. Thus, the status report included: (a) a list of major issues that have been encountered and questions that we ask the JSC to address at their October meeting; (b) a preliminary list of data elements recommended for inclusion in Chapter 13 of *RDA* that we request the JSC to consider in deciding on the content of the Part I draft; and (c) an appendix tabulating the results of the Task Force’s investigations of the various metadata standards, as background for our preliminary recommendations.
- H. *5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up, CC:DA/MLA/2005/4, and 5JSC/Chair/5/Sec follow-up/ALA response* [“Proposals to simplify AACR3 Ch. 21 special rules,” and responses by specialist associations to that document; September 13, 2005]:** 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was that the ALA representative to JSC write a document based on the original ALA follow-up, subsequent documents, comments posted in confluence, and any CC:DA discussion. The resulting document is, “Proposals to simplify AACR3 Ch. 21 special rules;” it is composed of brief “General observations” followed by comments on specific rules, divided up by category (e.g., “Art works;” “Musical works;” etc.). ALA’s two general comments are: ALA recommends the use of the reference structure within RDA to refer catalogers who are used to consulting special rules for certain materials back to the appropriate general rules; and ALA notes that if RDA follows the approach of eliminating the special rules and incorporating them as exceptions elsewhere in the rules in Part 2 in the name of simplification, this may in effect not be any simpler than to have the special rules identified discretely, even if they are in electronic format.
- I. *5JSC/LC/4, CC:DA/MLA/2005/3, and 5JSC/LC/4/ALA response* [“Rule proposals for musical format information (eliminating Musical presentation statement area (5.3)),” and response by the Music Library Association to that document; September 15, 2005]:** 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The motion was that the ALA representative to JSC submit an ALA response to this document, based on comments posted in the MLA response to this document, comments posted in Confluence, and CC:DA discussion on the list. The resulting

document is, “5JSC/LC/4: Rule proposals for musical format information”; while ALA agrees with the goal of simplifying the decision-making process for transcription of the musical presentation statement, ALA does not perceive that the LC solution solves the problem, and believes that the topic requires more discussion.

- J. CC:DA/TF/FRAR/3, CC:DA/Chair/2005-2006/2, and CC:DA/TF/FRAR/4 [Task Force to Review the Draft Functional Requirements for Authority Records (FRAR); September 22, 2005]:** 6 votes yes, 0 votes no, 0 abstentions. The Task Force’s charge includes both reviewing the draft of FRAR (for a October 31 deadline of getting the review in to the appropriate body of IFLA; this deadline was met) and also reporting to CC:DA on the possible impact of FRAR entities, attributes, relationships and user tasks on the guidelines for authority records in RDA by November 30, 2005; this deadline was also met. The former report was passed by CC:DA on October 26, with 5 votes yes, 0 votes no, and 0 abstentions, and sent on to the appropriate body as a Chair document, dated October 27. The latter report – “Considerations re functionality of Functional Requirements for Authority Records: A Conceptual Model (FRAR) and the drafting of *Resource Description and Access* and MARC coding” – and will be discussed at CC:DA’s ALA Midwinter meetings.