

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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

2001 Annual Conference — San Francisco, CA
June 16 and 18, 2001

Members present:

Adam L. Schiff, Chair
Steven R. Arakawa
Bradford L. Eden (*absent 6/18*)
Kate Harcourt
Susan M. Hayes
Carol Hixson
Daniel Kinney
Mary L. Larsgaard
Shirley J. Lincicum
Michael A. Chohey, Intern
Kristin Lindlan, Intern
John C. Attig, Consultant

Ex-officio representatives present:

Brian E.C. Schottlaender, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
(*rep. by Matthew Beacom 6/18*)
Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
Glenn Patton, OCLC
Ed Glazier, Research Libraries Group

ALA Liaisons present:

Gabriele I. Kupitz, ALCTS/CCS/CCM
Mark Watson, ALCTS/LITA/RUSA MARBI
Lowell Ashley, ALCTS/MRC
John Attig for Ann Sandberg-Fox, ALCTS/NRMC
Cecilia Sercan, ALCTS/PARS
Mary C. Grenci, ALCTS/SS
Robert L. Maxwell, ALA/ACRL
Aimée Piscitelli Quinn, ALA/GODORT
Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT
David Williamson, ALA/LITA (*absent 6/18*)
Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT
Gene Kinnaly, ALA/NMRT
Margaret Shen, ALA/PLA (*represented by Andrea Olson 6/16*)
Noelle Van Pulis, ALA/RUSA (*absent 6/16*)

Non ALA Liaisons present:

William Benemann, AALL
Judy Knop, ATLA (*absent 6/18*)
Anne E. Champagne, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Gertrude Koh, CLA
Robert McDonald, MedLA
Nancy E. Lorimer, MusLA
Ann Caldwell, PCC
Cynthia Marie Whitacre, SLA

CC:DA Webmaster:

John Attig

Notes:

- I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material has been rearranged to increase comprehension and to collocate items related to specific topics for clarity.
- II. Due to background noise, inconsistent use of microphones, etc., tapes of the meetings are of variable quality. The secretary regrets any loss of detail.
- III. In CC:DA minutes, a “vote of the Committee” indicates a poll of those Committee members appointed in their own right rather than those representatives of a particular constituency. 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 to CC:DA who are present. Such votes are advisory and are not binding upon the Committee. Where no vote totals are recorded, but 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 non-voting appointees to the Committee. Where a distinction is necessary, the terms “voting members” and “representatives” are used.
- V. Abbreviations used in these minutes include:
 - AACR** = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules
 - AACR2** = Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 1998 rev.
 - ACOC** = Australian Committee on Cataloguing
 - ALCTS** = Association of Library Collections and Technical Services
 - ANSI/NISO** = American National Standards Institute/National Information Standards Organization
 - BL** = British Library
 - CC:AAM** = Committee on Cataloging: Asian and African Materials
 - CC:DA** = Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access
 - CCC** = Canadian Committee on Cataloguing
 - CCS** = ALCTS/Cataloging and Classification Section
 - CDS** = LC, Cataloging Distribution Service

CPSO = LC, Cataloging Policy and Support Office
CSSC = ALCTS/Serials Section, Committee to Study Serials Cataloging
DCMES = Dublin Core Metadata Element Set
DCMI = Dublin Core Metadata Initiative
FRANAR = Functional Requirements and Numbering for Authority Records (IFLA Working Group)
FRBR = IFLA's *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*
Hallam = *Cataloging rules for the description of looseleaf publications: with special emphasis on legal materials*
IFLA = International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions
IRRT = ALA/International Relations Round Table
ISBD(CM) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Cartographic Materials*
ISBD(ER) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Electronic Resources*
ISBD(M) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Monographic Publications*
ISBD(NBM) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Non-Book Materials*
ISBD(S) = *International Standard Bibliographic Description for Serials*
ISO = International Organization for Standardisation
ISSN = International Standard Serial Number
JSC = Joint Steering Committee for Revision of AACR
LA = The Library Association (England)
LC = Library of Congress
LCSH = Library of Congress Subject Headings
MAGERT = ALA/Map and Geography Round Table
NISO = National Information Standards Organization (U.S.A.)
NLC = National Library of Canada
NRMC = ALCTS/Networked Resources and Metadata Committee
PCC = Program for Cooperative Cataloging
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
SCCTP = Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (CONSER)
UBCIM = Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme (IFLA)
VRA = Visual Resources Association

Saturday, June 16, 2001 – 2:00-5:30 p.m. – Marriott, Salon 8

724. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Adam Schiff opened the meeting at 2:00 p.m. in Salon 8. He passed around the attendance sheet/roster and distributed the latest version of the agenda, CC:DA/A/44/rev./4.

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

[\[CC:DA/Roster/2001 June\]](#)

Schiff reported that Andrea Olson was present for Margaret Shen. Committee members introduced themselves.

726. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[\[CC:DA/A/44\]](#)

Susan Hayes moved that the agenda be adopted, Carol Hixson seconded, and the members voted in favor.

727. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2001 Midwinter Conference, Washington, DC, January 13 and 15, 2001: Chair

[\[CC:DA/M/698-713\]](#)

With some minor corrections, including a change in wording on page 36, from “unanimous” to “overwhelming support,” in section about a straw poll on the term “continuing resources” for scope note in AACR2 Chapter 12.

Brad Eden moved that the minutes be adopted, Hayes seconded, and the minutes were approved unanimously.

728. Report from the Chair: Schiff

[\[CC:DA/Chair/2000-2001/3\]](#)

[\[Proposed Change in Midwinter Meeting Schedule\]](#)

[ALCTS Strategic & Tactical Plan, 2001-2005; distributed via email]

Schiff reported that CC:DA had had a busy 6 months. Three task forces had been suggested at Midwinter and formed afterwards: ONIX International, Rule of 3, and Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2, and another had also been formed, the Review of ISBD(CR). There were also 4 other ongoing task forces: Appendix on Major/Minor Changes; ISO Harmonization; Seriality Rules Review; and Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources.

Schiff thanked the chairs and task forces for their outstanding work.

Schiff then summarized the many CC:DA actions since Midwinter:

- approved the report of VRA core categories. Schiff read a letter from VRA and congratulated the task force.

Letter from the Visual Resources Association:

May 30, 2001
Adam L. Schiff
University of Washington Libraries
Monographic Services Division
Box 352900
Seattle, WA 98195-2900

RE: CC:DA Task Force on VRA Core Categories, January 2001

Dear Mr. Schiff

The CC:DA Task Force on the VRA Core Categories Report has been received and is currently being reviewed by the Visual Resources Association Data Standards Committee. The Task Force (Sherman Clarke, Robin Wendler, Anne Champagne, Sherry Kelley, and Sherry Vellucci) is to be congratulated on an excellent and informative report.

A link to the report has been posted on the VRA website and a synopsis of the report will appear in a forthcoming issue of the *VRA Bulletin*. When Core 3 was introduced in June 2000, the Data Standards Committee decided to postpone adding MARC tags to the Core's mapping in order to take into consideration recommendations of the Task Force. The new mapping will include Task Force recommendations.

The report notes that to support record sharing and resources retrieval, it will be necessary not only to develop meaningful metadata mapping, but also to agree on rules governing content. You will be pleased to know that our next standards initiative will address content rules in the form of a Guide to Good Practice. The guide is being partially funded through a grant from the Digital Library Federation. Plans for the project include a review of proposed rules by working groups from both the museum and library communities.

As the VRA continues to promote descriptive standards, it looks to the bibliographic community for inspiration and guidance. We are grateful for the support and encouragement of the CC:DA and look forward to future collaborations.

Sincerely,
Ann Whiteside, President, VRA
Eileen Fry and Linda McRae, Co-Chairs Data Standards Committee

Schiff continued reporting on CC:DA actions since Midwinter:

- approved another version of the Appendix on Major Changes after Midwinter and forwarded it to the JSC for their April meeting.
- approved the compilation of cartographic rule revision proposals with detailed explanations and sent it to the JSC.
- approved several responses to seriality rule revision proposals and sent them to the JSC.
- approved a slightly revised version of Appendix B.5 for abbreviations and sent it to the JSC.

- approved an ALA response (based on comments from Schiff and John Attig) on a previous draft of the 2001 rule revision package.
- approved the interim report of the T.F. on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources and sent it to the JSC for the April Meeting.
- voted to affirm “yes” vote on NISO Dublin core after reconstituting the task force to look at comments received on the ballot. Schiff sent a letter to the NISO representative [CC:DA/Chair/2000-2001/3], reiterating ALA support. He said he had still not heard from NISO, but someone responded it was still out, with 5 “no” votes at present.
- voted to withdraw 4JSC/ALA/30 Non-Roman access points.
- approved 21.30L2 on series added entry for integrating resources to be incorporated into the latest Chapter 12 rule revisions.
- agreed to co-sponsor in name only the regional AACR2 and metadata institutes to be held this year in Boston, Austin, Texas, and California and at a preconference in Toronto in June 2003.

Schiff reported that there was a proposed Midwinter meeting schedule change to eliminate meetings on Tuesdays, including that of the CCS Executive Committee. He asked for feedback from CC:DA.

CC:DA said it was not a good idea.

Matthew Beacom said it would make things more difficult for chairs and committee members and didn't think it was a good idea.

Brian Schottlaender added it would make reporting obligations difficult for chairpersons and liaisons, and said he would report that to CCS Executive.

Schiff reported on the ALCTS strategic plan discussed the previous day at CCS Executive Committee. He asked for feedback on its impact on CC:DA and on anything missing from the plan. Schiff added that CC:DA was mentioned in several places in the plan:

- 1.2.6 The deadline for the completion of the Appendix on Major Changes was changed to Midwinter 2002.
- 2.1.17 ALCTS Program on AACR2 and Metadata – CC:DA co-sponsoring in name only.
- 3.3.11 Educational program and 3.3.16 Educational program

These were both listed as possibilities for 2002. Schiff said that when it was discussed at CC:DA at Midwinter there was not much interest. He added that CC:DA couldn't do a program in 2002 except as a co-sponsor with another group that was already underway. Schiff said that he thought CC:DA ought to be doing some educational effort.

Carol Hixson said that there is a PCC Standing Committee on Training and a task force on integrating resources is in the works, with Valerie Bross (UCLA), chair.

Schiff asked what CC:DA thought about a program for 2003, given the new chapters 3, 9, and 12.

Attig agreed that CC:DA should do something and, because of scheduling, needed to get started. He added it could be packaged as all of the changes that had occurred.

Tillett responded that, with chapter 9 due out in summer 2001, 2003 is rather late for such a program.

Attig said he was working with a group of catalogers from OLAC to do a web-based tutorial for chapter 9, for which the changes are not as fundamental as in Chapter 12. He said they would appreciate assistance from any volunteers from CC:DA.

Schiff said that 3.3.12, a preconference on map cataloging, was still on the books. Mary Larsgaard reported that Lucinda Hall had done a workshop that morning and that a 2002 map

cataloging preconference was going forward, with Larsgaard as one of the instructors. She added that it would be presented to the ALCTS Program Committee on Tuesday morning at this conference.

Larsgaard said that the JSC had requested a clean copy of chapter 3 by August 15 and they were considering reissuing the entire chapter in the 2002 amendments.

Schottlaender, as a member of the ALCTS Board of Directors, said that the new chapter 12 needed a program. He added there was not enough time for a 2002 preconference, but several institutes should be held, perhaps in collaboration with PCC.

Mary Greci said that the Serials Section's Committee to Study Serials Cataloging wanted to do a program or institute on the chapter 12 changes. She added that it would appreciate co-sponsorship if CC:DA were interested.

Schiff said it needed to be arranged during this conference.

Schottlaender said that a two hour program might be a good "teaser" to an institute.

Carol Hixson said she could bring up the issue with Jean Hirons later that evening.

Schiff asked whether CC:DA should form a program planning task force.

Larsgaard made a motion to have a program planning task force and it was seconded.

Schiff said he would need a volunteer.

Schottlaender said that the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging could put the program proposal in motion.

Greci said she would report back on Monday or as soon as possible.

Larsgaard withdrew her motion.

Schiff returned to the tactical plan. He said they were going to put on the "to do" list things that are done regularly (e.g., reviewing ISBDs and NISO standards).

729. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillet

Tillet passed out copies of the report (available at: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/lc106.html>). She reported on highlights from the report.

Tillet reported that she and Glenn Patton are the ALA representatives to Standing Committee of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing. Her second term as an ALA representative ends in 2003 at the Berlin meeting. There will be an announcement in October for nominees to serve 2003-2007 as ALA's representative to the IFLA Section on Cataloguing.

Patton added that there would be a meeting sponsored by the ALCTS International Relations Committee on Monday at 11:30-12:30 in the Marriott and that US representatives to IFLA standing committees were needed. He encouraged people to apply and added that partial ALA funding is available.

730. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Schottlaender

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/BECS/2001/3]

(<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/jsc104.html>)

Report on the JSC Meeting, 02-04 April 2001

Schottlaender reported that the chapter 12 revisions were far along and were now in a second "clean" copy, thanks to Tillet and her staff at the Library of Congress. Constituent responses on the clean copy were due July 30, 2001, for JSC review by October 15, 2001, and for inclusion in the 2002 revision package.

He said that chapter 3 revisions were in the same state as chapter 12, thanks to Mary Larsgaard for preparing a consolidation package at the JSC's request. The JSC had requested ALA and Larsgaard to prepare a clean copy of the entire chapter 3 to be sent to the JSC by

August 15. Constituent responses to the clean chapter were due Sept. 15 for JSC discussion at the Ottawa meeting in October.

4JSC/ALA/32 Non-Roman access point series was not supported by the JSC and was withdrawn by ALA.

Schottlaender reported that the Appendix of Major Changes was still in play, with Kristin Lindlan leading the discussion on Monday.

The proposed area 3, 5, 7 revisions were also still in play, with Laurel Jizba leading that discussion on Monday.

[4JSC/Amendments/2001]

[4JSC/Amendments/2001/CCC rep response]

Review of 2001 Revision Package

Schottlaender reported that the revision had been typeset by ALA Publishing and reviewed by the national libraries and that he had just received comments by the BL and LC. A complete revision of the index had also just arrived and was out for national library review. The publishers and Committee of Principals have now changed the numbering of the amendments by year, rather than serially (i.e., 1, 2, 3).

The JSC meeting in Washington was followed a month later by a meeting of the Committee of Principals in Ottawa. There was no formal record of that meeting yet, although Ann Huthwaite had shared her notes. Schottlaender reported that the Committee of Principals and the publishers had decided to issue an annual rule compilation, beginning in 2002. It will be available as a loose-leaf punched shrink-wrapped block, with a standard size binder available at additional cost. The block will be priced approximately the same as the current soft cover. In addition, annual updates will be available on the Web. Users will be able to purchase the annual compilation or annual updates. The amendments will have a regular annual schedule: revisions due to the publishers by mid-February each year in order to be typeset and published by summer of that same year.

There was preliminary discussion underway about having a Web version of the code. Schottlaender reported that the Committee of Principals thinks an AACR website should be developed and linked to the JSC website. Don Chatham, ALA Publishing, has been charged with drafting a site map.

The proposal to fund a JSC secretary has been endorsed by the Committee of Principals; the secretary position will move with the Chair.

Schottlaender reported that the Committee of Principals had given authorization for the alpha prototype of the ISBD-based reorganization of part I to be made available to a select group of reviewers, with the objective that it be completed before the Ottawa meeting so that they could decide whether and how to proceed further. A consultant may be hired.

Schottlaender asked who CC:DA wanted to have access to the prototype: entire committee; voting members; or a task force to review and give input to the JSC.

Schiff asked Schottlaender if he had an opinion and Schottlaender replied that he thought a task force with a lot of voting members on it would be best.

Attig said that he was concerned about the timeframe of 3 months.

Schiff said that many members of the existing task force were leaving CC:DA at the end of this meeting and perhaps needed work to do.

Larsgaard moved to form a task force to study the AACR prototype and Brad Eden seconded.

Larsgaard suggested that it would be helpful to have special format people on the task force also.

CC:DA voted unanimously in favor of a task force.

Schiff passed around a sign-up sheet for the Task Force on the Alpha Prototype of Reorganized Part I.

Schottlaender reported that at the meeting of the Committee of Principals the idea of creating an information base to facilitate JSC rule revision process was endorsed.

[4JSC/Chair/71]

[4JSC/Chair/72]

JSC Format Variation Working Group

Schottlaender reported that the Format Variation Working Group had been established with members from the international AACR community. He invited Jennifer Bowen (Chair of the Working Group) to the table to report.

Bowen reported that the Working Group was just beginning its work. A couple of its members are not MARC-based catalogers, but are familiar with expression-level cataloging. Everyone was getting up to speed: doing a lot of reading, looking at the definitions, etc. At the JSC meeting, they spent some time trying to clarify the charge. Those that have been involved with multiple versions know the difficulties. The first problem they encountered was how to identify the expression and its data elements. They're looking at some of the efforts that have been going on. There will be an interim report in fall 2001 and a final report in spring 2002.

Schottlaender commended CC:DA for getting this ball rolling.

[4JSC/Chair/73: *General Material Designations (GMDs)*]

[4JSC/Chair/74: *Principles of AACR*]

Schottlaender said that these two discussion papers were drafted by Tillett, although 4JSC/Chair/74 was based on Elaine Svenonius's work. That paper is almost certainly going to be manifest in the introductory chapter being drafted by the British.

He added that 4JSC/Chair/73 was meant to advance in a general way the JSC's GMD discussion, as Jean Weihs's work on GMDs also would.

Tillett said that the 4JSC/chair/73 document was intended to promote ideas from others. She had put down on paper the history of how we got where we are, including ISBD(G). She added that there are many opportunities to address things in new ways with online systems.

Attig reported that Jean Weihs has been conducting a study on GMDs sponsored by OLAC. They had received her report the previous evening and it would be posted on the OLAC website soon. Attig said he would let CC:DA know when it was available.

Tillett added that Jean Weihs would be publishing the report in *Technicalities* also.

Attig said that there was confusion in the use of GMDs and cases where more than one applies. In the survey, there was a great deal of support for building on what's already in place, but that may not be the most interesting choice.

Schiff said Tillett had a recommendation at the end and asked if CC:DA should do anything, i.e., endorse it or do some investigation on our own.

Attig suggested that we put it on the agenda for Midwinter.

[4JSC/LA/1/LA follow-up]

[4JSC/LA/1/LA/follow-up/CCC rep response]

Publisher statement repeating data from title, etc., area (1.4D4)

Schottlaender said that LA/1/LA follow-up included proposals for rule revisions. Because these documents included a number of Canadian examples, it had been agreed at the Washington meeting that the constituents would wait for a Canadian response before responding. He said the Canadians supported the proposals with two exceptions, 12.4D1 and 12.4F2. They also wanted to propose an additional example at 3.0J1.

Schottlaender said he found the documents non-controversial except for one thing: the proposed text in A1.8B1 was to strike the final sentence. He said that Schiff had made the observation that only the parenthetical carries the implicit reference to 1.4D4, whereas the instruction that precedes the parenthetical is actually a valid instruction. He said that Schiff had suggested that the ALA response include a counterproposal to leave the final sentence and strike the parenthetical. Schiff had also provided him with some examples where that instruction would be necessary. Schottlaender then read one of the examples, where the lack of the final sentence is a problem. He said that in fairness to Matthew Beacom he was willing to write the last proposal, but he would need to know what CC:DA wished to say regarding the document. In his opinion, the Canadian response shortened the rule unnecessarily.

CC:DA agreed with Schottlaender and he agreed to write the response.

Schottlaender thanked CC:DA for being such a fun group for a dozen years, said it had been a privilege to represent CC:DA, and expressed his confidence in Matthew Beacom as the new ALA representative to the JSC.

Schiff thanked Schottlaender for being his mentor and for doing a superb job as the ALA representative to the JSC.

Hixson read a resolution regarding Schottlaender:

“Whereas he has provided CC:DA, ALA and the JSC excellent service since 1995, including the organization of an international conference on AACR2, and

Whereas he has been recognized for his outstanding professional achievement in cataloging by being awarded the ALA ALCTS CCS Mann Citation for 2001, and

Whereas with his gentle prodding and painstaking clarification of proposals, amendments, responses and counter proposals CC:DA has undertaken substantial revision of AACR2, including Rule 0.24, chapters 3, 9 and 12, titles of nobility and terms of honour, and the spelling of disk vs. disc, and

Whereas he has served with intelligence, patience, and no small measure of humor and wit,

Therefore be it resolved that CC:DA thanks Brian Schottlaender for his contributions to CC:DA as the ALA representative to the Joint Steering Committee, and to the national and international communities, and wishes him well in all his endeavors.”

The resolution was approved unanimously by the committee.

731. Presentation: *Digital Geospatial Data from Users' Perspective*: Larry Carver, Head, Map and Imagery Laboratory, Davidson Library, UCSB

[\[http://alexandria.sdc.ucsb.edu/~carver/download/flyer.pdf\]](http://alexandria.sdc.ucsb.edu/~carver/download/flyer.pdf)

Larry Carver said he would be speaking from a user's perspective and addressing CC:DA as the gatekeepers for information technology. He said that the kinds of thing he would want to know as a user would be: what exists; where it is located; special arrangements for downloading; usefulness to needs; how to get it; conditions of use; form (i.e., whether it is in original form or has it been altered in some way; how large is the digital file).

He said he would talk about four different forms of digital geospatial data: maps; remotely sensed images; geographic information system databases; and statistical information. These forms of data can take certain forms: raster; vector; tabular. Until recently it had been difficult to tie tabular data to geospatial forms. He also reviewed some information: the raster is made up of pixels (various shades of gray); in the vector environment we're looking at points with no representative fill.

He talked about several examples that illustrated user needs: integration of statistical information into J-peg format; enhanced radar versions vs. original uncolored; sonar; raw data vs. enhanced; hyperspectral data with 224 contiguous spectral channels from satellite.

He added that the important information for the user of digital geospatial data is: understanding what the data is; whether it's a single raw image or combined data sets; whether it's vertical or not; georectified or not, i.e., whether map accurately represents features on the ground; original data or resampled (altered, processed – possibly reduced); multispectral information (more than one channel of data), black/white, color; tabular; size of file is particularly important in digital community; file format (whether can be read by computer you have; representation (faithful representation of original; resampled; compressed); what media (storage vehicle).

Carver closed by saying his presentation was downloadable, as seen on the handout.

732. Rule change proposals for cartographic materials: Larsgaard

[\[CC:DA/MAGERT/2001/1/MAGERT follow-up\]](#)

[4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/2]

[4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/2/ACOC response]

[4JSC/ALA/31/ALA follow-up/2/LA response]

Larsgaard thanked Larry Carver for his presentation on user-related needs for access to digital geospatial data.

Following the directive of the JSC following the April meeting, Larsgaard had provided a clean copy of the rule proposals from the last two JSC meetings. The JSC had also requested a copy of chapter 3 with rule change proposals interpolated. Larsgaard said that the JSC would need this by August 15, so she would get it to the CC:DA Chair by July 13. She said she had included proposals approved in September 2000 and provisionally in April 2001, provisionally because the BL needed more time for its constituency to look at them.

Larsgaard reported that Velma Parker (National Archives of Canada) was able to attend the JSC meeting and that Parker and three MAGERT members were able to review the various responses and iron out problems.

Larsgaard returned to the clean copy of chapter 3, which included rule proposals and cross-reference changes that she and Elizabeth Mangan had checked. There were other changes for area 5 for model and section, examples to be removed, and SMDs that needed to be corrected. Also, there were some examples that stated "Scale varies" and they were changed to reflect the new rules.

Larsgaard said there was one more point to emphasize on page 2 in the list of rule proposals for 3.3B5, 6 and 7. There had been a lot of discussion with Parker and the three MAGERT members and responses from LC and ACOC. They wanted to make this straightforward for catalogers.

Mangan added that in trying to do the cleanup of chapter 3 and in looking at the examples, they came across one example in 3.5B4 that didn't make sense. Mangan said that she and Larsgaard had drafted a revised 3.5B4; they hoped that CC:DA could discuss it electronically for inclusion in the final package for the 2001 rule revisions.

Schiff said that he had few corrections, including a typo in 3.3C2 and a problem with the language in 3.3B7. He asked if there were any other changes or questions from CC:DA.

Hixson made a motion to accept the document as corrected and Susan Hayes seconded. Vote: 8-0.

Schottlaender commended Larsgaard, Mangan and their colleagues for their excellent work.

733. Report of the Task Force on ONIX International: Eden

[\[CC:DA/TF/ONIX/3\]](#)

Brad Eden said that the task force had met that morning and this was their interim report with the final report due Midwinter 2002. He said he would mention the important points at this time.

Eden said that the ONIX standard was not designed to support e-books at this time; its original purpose was for use with print books.

LC and OCLC were preparing to use ONIX data. Mappings have already been done.

Most of the descriptive data elements map to MARC, but many of the administrative and structural elements do not have equivalents.

Eden said that if you look at the end of the categorization of the metadata categories, you'll see the URLs for the cross-walks, as well as two reports, one of which is Alan Danskin's and the other Bob Pearson's mapping.

One of the main concerns with ONIX was the lack of authority control.

Eden thanked the task force members for their work, including finding URLs for information on ONIX and XML presentations. He added that the task force would address the other charges in the final report, but were not expecting to draft any rule revision proposals.

734. Report on a Review of the Proposed ISBD(M): Jizba

[\[CC:DA/Chair/2000-2001/1\]](#)

[\[ISBD\(M\) 2001 Revision Draft\]](#)

[\[CC:DA/TF/ISBD\(M\)/2000/3/Jizba follow-up\]](#)

Schiff said that CC:DA had reviewed the new ISBD(M) and CC:DA had sent comments to John Byrum in July 2000. The new version, based on comments, was again available on the Web. With the call for more comments, CC:DA should be interested to see which of its recommendations were incorporated into the latest draft. Schiff said that Laurel Jizba had volunteered to look at CC:DA's previous recommendations and compare them with the new version. He added that she had written a report and CC:DA needed to decide whether it wanted to comment again.

Jizba said that the charge had been to look at the recommendations made last summer and not reevaluate the entire ISBD(M). She reported that there were twelve recommendations, of which three disagreed to a greater or lesser extent with the optionality decision.

She added that the first one where there was disagreement was the statement of responsibility, which we had objected to making optional. However, in 1.5.1 the ISBD(M) gave us a reasonable compromise with an exclusionary caveat: "Subsequent statements of responsibility are included to the extent that they are essential to accurate identification or are considered important to the users of the catalogue." She added that this element was not optional in FRBR.

Jizba said the second point of disagreement was on dimensions. The 2000 Task Force wanted this element to remain mandatory, but ISBD(M) had made it optional. She added that for special collections books, dimensions were critical to distinguishing between manifestations. She also said they had added qualifying information to make it mandatory only for titles needing playback equipment. Jizba found this point difficult to comprehend.

Jizba reported that the third element was the statement of responsibility related to series and subseries. The ISBD(M) and the CC:DA 2000 Task Force disagreed. The statement of responsibility was made mandatory when generic terms comprised the title proper of the series or sub-series, although it was optional otherwise. The Task Force had agreed to make the whole thing optional and had not considered the case of "generic" terms comprising the title proper of the series or sub-series.

Schottlaender said he wanted to clarify regarding the three areas of disagreement. Since the first was a reasonable compromise, he suggested we really have only two areas of disagreement.

Schiff said that the deadline for response was June 22 and CC:DA would not form a task force. Schiff asked the committee whether it agreed with Jizba that the first point was a reasonable compromise. CC:DA agreed.

Schiff moved to the second area of disagreement, i.e., dimensions.

Larsgaard said she also found it strange that the statement on dimensions for non-print media had been included and that she did not agree with it.

Attig added that non-print media fall outside the scope of ISBD(M) and it deserved comment.

Schiff said the comment would be that CC:DA continued to disagree, that recording dimensions should be optional and we found the exception made are for non-print media to be inappropriate for inclusion in ISBD(M).

Nancy Lorimer added that it implied that sound recordings were described with this ISBD.

Schiff moved to the last area of disagreement, i.e., statements of responsibility related to series or subseries. He added we were saying they should record any and they're saying it's only mandatory when the series statement is generic. He asked whether CC:DA agreed or whether they should be optional in all cases.

Attig said it sounded as if what was proposed as a changed ISBD(M) was in line with AACR practice and so perhaps we should not disagree with it.

Schiff said he saw nods from the committee and he would ignore that one.

Schiff said he would write a letter to Byrum and thanked Jizba for her work.

735. Other announcements: Chair

There were no other announcements. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

*Monday June 18, 2001 – 8:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Cathedral Hill, International Room*

736. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

CC:DA Chair Adam Schiff welcomed the committee and audience and distributed the roster and agenda.

Schiff paid tribute to outgoing ALA Representative to the JSC Brian Schottlaender, and explained that Schottlaender would be absent from this day's CC:DA meeting because he was receiving the Margaret Mann Citation this morning in another part of town.

Schiff welcomed former CC:DA voting member and incoming ALA representative to the JSC Matthew Beacom.

Beacom thanked the committee and the audience for their applause, and said that he had prepared a short statement.

Adam mentioned something at Saturday's meeting about how difficult it will be to fill Brian Schottlaender's shoes. Adam is not the first to say that, and he won't be the last. I know it will be hard to fill Brian's shoes, so the idea that I have is that instead of filling his shoes, I'll stand on his shoulders. And I think that I will not only be standing on Brian's shoulders, but I will be standing on all of your shoulders as well. If I am to serve you well as the ALA representative, it will only be with your support.

As a profession, I think our strength is really less in the great ones among us—and we have had some great ones like Cutter and Lubetzky, along with current great ones, like Brian—than in the community of which each one of us is a part. It is a privilege to represent you, and it is an honor to be one of you. I hope that I will serve you well. Thank you.

Schiff thanked Beacom for his remarks and said that Beacom assumes his new responsibilities with the full confidence of ALA and everyone seated around this table.

737. Report of the Task Force on ISO Harmonization: Chohey

<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-iso1.html>

Task Force Chair Michael Chohey reported that the task force had had the deadline for its final report extended to December 16, 2001. Chohey, who took over as chair when the originally appointed chair had to step down because of other commitments, said that the task force was down to only three members including himself (since Kristin Lindlan would be leaving the task force to assume the chair of CC:DA). He said that Schiff would be distributing a sign-up sheet for additional volunteers and the task force would appreciate the help of anyone interested in serving. Chohey thanked Aimee Quinn and John Hostage for their continued service, and Lindlan for her service on the task force.

Chohey reported that the task force is now in the stage of identifying ISO standards that relate to bibliographic description, and would be surveying various cataloging communities this fall to get ideas from them on where AACR2 could benefit from harmonization with ISO standards.

738. Report of the Task Force on Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2: Lincicum

<http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/tf-uri1.html>

Task Force Chair Shirley Lincicum said that the task force had officially been formed in March of this year, and upon receiving the task force's charge, she had created for the task force an online site at Blackboard.com to facilitate the work of the task force since they would not have many opportunities to meet together in person. In April and May, the committee interacted via that site, and on Saturday at this conference, the task force met in person for the first and probably the only time.

The task force had a very productive meeting on Saturday, during which the members had a free-form discussion with a lot of brainstorming about the areas that the task force would need to discuss in its report, and about the changing environment in which catalogers and catalogs need to operate and how that might impact the way the task force approaches this report.

The task force now has a good rough outline of its final report, and task force members have accepted individual assignments for completing different parts of the task force's charge, Lincicum said. She said the task force is on schedule to meet its December 16 deadline, and would continue to use its online meeting site to communicate and to exchange ideas and drafts of different parts of the report.

Attig said that he was interested in this Blackboard.com technology and asked how it works and how one can take advantage of it.

Lincicum said that it is a free service offered by Blackboard, and you can create what is called a "course Web site," which is really meant to be used by people doing distance education. She said she was not sure yet how well it would work for the task force, but she had chosen it because it would allow them to have threaded discussions, and would allow her, as chair, to post links easily to relevant documents without having to do a lot of Web page maintenance and things like that. She said this is an experiment to see how well it works, and so far it is working better than conducting all of the task force's work via e-mail would.

739. Report of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD(CR): Larsgaard

[\[ISBD\(CR\) draft\]](#)

[\[CC:DA/TF/ISBD\(CR\)/3\]](#)

Schiff introduced Task Force Chair Mary Larsgaard and said that he really wanted to thank her very much for agreeing to chair this task force on an extremely tight deadline. He said that despite the short time frame the task force had had to complete its charge, Larsgaard and the task force had submitted a wonderfully thorough and informative report.

Larsgaard thanked the task force members. She said she had not regularly cataloged serials since 1988, so she was grateful to have serials cataloging experts on the task force who knew what they were talking about and who could guide her by the hand in putting the report together. She said the report consisted mainly of the comments of these experts, and that her role had mainly been to compile the report and keep the task force on schedule.

Larsgaard said that after the bulk of the report had been written, a key task force member, John Attig, who had been otherwise occupied during the task force's discussions, had made several comments on the report that would probably have a great impact on what form the final report would take. She said she would like to turn over the microphone to Attig to summarize his analysis of the report. Larsgaard asked the committee to consider the following action plan while listening to Attig's remarks:

Following this meeting, Larsgaard would incorporate Attig's remarks into the final report, and then send it out to CC:DA for the committee's remarks. The committee would have to act quickly because the revised report would have to be submitted to John Byrum by June 30. She said her plan was to get the revised report back to CC:DA via the committee's e-mail reflector on June 26 or 27, and to give the committee a day or so to respond.

Attig began his remarks by apologizing for raising all of these issues at the last minute. He said that his position with regard to serials cataloging was similar to Mary's, except that his employers *never* let him near them [serials]. <Laughter> He said he does occasionally get close enough to serials cataloging to have a good idea of what some of the general issues are, and that in any case his remarks were based more on his experience with the review of other ISBDs than on anything specific to serials.

Attig said that his reading of the task force's comments is that they are a mix of notices of differences between AACR2 and ISBD—many of them without recommendations to change either ISBD or AACR—and notices of inconsistencies or errors or less-than-ideal features in ISBD(CR). He said he found it a little bit disconcerting to see these mixed together without any warning, and he worried about how they would be perceived when they are read by the ISBD Working Group. If it is not possible to separate these into different sections, he said he would at least like to see the notices that are simply pointing out differences be clearly labeled as such so that there is no confusion among the Working Group that we are not actually suggesting an action item in these cases.

Attig said he noted that some of the comments in the report were comments that suggested changing the draft of the new Chapter 12, and he questioned whether these should even stay in the report that is forwarded. He said that he had already said as the chair of the task force that in reviewing the Chapter 12 draft that he would cull all of these remarks out of Larsgaard's report and present them to the task force for consideration.

Further, Attig said, the report mixes comments on the ISBD(CR) draft with comments that are either applicable to all the ISBDs, or at least to more than ISBD(CR), and he thought we are not even sure to which ISBDs the comments apply, since the task force did not do a comparison.

Consistency across the ISBDs is something that ALA has always strongly urged, and it is something that, unfortunately, we have always had to comment on since the early days. In the early days, we were dealing with working groups that were directly charged by the [IFLA] Section on Cataloguing, were not mandated by the section to achieve consistency across the ISBDs, and were made up of experts that cared only about the particular type of material they were working on. We have some new opportunities now that there is an overall Working Group, Attig said, and it is worth reiterating and reinforcing our interest in consistency. Therefore, it is very important that we warn the Working Group that there are some comments that we know apply to other ISBDs, and there are some others that we think might apply to others. Also, that if the Working Group were to make some of these changes only in ISBD(CR), we might even be introducing new inconsistencies.

Attig said that what he would like to suggest is that if we can not do two separate documents—and to do so would probably be overkill—we should send a copy of our report both to Ingrid Parent, as chair of the working group, and to John Byrum, as chair of the Review Group, and clearly state at the beginning of the document that we are making both kinds of comments, why we are making both kinds, and that we would appreciate it if the comments that do apply to other ISBDs be taken into account by the Review Group as part of the ongoing review process.

Attig said that he wanted to give a couple of examples of what he was talking about:

The ISBD(CR)/ISBD(G) outline. This is one of the areas that is almost literally consistent in all of the ISBDs in terms of layout and style. So all of the task force's comments on this are comments on ISBD(G), not on ISBD(CR).

Appendix A. This is a good example of what I've been talking about. The first comment on Appendix A from the task force is that "multilevel" is spelled throughout ISBD(CR) sometime with and sometimes without a hyphen, but the task force does not give a recommendation. Later on, there is a comment that "ISBD(S)" is used and it was probably an oversight and should have been updated to "ISBD(CR)." That is a very different kind of comment, and both are probably very legitimate comments to make. The other comments on Appendix A fall into the category of comments on ISBDs in general. This appendix is almost verbatim in every ISBD. Furthermore, it is a technique that the United States has chosen not to have anything to do with, but which is very familiar to other countries, who use it routinely and who find it very important to use. Frankly, Attig said, he finds our comments here to be presumptuous and spoken from a point of view of ignorance. He said he would strongly suggest that we remove these comments from the document. They are an embarrassment.

Attig said that that was all he really had to say at this point, though there were a lot of things we could all take a look at. He said the committee will want to take a look at these comments and make sure that they are comments that we all agree with, because they will be taken seriously.

In response to Attig's comments, Larsgaard said that she would find it fairly straightforward and easy to separate out the comments that were noting differences between AACR2 and ISBD(CR) and to remove those comments that suggested changes to the Chapter 12 draft—especially since Attig's task force had agreed to take a look at these suggestions—but that the area in which she would feel unsure about what she was doing would be in separating out comments that apply to all of the ISBDs in general or at least to more than ISBD(CR). She said that if Attig could speak to that point in the digital file he will be giving her, she would be willing to do that for the report. Otherwise, Larsgaard said, she does not have the detailed knowledge of all the ISBDs to be able to do that.

Attig said that he would not have an opportunity to give Larsgaard very much more detail. What he would suggest, he said, is that she and the task force try to identify those that they could, and that Larsgaard state at the beginning of the report that some of the recommendations may apply to more than ISBD(CR).

Larsgaard said she could do that, and that she would appreciate comments from the committee on whether her plan to incorporate Attig's remarks and then get the revised report back to CC:DA on June 26 or 27 was feasible or not. She noted that Schiff had kindly volunteered to take charge of getting the report to Ingrid Parent by June 30 even though Schiff's term as chair of CC:DA would be over after this conference.

Schiff said that there might be a couple of options. One would be to send a letter to Parent saying that CC:DA was working on comments, but that they were going to be a little bit late. He said he wasn't sure how flexible the working group would be on their June 30 deadline.

Larsgaard said that from her standpoint, that would be ideal. If this were possible, Larsgaard said, she would still plan on getting the revised report to CC:DA by June 27, but then the committee could have at least a week to look at it.

Schiff said he would e-mail Parent.

LC Liaison Barbara Tillett [Chair of the IFLA Section on Cataloguing that Parent and John Byrum report to], stated that IFLA deadlines are true deadlines, and that an extension would most likely not be granted. She said that if CC:DA were to send preliminary comments, and say that further comments will follow, that would probably be acceptable. Tillett said that that would be the approach she would recommend. IFLA meets in August, she noted, but they would be making decisions about this after the June 30 deadline date.

Schiff thanked Tillett for this advice, and asked Larsgaard how that would work. What sections of the report could we send by June 30?

Beacom suggested that CC:DA send to Parent and Byrum the report that Larsgaard has already prepared to send to CC:DA by June 27, but with the label "preliminary comments" and the statement "further refinements to follow."

Tillett suggested that if CC:DA takes this approach, the preliminary comments need only be sent to Parent, with the final report going to both her and Byrum, since there is no deadline for the report to Byrum.

Schiff said that he would forward that preliminary report to Parent and to CC:DA at the same time, as soon as he receives it, and then the committee would need to make suggestions for the final report and vote on it. Then the final version would be sent to Parent and Byrum.

Finally, Schiff said, he wanted to ask the committee how it felt on the question of whether the parts of the report that are notices of differences between ISBD and AACR2 without a recommendation for change in either place should remain in the report. Is that something that the Working Group or the Review Group cares about?

Larsgaard said that her interpretation of the task force's charge was that they were to identify areas in which ISBD(CR) and AACR2 are not in conformance. Further, she interpreted the charge to mean that the task force should *not* suggest revisions to either AACR2 or ISBD(CR), but should try only to point out areas of non-conformance. Larsgaard said that she understood that the task force was charged with saying "here are the areas where ISBD(CR) and AACR2 are different," and then leaving it to the people working on ISBD(CR) and the revised Chapter 12 of AACR2 to decide whether and how these differences should be addressed in their respective documents.

Tillett said that Larsgaard's idea that the task force should report differences between ISBD(CR) and AACR2 to CC:DA so that these could be turned into rule revision proposals to be forwarded eventually to the JSC was a good one, and she encouraged the task force to pursue this. For the report that will be forwarded to the Working Group, however, she suggested that the task force limit its comments to areas in which the draft ISBD(CR) is erroneous or internally inconsistent. She said she would not urge CC:DA to forward an elaborate comparison of ISBD(CR) and AACR2, because that is not what the Working Group is after.

Schiff asked the committee what its feeling was about this. Should the task force pull out all of these comparison comments and reserve them for CC:DA's use?

Larsgaard said that she recalled reading a letter from Byrum in which he said that the Review Group is very much interested in having the various ISBDs in as much conformance as possible with the various national and international cataloging codes, and that is why she had understood that the task force was supposed to notify the Review Group of differences when they are found in a review such as this.

Schiff noted that the cover letter received with the invitation to review stated:

I would also like to point out that the revision to the text was not done only from the ISBD viewpoint. When we started the revision process, one of our key objectives was to harmonize with ISSN and AACR2 standards in order to minimize the bibliographic differences among the three standards to the greatest extent possible.

Tillett said that she would step back from her earlier statement and advise Larsgaard to go ahead and submit the report she had originally intend to send. She was not sure that the working Group would make use of these comparison comments at this point, but she agreed that the task force would be within the guidelines of that letter to identify the differences it had identified.

Harcourt asked whether the committee should follow up at this point on Tillett's suggestion that we look for areas of the report that suggest potential rule interpretations to Chapter 12.

Attig said that these parts of the report were already known to the task force reviewing Chapter 12, so they could be handled in that arena.

Tillett said that she wanted to make two comments of her own on ISBD(CR) for the task force's consideration. One is that the current version of ISBD(CR) is very inconsistent with regard to serials versus integrating resources. She said she wondered if the task force might want to point that out in its comments. Another observation she had was that there are almost no examples for integrating resources. The task force might want to suggest that they provide some.

740. Report of the Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes: Lindlan

[4JSC/ALA/34/Rev]

[4JSC/ALA/34/Rev/ACOC response]

[4JSC/ALA/34/Rev/CCC response]

[4JSC/ALA/34/Rev/LC response]

Task Force Chair Kristin Lindlan reported that the task force had had a very productive meeting the day before, and thanked everyone who had attended the meeting and shared their valuable comments and suggestions.

Lindlan said that the task force had also discussed the LC recommendations at its meeting, so she would be going through the two documents together in her report, and pointing out where the task force agrees with LC on significant points.

Lindlan said that the task force was prepared to issue another report after this conference, and that there would be further points that the task force would need to discuss via e-mail since they did not have time to cover these points in their meeting.

A general comment that Lindlan said she would like to make is that the task force respectfully disagrees with the CCC response that we should postpone putting this appendix into the code until the Format Variations Working Group is finished with its work. The task force's disagreement is based on its feeling that AACR2 is a work-in-progress.

Lindlan said that the task force had looked at the ACOC response, and it would include some examples. This is something the task force will need to do via e-mail, she said. She said they would also redo the chart to reflect the numbering in the appendix itself—the task force had already come to that conclusion by itself. She said they would also shorten the chart based on the changes they had made yesterday.

Lindlan reported that in response to comments from LC and ACOC, the task force agreed that the wording in 21.2 should be left in 21.2, and taken out of the appendix.

Lindlan thanked LC for its extensive comments, and said that the task force agreed with many of them. She said she would not discuss all of these points today, but that they would appear in the task force's next written report.

F.1 The task force will add a scope note about what means “difference” and what means “change.”

F.3B1 The task force does agree with LC that the information on editions more properly belongs in 1.2 than in the appendix. “What is an edition?” really does belong in the body of the rules, so I assume we will draft wording for that?

Schiff indicated that if the task force were willing to do so, the committee would be happy to have them do so.

F.3D1 The task force agrees with LC that the JSC should add to its “to-do list” an examination of 1.4C5. The task force agrees that AACR2 is too cataloging-agency-country-specific in regard to how place of publication is transcribed. The task force hopes that CC:DA also agrees.

F.3D2 The task force also agrees with LC that the JSC should add to its “to-do list” an examination of 1.4D2. The task force agrees that the transcription of the publisher statement in an abbreviated form sometimes confuses catalog users. Lindlan pointed out that there was

recently a discussion on the CONSER listserv about how Springer and Springer Verlag are actually two different publishers, and people were having trouble knowing which was the correct publisher in some cases because catalogers were abbreviating the latter.

Schiff asked the committee to respond to these two suggestions. No one was opposed.

F.3D3b The task force would like a clarification from LC here. The task force believes that there was a cut-and-paste error here. This is the rule that is about single-part*****, and the LC comment uses the term “multipart.”***** The task force suspects that someone cut-and-pasted the wrong term here. The task force would like a comment on what exactly LC is suggesting they do with this.

F.3E4 The task force decided at its meeting that the appendix needed to address the presence versus absence of accompanying material, as well as the difference, and it is planning to add some new wording here.

F.3F The task force agrees with LC on the series wording and definitely likes the idea of addressing presence versus absence first, and then difference, and then the numbering. LC’s wording is what the task force is planning on using in this area.

F.5A1 The task force agrees with LC that the wording on what is a major title change should be in Chapter 21 since the appendix is now totally focused on major differences, and no longer on major and minor changes. The task force also appreciates the fact that this will make the appendix shorter. The task force does plan to make a reference here to 21.2.

F.6C The task force agrees with LC to add this for material- or type-of-publication-specific detail areas. ***** The task force believes this was left out by mistake.

F.7 The task force believes this is a significant proposal, and would like LC to explain the proposal to CC:DA. For years a change in format has been treated as a major change, and the task force feels that more discussion is needed on LC’s proposal. One task force member raised the question “what if we have two formats simultaneously and one of them goes away? We would then have [i.e., need?] two records.” The task force simply thinks this proposal needs more discussion, and is not prepared to comment until it hears more about it. ***** If the committee agrees with the task force, F.7A would be removed.

Schiff asked Tillett if she would like to comment at this point. Tillett said she would comment later.

F.8 The task force agrees with LC that there should be glossary term for “latest entry.”

Lindlan asked Attig if this proposal could be taken on by the Chapter 12 review task force. Attig asked if there was already an entry for “successive entry.” He said the concept was there, but that the term needed to be there for the glossary entry to be justified. He said the Chapter 12 review task force would discuss this.

F.8A1 The task force is going to take out the wording on major/minor changes, and make a see reference to 21.2A.

F.10 The task force is planning to simplify the chart based on the changes it is making, and number it as it is in the appendix.

Lindlan asked the committee for questions or comments.

Nancy Lorimer noted that the task force had identified the musical presentation statement area as a place for major change. She said that this does not always show in the musical presentation statement, but it is in the physical description, and the appendix has not addressed this possibility.

Lindlan noted Lorimer's comment.

Schiff noted that there was much in the LC response that Lindlan had not addressed. Should the committee assume that these were points with which the task force was in agreement?

Lindlan said that for the most part that was the case.

Schiff asked Lindlan if the task force would be able to produce a report for CC:DA by August 15 so that CC:DA could make comments and suggest revisions, allow the task force to revise the report based on these comments, vote on the report, and submit it to the JSC by September 15 for the JSC's review at its mid-October meeting.

Lindlan said that the task force could do that.

Mary Grenci asked if this August 15 report would be expected to include the rule revision proposal for 1.2 that the task force was suggesting.

Schiff replied that that rule revision proposal would need to come to CC:DA as a separate document.

Lindlan noted that it would be hard to decide what the report was going to say in the area relevant to 1.2 without knowing what the rule revision proposal would say.

Schiff suggested that the task force draft the rule revision proposal at the same time it is preparing the report, but submit the rule revision proposal as a separate document to be discussed and voted on separately.

Tillett said that CC:DA would need to respond to the comments that came from the Library Association and the British Library. Tillett suggested that Beacom might be charged with drafting those responses. Schiff concurred, and said that Beacom could discuss ALA's response with Task Force Chair Lindlan.

Beacom noted that these two responses were not listed on the agenda or on CC:DA document checklist.

Schiff confirmed that they had not yet been received.

Tillett said they should be coming to CC:DA soon.

741. Rule revision proposal for 24.1C, Changes of name: Lindlan

[\[CC:DA/TF/Appendix on Major/Minor Changes/4\]](#)

Lindlan said that this proposal had pretty much gone forward as it had been in the previous document. The task force had basically drafted "minor changes to corporate names" based on the existing Library of Congress Rule Interpretation that is in the text of the proposal. Lindlan said that if committee members had comments, they should let the task force know. No comments on this proposal had been received in a long time. She noted that this had been part of an earlier task force report, and that the task force had been asked to remove it and make a separate proposal out of it, but since doing so, no comments had been heard.

Schiff said that a few changes had been made. These were: adding a header to each of the rules ("Minor Changes" — with "Major Changes" in bold as part of the caption), and adding a cross-reference in 24.1C1 that says "see 24.2-24.3."

Attig asked what needed to be done with this document at this point.

Schiff said that CC:DA needed to consider the document now, and decide whether to forward it to the JSC.

Ann Caldwell said that in 24.1C1, section a, with the phrase "the representation of a word or a number and the acronym," it was not entirely clear that this provision would apply to nicknames, such as the International Symposium on Cavitation, which has the nicknames "CAV 99" and "Cavitation 2000." She asked whether the phrase "but not limited to" covered that.

Lindlan said that the intention had been that it would.

Caldwell also pointed out that in section f, when acronyms are dropped out, sometimes different corporate body names sneak in with different sponsorship, but the conference name might stay the same, and it is not clear whether the sponsoring body is still involved. She cited as an example the IEEE Conference on Automation. The IEEE may drop out as a sponsor, but the ACM may actually join in as an additional sponsor.

Schiff said that these examples were taken from the LCRI, and had not been edited by the task force. He asked whether Caldwell wanted the example she had cited to be considered a case where the conference name had changed or had not changed.

David Van Hoy said that one of their concerns had been with the World Health Organization (WHO) example. If WHO is no longer even connected with the conference in any way, should the conference still be entered under International WHO Conference on Health Promotion? A similar concern had to do with the case where the IEEE Conference on Automation sort of "morphs" gradually into an ACM conference by first adding the ACM as sponsor, and then dropping the IEEE as a sponsor. So we are left with the original entry under IEEE even though it is now purely an ACM conference.

Van Hoy said they would like some sort of wording here that indicates that the sponsor is somehow still connected with the conference, even though it is not part of the name.

Lindlan asked whether the solution would be to add a phrase to the effect of "as long as the conference is still sponsored by the same body."

Van Hoy said yes, still sponsored by, or at least still linked with the conference in some way.

Schiff asked if someone would like to suggest some wording that would actually go into this rule.

Attig suggested that " , provided that the body (or bodies) is (are) still associated with the conference" at the end of the text.

Van Hoy said that it should go both ways, that is, it should cover cases where the body is added or dropped from the name, and suggested instead: " , provided that the change does not reflect a change in the sponsorship of the conference."

Hixson moved that CC:DA approve the additional phrase. Larsgaard seconded the motion.

Arakawa asked for clarification on sections e and g. When there is a change in the higher corporate body's name, does that cover both official changes and variants? Is an official change to be considered a minor change?

Schiff said the committee would first vote on the wording change in section f before discussing this further. The vote was 7-0 in favor of adopting the additional wording.

Grenci pointed out that the case in point in these sections was that the lower body's name was being entered directly, and that is why the change in the higher body's name, even if an official change, could be considered minor.

Tillett noted that in CC:DA's own instructions on how to submit a rule revision proposal, there are instructions to add a justification. She suggested that Lindlan add one to this rule revision proposal.

Schiff asked if Beacom would be willing to add this in his cover letter.

Beacom said that he would.

There was no further discussion. Larsgaard moved that CC:DA approve the rule revision at 24.1C as amended. Harcourt seconded the motion. There was no discussion; the vote was 7-0 in favor.

742. Report of the Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources: Jizba

[4JSC/ALA/36]
[4JSC/ALA/36/ACOC response]
[4JSC/ALA/36/BL response]
[4JSC/ALA/36/CCC response]
[4JSC/ALA/36/LA response]
[4JSC/ALA/36/LC response]
[\[CC:DA/Larsgaard/2001/1\]](#)
[\[CC:DA/MAGERT/2001/2\]](#)

Jizba said that she would read through her task force's report, and then invite discussion afterwards.

Jizba said that the report she was reading was a report of the task force meeting that had been held on Saturday. There were 17 attendees. Because some of the JSC members had responded to the original recommendations in the task force's report, and some had responded only to the proposed rule changes, it became difficult to look at the JSC responses. She therefore had re-written the report to include the five original points.

1. **Eliminate Area 3.** In the Saturday meeting, the task force agreed that it continued to support elimination of Area 3. 5 of the JSC responses agreed with the task force and with CC:DA on this point.
2. **Continue with the existing footnote, with the new option to use Area 5 for remote resources, versus the text instructions to use Area 7 exclusively for remote resources.** The task force can say that it has no objections to doing this. The Library of Congress compromise is to continue with the footnote—now changed to be an optional footnote—allowing Area 5 description for electronic resources by remote access. LC's compromise would: a) support the status quo of no Area 5 description for remote resources in the text, while b) simultaneously supporting the optional choice, which is to describe remote resources in Area 5 via the footnote. The LC compromise accommodates the cartographic material community.

Four JSC members agreed with the original task force and CC:DA proposal to move Area 3 to Area 7.

So, the advantages of going with the Library of Congress compromise are that it enables the cartographic materials community to use area 5 and it also enables other formats and chapters to employ Area 5.

Other considerations are that currently there is no conventional or prescribed terminology in either category for describing remote resources. The focal point of guidance and development would then best be shifted to other chapters where use would be more immediate and practical. However, the task force has heard repeatedly during this conference from music catalogers that other communities are not ready to do this.

The SMD becomes at least one of the focal points for the content and carrier debate, since the terms conveying embedded content would be present with carrier terms, and terms conveying both content and carrier in one single word would also be in use. Since the SMD serves multiple user communities, multiple tables of precedents—a type of case law—may potentially be invoked at some point in the future. But we cannot predict the future, and, alternatively, other options may become apparent.

3. **The use of prescribed SMDs versus conventional terms.** Overwhelmingly, task force discussion supported the notion that: a) at the present time, users and library staff do not understand prescribed terms as well as they understand commonly used conventional terms, and that b) electronic resources terminology is changing faster than the rule revision process can keep up with it.

Because of that, the task force and its audience voted overwhelmingly to support the use of common, conventional terms now. Among JSC members, 2 members agreed with CC:DA and this task force (ACOC and BL), one member (LC) would use prescribed terminology in the short run, and conventional terms in the long run—in Saturday's meeting, the task force saw no point in this, and two members would retain prescribed terms (CCC and LA).

4. **Notes.** The Library of Congress would agree to add examples for notes in two cases, and the task force would be happy to supply those examples. Three JSC members supported the recommendation to state explicitly that complex accompanying materials be described in the notes. Three JSC members support the concept of making instructions about notes to in effect have catalogers emphasize specific notes and to avoid redundancy. But CCC, BL, and ACOC would place this in a conceptual chapter, which is fine with the task force.
5. **Summaries and added guidance.** The task force and its audience voted to continue to support more guidance in summary note construction in the rules. If we can supply revised summary note instructions for Chapter 1, that would be up to CC:DA. Two JSC members (LC and ACOC) also noted that the place to add new summary note examples would be at the beginning of the rules because multiple chapters are involved.

Schiff asked the committee if there was agreement on issue #1, that Area 3 should be eliminated.

The committee indicated that there was agreement.

Schiff asked Jizba to draft a rule revision proposal for this.

Jizba stated that the task force had already done this, and the proposal had gone through the JSC process and received comments on where it needed to be revised. Jizba said the task force would revise it accordingly.

Schiff asked if there was discussion on issue #2. He noted that there were responses on this issue from MAGERT, and asked Betsy Mangan and Larsgaard whether their concerns had been answered.

Larsgaard said that they had, and thanked the task force and LC for the special attention they had been paying to cartographic materials. Larsgaard said that she supported the task force's statement that SMD revisions should be shifted to the specific format communities as they are needed. She added that it would be a poor idea for MAGERT to try to incorporate this into the Chapter 3 work that is being carried out now, and suggested that they begin to focus on it early next year.

Schiff asked if MAGERT had gotten its question about how to handle maps on CD-ROMs answered.

Mangan said that at Schottlaender's suggestion, MAGERT had decided to treat these as analogous to “__ maps on __ sheets” and not request special attention to this situation in Chapter 9 at this time.

Schiff asked the committee if it agreed that the task force should write a rule revision proposal prescribing the use of the optional footnote. The committee indicated that it agreed, and Schiff charged the task force with doing so.

Schiff asked the committee if it agreed that conventional terminology should be used in Area 5.

Nancy Lorimer said that in the list of options that are given for SMDs, such things as a DVD are listed here as electronic resources, where, if the DVD carried an opera or a movie, it would not be cataloged according to Chapter 9. This could be confusing. If catalogers see DVD listed here, they might think that a DVD must be described using the rules in Chapter 9.

The committee indicated that they agreed that the task force should write a rule revision proposal prescribing the use of conventional terminology.

Lorimer pointed out that “conventional terminology” will vary among description communities. She suggested that inclusion of “DVD” as a conventional term in Chapter 9 was not appropriate in that, if it is indeed a conventional term, its meaning for most people is the carrier of moving images, not computer files.

Schiff asked the committee if it agreed that the task force should supply examples for LC per issue #4.

The committee indicated that it agreed. Schiff so charged the task force.

Schiff asked the committee if it agreed that the task force should suggest summary note examples for Chapter 1.

The committee indicated that it agreed.

Schiff so charged the task force. He asked if the task force could accomplish all of this by August 15.

Jizba said that it could.

743. Report of the Task Force on the Rule of Three: Arakawa

[4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up]

[4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/LA response]

[4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/LC response]

[[CC:DA/TF/Rule of Three/3](#)]

Task Force Chair Steven Arakawa began his report by thanking the members of the task force. Arakawa said that at its 13-15 September London meeting, JSC instructed ACOC to revise the proposal to develop option 2. 4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC/follow-up is the revised proposal, and that’s what his task force was reporting on.

Arakawa said that Part I of the report said that the task force was nearly unanimous in recommending that the JSC should reconsider option 3. Part II comments on the report of ACOC as it stands. The underlying theme of Part I is that the task force believes that the case can be made for option 3, although the case for option 2 is not without merit. The LA appears to agree with the task force’s point of view on this. The point is that the cost/benefit of the temporary status quo needs further justification.

Arakawa said he thought in retrospect that it might have been better if the JSC had designated one constituent group to work out the implications of option 2, as ACOC has done, and another constituent group to work out the implications of option 3, and then compare both for the effect on logic and consistency, explanatory force, and effect on workflow. The task force obviously believes that the latter exercise still ought to be done. The potential benefit is that if the exercise demonstrates that the rules can be translated to option 3 successfully—in other words, without uncovering problems in logic, consistency, clarity of articulation, and insurmountable workflow problems—then we will have advanced the general revision of Chapter 21 ahead of time. If it turns out that there are indeed problems with the option 3 approach, we know that option 2 has already been successfully developed, and could be utilized, with some tweaking, almost immediately. More importantly, the exercise would still contribute, perhaps at an even more valuable level, to our understanding of what is at stake in a complete revision of Chapter 21. The

sooner we understand what problems arise in applying the Delsey questioning of the rule of three to a revision of Chapter 21, the better off we will be.

The underlying theme of Part II is selective access and cataloger judgment. The submission of this report was delayed in part because of the discussion over selective access, which gained even more focus with the LC response to the ACOC document. Like LC, the task force had problems with the phrase “any or all.” LC’s position, however, would transform the option from selective access beyond the default rule to requiring total access when that option is elected. The task force position, on the other hand, is that the strength and value of the option is its selectivity. One of the first things the task force noted in the ACOC document, in fact, was that none of the examples brought out the selective aspect of the option. It was as if the new rule said one thing, and the examples had decided in advance to follow the LC response. The task force’s modification of the ACOC phrase and the examples it suggested were concerned to bring out, rather than to suppress, selectivity and cataloger judgment.

Although the task force did not have much time to review the LC response, and this in fact delayed submission of the report to some extent, when Arakawa put it to the group whether it still supported the selective aspect of the option, the majority responded positively. One member commented that he “did not find LC’s reasons for using ‘all’ in the options to be persuasive. The point about consistency in shared databases is questionable in that different levels of cataloging that are accepted in such databases already have greater impact on consistency than the optional selective transcription would have. We are talking about possible variation that could occur above and beyond a high level of consistency that has already been reached. In other words, all that is necessary to satisfy the requirements of the basic rule would be present. It is also not clear that the ‘all-or-nothing approach’ is any easier to apply. A cataloger is going to have to make a judgment about whether or not to apply the option, and a decision to do some, but not all, is not necessarily any more onerous than a decision to do all. The application of an ‘all’ option could certainly be more wasteful of time and resources when ‘some’ is what is really desired. In any case, cataloging agencies can establish policies on when and how to apply the options, and it may be appropriate for a national agency to decide that ‘all’ is best in a shared context—a choice that would be possible if the options use the word ‘any’ ... I would also question what the ‘all’ approach might mean for sound recordings and moving image materials. LCRI 21.29D provides detailed guidance on making selective added entries that may go beyond the rule of three for sound recordings and audiovisual materials. However, the application of these instructions in some cases still falls far short of ‘all,’ particularly with regard to performers. The intent of rule 21.29D is to allow additional *selected* added entries in any given catalog beyond those prescribed in 21.30, and the ‘all’ approach would seem to contradict this rule.”

In the context of the ACOC report as it stands, Arakawa said, the question is whether, as an option, the increased flexibility and reliance on cataloger judgment, as implied in the option language, is to be supported by CC:DA. Both the task force’s and LC’s reports bring out the significant implication, although they appear to come at it from different points of view. In the context of the task force’s recommendation in Part I, this perhaps raises one final question, that is, seen as an option, as in the ACOC report, i.e., as a supplement to the default rules, the selectivity aspect does not have to be framed by all kinds of qualifying rules and sub-rules. But, if what was the option became the default rule, simplicity and clarity seem to argue for something close to LC’s position on the option language, ironically. In the task force’s proposal, the default instruction would be to make added entries for all. But even here, the task force includes the option to be selective. Perhaps selectivity and cataloger judgment always need to be the optional, rather than the default, rule. But the task force was not in favor of losing these aspects, even at the option level, whether the committee accepts the approach articulated by the ACOC document, or the alternative approach suggested by the task force.

Schiff asked whether CC:DA wished to support the opinion of the task force that the third option, which the JSC decided not to support, was the way to go, or whether the JSC should commission another group to do that, and compare the two.

Larsgaard, who was a member of the task force, said she was in agreement with the task force report. She said she believed that Arakawa's suggestion that the task force suggest to the JSC that they commission a group to do with option 3 what ACOC had done with option 2 made a great deal of sense.

Schiff took a straw poll of everyone in the room to determine if there was agreement that this alternative approach not taken by ACOC should be investigated further. The straw poll indicated that there was agreement.

Arakawa said that in addition to the specific changes the task force was suggesting, he would like to know whether the modification of the key phrase which in ACOC is "Optionally, make additional added entries under the heading for any or all," and which the task force modified to "Optionally, make additional added entries under the heading for any other" has continuing support among committee members.

Lorimer said that catalogers of sound recordings do like to make extra added entries selectively, and that the recommendation of the task force was in line with what catalogers of sound recordings were already doing. Lorimer said that LC's "all or nothing" approach was quite frightening, and would result in less access to sound recordings, because most institutions would pick nothing.

Hixson pointed out that in many institutions, it was impossible to give complete access to all performers, etc., especially given the extra authority work required by doing so. Hixson said that she agreed with Lorimer that LC's "all or nothing" approach was not helpful. She said that the LC approach was in discord with the PCC. The PCC has stressed cataloger judgment over and over again, and now one of the most important areas of cataloger judgment is being threatened by the LC proposal. She said that she was happy with the ACOC proposal as it was.

Tillett said that she agreed with Hixson. She said that she personally disagreed with the LC stance. She said she also wanted to clear up the misconception that the LC proposal was "all or nothing." In fact, she said the LC proposal is "all or rule of three," so it recommends access as we have always given in AACR.

Attig said that he thought judgment should be the basic principle here.

Schiff asked whether there would still be an option to transcribe the first named author followed by ellipses, or was the task force recommending that the transcription rule be changed irrespective of what we do with access points.

Arakawa said that his understanding was that we were tinkering with the transcription rules to account for the situations where we were going to make additional added entries.

Schiff asked for confirmation that under option 3, the default rule would be to transcribe all parties listed, and the option would be to omit names selectively.

Arakawa confirmed that that was true.

Schiff asked if, under option 3, the rules for entry would allow the cataloger who has transcribed all names to be selective about which ones to make added entries for.

Arakawa said he believed that they would.

Lorimer pointed out that not all added entries are justified in the statement of responsibility. Some are justified by notes. In the examples for sound recordings in the task force's document, there are multitudinous performers in the statement of responsibility, whereas in sound recording cataloging practice, these would actually appear in notes, according to 6.1F1.

Schiff asked Lorimer if she would be willing to supply an alternative example.

Lorimer said that she would, or would supply corrections.

Lorimer said that she also wanted to point out that in 21.19C1 (Writer's works set by several composers), the rule of three is not explicitly mentioned, but in the example for multiple composer added entries, there are five composers listed, but added entries for only two of them. This one example seems to have been missed in putting in the optionality phrase.

Schiff summarized what had been decided so far: CC:DA would suggest to the JSC that it reconsider option 3, and would tell it that CC:DA is willing to do the work of preparing proposed revisions to Chapters 1 and 21 if the JSC agrees.

Schiff asked the task force whether it had an opinion on LC's suggestion that you don't need to have an option everywhere—you just need to have it in the beginning, and then you just give examples everywhere else.

Arakawa said that the task force had not had time to discuss this.

Schiff asked the committee how it felt about the LC proposal in this regard. Did it like LC's approach to this better than ACOC's and the task force's approach?

Hixson said she didn't know whether she liked it better, but she thought it was an acceptable approach.

Lindlan asked whether CC:DA had ever discussed whether the PCC core record approach of making added entries in some cases without justifying notes was acceptable.

Hixson said she was glad Lindlan had mentioned that. That is indeed true of the core standard, and she had been wondering how that was sitting with catalogers.

Bob Maxwell said that this had come up in the task force and had been discussed, but as Maxwell had pointed out at that time, that is not AACR2's stance, and we need to work within the framework of AACR2 for this. He also pointed out that the core record standard does depart explicitly from AACR2 in allowing non-justified added entries to be made.

Lindlan said she wondered whether we were creating problems for ourselves by not addressing the idea of core records in the code if an increasing number of catalogers were creating core records.

Schiff summarized that the committee had agreed that it prefers the optional rule in each place, but could live with the LC alternative of just listing it in the beginning.

Arakawa pointed out that the task force did have problems with the language of the option.

Schiff asked if the CC:DA could say it agreed with LC's comments on punctuation, missing commas, etc.

Arakawa said the task force agreed with these.

Schiff pointed out one more error that LC had not caught. It is on page 10, number 2, of the ACOC proposal that the task force is commenting on. In the example for Vertebral paleontology of Australasia, Schiff said he believes we would not transcribe the colon after "editors"—that should be changed to a comma.

The committee and task force agreed.

Schiff asked Arakawa to get the report, with revisions decided upon today, and Lorimer's corrections and examples, to the Committee by August 15.

Tillett said that it would be helpful to the JSC if the two different preferences in Parts I and II were not both included in the final report. She said CC:DA could give Beacom a fallback position if it wished, but this did not need to be included as part of the report.

Arakawa said that in that case, the task force would formally submit the first part, and would revise Part II and give it Beacom as a suggested fallback position.

Tillett said that she wanted to put this in a broader perspective by saying that the JSC is still working on a strategic plan of how it is addressing all of these things. This amounts to tweaking the rules as a result of one of the suggestions from Tom Delsey, and unfortunately, the JSC had jumped right into this because it had wanted to show action on all of the Toronto Conference recommendations. In hindsight, Tillett said, this was probably a bad decision,

because it would be better first to have a broader perspective of where we are heading with the rules in general. She said the strategic plan would definitely be on the agenda in Ottawa, and this definitely will be revisited by the JSC once it has a longer range view.

Schiff said that he wanted to thank the task force for doing an extraordinary job of justifying its recommendations and clarifying the other various recommendations.

Arakawa asked whether Beacom had a deadline for the fallback position, now that the full report would not be due on August 15.

Beacom said that October 1 would be fine.

744. Report from the Task Force on the Review of *Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals: Attig*

[4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/2]

[4JSC/Chair/68/Chair follow-up/2/LC response/LC rep response/ALA response/ALA follow-up]

Task Force Chair John Attig said that the JSC had done a phenomenal amount of work on the Chapter 12 proposals at its last meeting in April, thanks in great part to the great work Judy Kuhagen of LC did in laying out in tabular form all of the different proposals that were in play on each individual rule. The JSC worked through all of that and made decisions on everything, and very quickly produced a new clean copy of the chapter. It is very clean, so the task force will have very few editorial comments, but will be looking at that.

In the course of its discussions, the task force had come up with two substantive issues that it wanted to raise at this meeting. In Part I of the document, page 7, rule 12.0A1, paragraph 2, the task force questions whether the inclusion of “or non-serial cartographic material (e.g., map series)” is appropriate. The task force recommends removing it.

Mangan said that MAGERT agreed that this could be removed. It was CCC’s idea to add this.

The second substantive issue is on page 1-9, rule 12.0B2, paragraph 2. “Use the colophon as the chief source of information for an oriental nonroman script resource if the colophon contains ...” This rule also appears in Chapter 2, and that would also be affected by the change that the task force was recommending.

Attig said that in an earlier iteration of Chapter 12, it was suggested that the word “oriental” was inappropriate and should be removed from the code, and that this was a good opportunity to do so. He said this was suggested by one member of the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging, or perhaps by LC, and he didn’t know if CC:AAM had discussed or not, but it did seem that the word “oriental” was inappropriate.

What Attig was less clear about, he said, was what language should replace it.

Schiff asked if Attig had been in touch with the CC:AAM liaison to CC:DA.

Attig said that he had not. The liaison was not present at the meeting, but Attig said he would contact her as soon as he got back from this conference. He also added that this had been discussed at one point by the JSC, but there were problems with the suggested replacement wording. He said he believed also that the term is seen as potentially offensive in the U.S., but not in Britain or Australia.

Tillett confirmed that this was an accurate statement of what had happened to this suggestion at the JSC.

Attig said that the feeling in the U.S. is strong enough that we probably do want to raise it again. Attig said they would work with some other groups and try to come up with alternative wording.

Beacom said that he wondered why this rule was restricted to oriental nonroman scripts in the first place.

Chopey said that he didn't know if this was true in Near Eastern languages (which "oriental" might have been meant to include here), but in East Asian language publications, the colophon usually is the source of the fullest bibliographic information, so this rule was probably originally meant to provide a justification for treating the colophon as the chief source of information in most cases, i.e., cases where the publication was not set up to look like a western language publication (which sometimes is also the case, hence the need for the qualifications here).

Beacom said he thought maybe this rule should be more specific—that is, it should list by name whatever languages it was meant to cover.

Schiff said it was probably impracticable to list all of them.

Beacom asked, what is the "them" here? Why can't we just say "nonroman scripts?"

Attig said that this was really the question here. What "oriental" languages are we talking about. He said his guess was that it was originally meant to include only East Asian languages.

Schiff suggested that Attig talk to CC:AAM to get the background on this rule.

Attig said that he would.

Lindlan pointed out to Attig that the footnote here also contained the word "oriental."

Schiff asked when CC:DA would hear next from the task force.

Attig said that August 15 would be a good deadline for completing its task.

745. Report from ALA Publishing Services: Donald E. Chatham, Associate Executive Director

CC:DA Chair Adam Schiff introduced Don Chatham, Associate Executive Director at ALA Publishing Services, to give a report on the status of the 2001 Amendments package.

Chatham said that he would speak on the topic of the 2001 Amendments package, the concept of the annual editions, and ALA Publishing's thoughts about a marketing campaign to position AACR2 as the best resource for cataloging the Web or online cataloging.

The 2001 Amendments package is moving along, Chatham reported. ALA Publishing received the JSC's comments on the typeset pages on Friday, June 15, and will incorporate those into another pass and return those to the JSC for review. The index is a revised index that incorporates the new amendments. ALA Publishing will issue that revised index with the amendments package. Chatham said he believed this would be the first time that had ever been done.

The index is now out to the national libraries, Chatham said, so as that comes back, and as ALA Publishing goes through the final editing of the amendments on the pages themselves, they and the JSC will hopefully converge, and ALA Publishing will be able to publish. It is now looking like the final release of the 2001 Amendments in printed form will happen in the early part of August, Chatham said. ALA Publishing will issue them in print only. The expectation now is that the package, including the index, will be priced at \$15.00.

ALA Publishing will then sell new copies of the hard-copy version and the soft-cover version [of AACR2R] with the 1999 Amendments and the 2001 Amendments shrink-wrapped as a package. So each time a new AACR2 is ordered, what the customer will receive is either the hard-bound or soft-bound version, plus a shrink-wrapped set of the 1999 and 2001 Amendments. This package will sell for \$65.00 for the soft-cover and \$90.00 for the hard-cover, which is to say \$10.00 more than the current price of each of those versions.

At the time of these releases, Chatham said, because of the convergence to the 2002 annual edition, ALA Publishing is planning to issue a press release so that it is clear that in July 2002, it expects to have another fully integrated version, or revision, of AACR2. This is just so that

buyers will know that less than a year later, there will be a new revision, so to speak. At that time, Chatham said, ALA Publishing also wants to start launching the marketing campaign for AACR2 as the primary resource for online cataloging.

ALA Publishing's expectation is to publish a completely revised edition of AACR2—incorporating all of the amendments to that point—every year, preferably in July in order to supply copies for classroom situations. They will also issue a separate amendments package for whatever amendments have been issued between editions, probably with a revised index. The plan now is to make that separate amendments package available only on the Web as a downloadable pdf file, at a relatively nominal cost.

One of the questions that ALA Publishing has is whether, when the new format starts in 2002, should it issue a separate amendments package for the amendments that might be in place at that time? That question is open for suggestions. One of the thoughts ALA Publishing has is that, since it is launching a new format at that time, it would like as many people as possible to convert to that new format and embrace it, so it is thinking it might not offer a separate Amendments package at that time. It *would* offer a separate Amendments package in each subsequent year, but not in that first year. But this is open to consideration. ALA Publishing welcomes any thoughts or opinions on this. Another argument for not issuing a separate set of amendments in 2002 is that this would be the third set of amendments that would have to be incorporated, which could get complicated for AACR2 owners.

Attig asked if there would be a major change in format. In other words, would the size and hole punching be so different that you really could not incorporate the new separate amendments into an older edition?

Chatham said no, the two formats would be exactly the same.

In that case, Attig said, he thought there would be an advantage to issuing the 2002 amendments also as a separate package.

Chatham noted Attig's comment, and said that the issue did not have to be decided at the present, and that he would appreciate any comments as time goes by.

Attig asked if the 2001 Amendments would be issued via the Web.

Chatham said that that package would be issued only in print, because of the size and magnitude of that package.

Chatham said that ALA Publishing was planning to issue the annual editions in an 8 ½ x 11 format, and to drill it with 5 holes so that it can accommodate either a 3-ring or a 5-ring binder. The plan is to make those holes standard holes, so that someone could purchase any binder at a Walgreen's if they so chose, and insert the text block. They would also make available for sale, for anyone who so chose, an embossed deluxe folder. ALA Publishing still needs to work out the specifications on the holes for the international community, and it is looking into that now. So it is possible that the text would have to be issued in two versions, but the hope is that it can drill the holes in such a way that one version is usable by all.

ALA Publishing's expectation is that the cost of that loose-leaf text block will be about the same as the cost of the soft-cover version now, but this is yet to be determined. They expect to have shorter print run for each annual edition, so the costs could be higher. It will only be available in an 8 ½ x 11 loose-leaf format as of 2002, with replaceable pages. There will be no more soft-cover and no more hard-cover version—only loose-leaf.

Chatham reported that ALA Publishing is also sensitive to the issue of how the new title will be worded. They are thinking of calling it the "AACR2 2002 Revision, AACR2 2003 Revision, AACR2 2004 Revision," etc., but if that is a problem, he invites CC:DA to communicate that.

Chatham said that there would be several advantages to the new format. These would include heavier-stock paper, larger and reinforced holes for easy flipping, and a fully integrated text that would be a full reflection of the electronic text.

ALA Publishing's expectation is that a good portion of catalogers will buy one of those annual editions and then supplement it for a period of time, maybe 2-3 years. It is running a market survey now at the ALA Store [at this convention] to get a sense of how catalogers would respond to the new format. The results so far seem to be that catalogers endorse the idea, and expect to keep an edition for 2-3 years, updating it each year with the supplements.

ALA Publishing's plan is to issue replacement pages, and where necessary, to add pagination such as 2a, 2b, 2c, etc., rather than re-paginate every page.

At Ann Huthwaite's suggestion, ALA Publishing will launch an extensive, broad-based, enthusiastic campaign that will carry three or four message points about the validity and the value of AACR2 as the source for online cataloging, Web cataloging, etc. So ALA Publishing would like to work with JSC catalogers and other catalogers to explore what is the best way to present these message points, what are the effective sound bytes that will catch the attention of the marketplace, and then go out and launch a campaign to position AACR2 in that regard. ALA Publishing's marketing department will be working with Brian Schottlaender, Barbara Tillett, and Matthew Beacom to get some content that they can then turn into advertising copy to be disseminated via online ads, brochures, e-mail, etc. It expects to start this whole campaign at around the same time that the 2001 Amendments go out, so, fall of 2001 or spring of 2002.

Ed Glazier suggested that the word "compilation" might be better than "revision" for the annual edition, because to him "2002 Revision" suggests that it is all new, which obviously is not the case.

Chatham said that the wording "1998 revision" was chosen to convey the idea that the text was the same as the 1988 edition, except that new amendments had been incorporated, so he wondered if, to the extent that that was a precedent, new wording would confuse the marketplace.

Laurel Jizba said that the use of "revision" in the context that ALA Publishing was proposing to use it was a non-standard usage of the English-language definition of the term.

Chatham said that ALA Publishing would continue to solicit comments and suggestions on this matter.

Mary Greci asked when the next amendments package would be issued.

Chatham replied that the 2001 Amendments would be issued in the summer of 2001.

Greci asked whether this package would include the seriality revisions.

Tillett said that those would not be released until 2002, and pointed out that it might be temporarily a little bit confusing since the JSC had been referring to their amendments packages by numbers, and now they were being referred to here with their publication years (different from the year in which they were approved by the JSC).

Schiff added that the 2002 Amendments would have to be given to ALA Publishing by the JSC by February 2002.

Chatham said that one more thing to consider about the idea of an annual edition is that, if the JSC were to miss the February deadline, the publication of the next annual edition in July of that year would go forward even if new amendments would not be added. It is also conceivable, Chatham said, that there would be a year in which there were no amendments approved by the JSC, in which case a new annual edition would nevertheless be issued.

Schiff asked Chatham to talk about the possibility that there would be an AACR2 Web site.

Chatham said that there was a technicality that was holding up this idea. ALA Publishing considers the JSC Web site a working Web site for a group called the JSC, which happens to be part of the AACR fund. To the extent that the AACR2 Web site goes out as the official Web site of a body, that body assumes responsibility for what is on that Web site. So if there are any

copyright infringements or libel, the person holding the copyright is subject to action on those issues. The AACR fund could be sued, so theoretically it needs to protect that possibility by establishing rights to the AACR2 site, and if John Attig were the one that was going to be putting content on this Web site, Attig would need to have a contract with the AACR fund warranting that everything he puts up is original and not libelous and will not harm anyone, etc., and that will indemnify the fund should any action take place. So that is why the Committee of Principals could not simply authorize that this site was under the copyright of the three publishers.

At the Committee of Principals meeting, the question also came up, do we really need an AACR2 site? What would be on it if not the work of the JSC? The consensus was that there could be information on the site about the fund and the three publishers, etc. It could also put promotional materials, information about price changes, links to other sites (like the JSC site), etc. But they would not plan to update the site often.

The site will be created, Chatham reported. He told Beacom that Ann Huthwaite or someone from the Committee of Principals would be contacting him to see if he had any ideas for the direction of this site.

Schiff asked whether the site would be active before Midwinter 2002.

Chatham said that the hope was that it would.

Schiff asked if there was any progress on making AACR2 available via the Web.

Chatham said that ALA Publishing has been examining this in terms of economic feasibility. They are now in the phase of investigating the possibility. He mentioned that the Library of Congress is investigating the feasibility of making Cataloger's Desktop available via the Web.

746. Report from the MARBI Representative: Watson

Mark R. Watson, MARBI Representative to CC:DA, presented a report of actions taken at the two MARBI meetings that have taken place so far during 2001 Annual. He said that most of the business on this conference's agenda has been done. There are 8 proposal documents and 8 discussion papers. He said he would report on the proposals that MARBI has taken action on, and not get into the discussion papers. He distributed a summary report with a description of each discussion paper and the URL, so that members can follow up on these if they are interested.

The final version of Watson's MARBI report is available at <http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ccda/marbi106.html>

Schiff thanked Watson for his excellent report.

747. Report from the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

CC:DA Webmaster reported on the reorganized CC:DA document distribution site, in which the most recent documents are listed, and documents are also listed in their series. He asked if there were any comments or suggestions for improvements. He said he had reorganized it because he was also maintaining the JSC Website, and that was the way they had wanted it organized.

Several committee members expressed their appreciation for Attig's work and said they were very satisfied with the way the site was organized.

Glazier said that he also wanted to thank Schiff for initiating the electronic distribution of documents, and particularly the creation of the meeting agenda with links to the documents.

Lincicum said that it would be very helpful if we could have a version of the agenda on the internal site.

Attig said he would see if he could do this. He said that he had been putting up some of the more complex documents, such as the minutes, in HTML, so he could do cross-linking, and he had decided he would also put up a pdf version for printing. He said he hoped committee

members were finding this useful. Technically, you could do all the functionality in a pdf document, but it's a little bit easier to set it up in HTML.

Schiff said it appears that we are now getting most, if not all, of the other constituents' documents electronically, and asked Attig if that was correct.

Attig said that that was correct.

Finally, Attig said, he wondered if anyone had noticed that when he puts the complex documents up in pdf, he adds thumbnails and tables of contents in a bookmark page. Was he wasting his time doing this, or were members finding this useful? He said a lot of effort was involved in doing this.

The committee indicated that this was very useful, and thanked Attig for continuing to do this.

Schiff thanked Attig again for all of his efforts.

The committee and attendees gave Attig a long round of applause.

747a. Additional item: Mary Grenci

Schiff said that he was inserting a small item into the agenda. He said he would call on Mary Grenci to report on what she had learned from the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging (CSSC) on the idea that had been proposed in Saturday's meeting about the possibility of doing some programming on the new Chapter 12.

Grenci said that she had spoken to most of the members of the committee, even though the committee had not yet met during this conference. They would be meeting this afternoon, but this meeting was to be a presentation, not a business meeting.

She said she had spoken to the incoming chair, John Radencich. She said that there did seem to be general agreement that CSSC wanted to do something, and it would like to co-sponsor it with CC:DA. Also, it agreed that it would like to do an institute in the future, and also co-sponsor that. There were concerns about the time frame of things. One of them was whether the Amendments package was actually going to be published on time.

Schiff said that they could probably assume that it would be published on time, which would mean after Annual in 2002.

Grenci reported that there was also concern about the timeline of the utilities' implementing of the amendments. It did not want to give too detailed instructions before the utilities implemented the new rules. But it could do program, and not do the institute until after the implementation. As for the timeline of the institute, it would want it to be closer to fall 2002, rather than at the next Annual in 2003.

There was also concern that the Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (SCCTP) might already be planning something like this, so the CSSC did not want to embark on something like this without talking to SCCTP first.

Finally, since CSSC had not actually met and voted on this, it did want to have a brief e-mail conversation after the conference before Grenci could say anything definite.

Schiff asked the committee if CC:DA was interested, and said the next question would be whether CC:DA would be co-sponsors in name only, or actually help organize the program.

Grenci said that CSSC was hoping to have CC:DA help organize the event.

Schiff told the committee that it should be prepared to get a call to organize a task force, and be ready to organize this on a tight schedule.

Attig said that for an institute, something should be done soon, but as for a program at Annual 2002, something would need to be done right at this conference.

Grenci said that there was a form available at the ALCTS booth, so if we know that we are interested in doing this as a joint venture, we can fill out a form and submit it at this conference.

Schiff said he would be willing to sign the form right away, and Grenici said that she could get Radencich's signature also.

Larsgaard was asked to present the proposal to the ALCTS Program Committee at this conference, as Schiff and Grenici had commitments to be at other meetings during the time the Program Committee was meeting. Larsgaard agreed to present the proposal.

748. Timetable for proposals to CC:DA: Larsgaard

[\[CC:DA/Larsgaard/2001/2\]](#)

[\[Committee Procedures\]](#)

[\[How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA\]](#)

Schiff said that this item had come out of discussions that the committee had had at Midwinter about the problem of getting documents just before conferences, and a discussion about what to do about that. Mary Larsgaard graciously agreed at Midwinter to draft a proposed change to deal with the issues of timing of documents.

Larsgaard said that the document was very brief and, she hoped, straightforward. She said that she was suggesting that CC:DA revise its instructions on how to submit a rule change proposal to CC:DA, so that there will indeed be a timetable. She said that she had included proposed language, and was more than happy to have it improved any way that the committee saw fit.

Larsgaard's first suggestion is that rule revision proposals be submitted to the chair of CC:DA no later than six weeks prior to the next CC:DA meeting at Midwinter or Annual. She asked the committee if it agreed that six weeks was better than the current one month that the JSC has for its documents. She said that one of the reasons she thought a longer time frame was appropriate was because of the heavy workload that CC:DA Webmaster Attig has. She said that Attig has been doing such beautiful work for the committee that he deserves as much support as we can give him.

Schiff noted that the current requirement for getting an item on the agenda of a CC:DA meeting is also six weeks, so Larsgaard's proposal would bring those two requirements into alignment. Schiff also suggested that the wording be changed to "... no less than six weeks prior to the next CC:DA meeting at the ALA Annual or Midwinter meetings ... posted on the CC:DA Web site at least one month prior to the next CC:DA meeting."

Attig noted that the proposed revision was to a document that is for external use. He asked whether we were intending to apply the same timeline to our own task forces and other internal documentation. Obviously, he said, we cannot apply this timeline to JSC documents—when we get them we have to deal with them.

Larsgaard said that one of her thoughts on that was that when a task force report includes rule change proposals, it should probably follow this.

Schiff said that it would up to the CC:DA chair to look at the timeline when it is expected that a report will include rule revision proposals, and set the deadline accordingly. Also, some discretion will have to be exercised, because there are times when we have to work very fast.

Larsgaard agreed, and noted that the language here was "should," so some discretion was built in.

Schiff suggested that in the second sentence "the proposals" be changed to "such proposals."

Lindlan pointed out that in the CC:DA procedures, there was the statement in IX.B "Documentation pertinent to the deliberations of the Committee shall be sent to the Chair early enough ...". She asked whether we wanted to consider making that more specific.

Larsgaard said that although it was not part of her charge (which was to revise the document "How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA"), Attig had already suggested this to her,

and her response had been, “why don’t I first try to change ‘How to Submit ...,’ and work on the procedures after that.”

Schiff said there were a number of places where the procedures needed revision, and this was just one of them. He said for now, we will focus on the document Larsgaard is charged with revising.

Hixson moved that CC:DA amend the document “How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA” per Larsgaard’s suggestions and the wording agreed upon in this discussion. Kinney seconded the motion. The vote was 7-0 in favor.

Attig said that he hated to raise this point, but he just realized that this page is part of the ALCTS Website. He asked whether we had run it through the formal approval process.

Some members replied that we had.

Attig asked if we needed to do that again to change it.

Schiff said he find out at tomorrow’s CCS Executive Board meeting.

Schiff said he wanted to speak a little bit about the procedures now, because in places they don’t agree with what we do now. In V.B, for example, it says that parties must submit a *written* request—does this include e-mail?

The committee indicated that it believed e-mail was included here.

In VI.C, it talks about non-voting members of task forces. Schiff said that he didn’t believe there ever really is such a thing.

In IX.A, it says the secretary shall take the minutes, but the committee does not have a secretary. It has interns that are charged with doing that. Also, the minutes are never distributed two months after the meeting. IX.B talks about distributing “copies,” and this has mostly been done away with. IX.E talks about “Gopher Submission Guidelines.”

Attig suggested that this might be a lovely task for the outgoing CC:DA chair.

Schiff said that he would be willing to suggest some replacement language some time before Midwinter

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

GODORT Liaison Aimée Quinn said that GODORT would like some guidance on an issue that it did not know was going to be an issue until midnight last night. She said that ALA had contacted GODORT and told them that Senator Lieberman’s bill is suddenly a hot potato. He issued a bill some time ago asking for the appointment of a “chief information officer” for the U.S. government. This bill includes language that directs the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to “provide all cataloging standards for government information.” Quinn said that she did not have the text of the bill with her, but she would send it to the committee after the conference.

Quinn said GODORT was seeking guidance about how to respond to Senator Lieberman.

Schiff asked whether this was truly a CC:DA matter, or was it a CCS or an ALCTS matter?

Attig said it was all of the above.

Quinn said that the ALA Committee on Legislation would be discussing this matter, either tonight or at Wednesday morning’s meeting, but it would like to have language this afternoon.

Schiff said he did not know how the committee could supply revised language without seeing the bill.

Quinn said she had already told the Committee on Legislation that no revised language would be forthcoming until after the conference, but the Committee on Legislation wanted a GODORT position (did it or did it not support the bill, and the idea of having OMB handling cataloging standards?) now.

Schiff said that anything CC:DA passed on this would have to be approved through a whole chain of higher ALA bodies. He said he could bring this to the CCS Executive Board tomorrow. Schiff asked if the committee agreed with this approach.

Quinn said that she was returning home tonight, so she could e-mail the documentation to Schiff before tomorrow morning.

Schiff asked if there was any other new business.

Larsgaard said that she and Kinney would like to propose a resolution.

Whereas Adam Schiff has served on CC:DA from 1993 to 1997 as representative from the Special Libraries Association, and from 1997-2001 as a voting member, serving also on the Task Force on Seriality and AACR2R, and chairing the Task Force on the Review of the Draft Revision of AMIM; and,

Whereas he has improved the cataloging rules by developing rule revisions related to electronic resources in CC:DA/Schiff/2000/1; and,

Whereas he has, even today, proved himself to be King of the Commas; and,

Whereas he has provided CC:DA with excellent leadership as 2000-2001 Chair, serving in two centuries and two millennia, and earning the gratitude of future chairs and future and current members of CC:DA, environmental groups, and postal carriers by initiating the electronic distribution of JSC and CC:DA documents; and,

Whereas he has served as a superb ringleader of the task forces, including The Task Force That Would Not Die; and,

Whereas he has served with equanimity, intelligence, and patience:

Therefore be it resolved that CC:DA thanks Adam Schiff for his contributions to CC:DA and the Anglo-American cataloging community, and wishes him well in all his endeavors.

[sustained applause]

The vote to adopt the resolution was unanimous.

Schiff thanked the committee and said that he also had some comments that he wanted to make.

Schiff said that he first wanted to thank interns Michael Chohey and Kristin Lindlan, who were finishing their two years of intern service at this meeting, but who would be returning to the committee, Chohey as a voting member of the committee, and Lindlan as Chair. Schiff said that the quality of the minutes and the level of detail that these two interns provided was better than he had ever seen before during his years on CC:DA. He said he thanked them for all their hard work.

Schiff said that he wanted to thank and recognize the five voting members who were leaving the committee after this meeting:

Shirley Lincicum, who was CC:DA intern from 1997-1999, is the current Chair of the Task Force on Uniform Resource Identifiers in AACR2, is a member of the Task Force on the Rule of Three, was a member of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD(M), and was a member of the Task Force on the Review of the IFLA Guidelines for OPAC Displays. Shirley has decided that four years on CC:DA is enough right now, but she is staying on as task force chair and member, so she will still be with us.

Carol Hixson, who served as a member of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD(M), is a member of the Task Force of the Review of ONIX, and was the Chair of the Task Force on the Review of the IFLA Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. Schiff said that he had served with Hixson on a number of other bodies, such as PCC and the CCS Executive Board, and she had been a great mentor to him.

Daniel Kinney, to whose deciding that he had had enough Schiff owes where he is sitting now. Kinney served as Chair of CC:DA from 1997-2000, during which time he coordinated the 1998 preconference What in the World? Cataloging on an International Level, and as a voting member from 2000-2001, during which time he chaired the Task Force on the Review of the Draft Descriptive Cataloging of Ancient, Medieval, Renaissance, and Early Modern Manuscripts (AMREMM), and who served, prior to becoming a member of CC:DA, as the Chair of the Task Force on the Cataloging of Music Moving Image Materials.

Mary Larsgaard, who constantly amazes everyone with her willingness and ability to take on ever more responsibilities above and beyond the call of duty, and her energy and enthusiasm. She has served as Chair of the Task Force on the Review of ISBD(CR), Chair of the Task Force on Metadata, Co-Chair of the 2000 Preconference Planning Task Force, member of the Task Force on Recommendation 2 in 4/JSC/ALA/30, member of the Task Force on the Harmonization of ISBD(ER) and AACR2, member of the Task Force on the Logical Structure of AACR, and member of the Task Force on the Rule of Three. Larsgaard is one of the key people who shepherded all of the Chapter 3 changes through CC:DA and JSC, and went to JSC to explain all of these difficult concepts to them. Schiff said that he also wanted to thank Mary on a personal level for her wonderful sense of humor. She has brightened his day more times than he can say with her amazingly fun and funny e-mails, which made being Chair a lot easier. He said he wanted to thank her for her constant willingness to help out in the face of really tight deadlines, and her wonderful kindness.

In addition to Chohey and Lindlan, the other new voting members are John Attig, Peter Fletcher, and Dorothy McGarry. So we have some very experienced new members coming on, and we will have two new interns: Lynnette Fields and Cheri Folkner

Larsgaard moved that the meeting be adjourned; Hayes seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 11:43 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Michael A. Chohey, CC:DA Intern
Kristin Lindlan, CC:DA Intern