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

Committee on Cataloging: Description and Access

MINUTES

**Minutes of the meeting held at the
2002 Midwinter Meeting in New Orleans, La.
January 19 and 21, 2002**

Members present:
   Kristin Lindlan, Chair
   Steven R. Arakawa
   John C. Attig
   Michael A. Chopey
   Bradford L. Eden
   Peter Vincent Fletcher
   Kate Harcourt
   Susan M. Hayes
   Dorothy McGarry

   Lynnette M. Fields, Intern
   Cheri A. Folkner, Intern

Ex-officio representatives present:
   Matthew Beacom, ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee
   Barbara Tillett, Library of Congress
   Glenn Patton, OCLC
   Ed Glazier, Research Libraries Group

ALA Liaisons present:
   Chalermsee Olson, ALCTS/CCS/CC:AAM
   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 (absent 1/19)
   Laurel Jizba, ALA/IRRT
   Shelby E. Harken, ALA/LITA
   Elizabeth Mangan, ALA/MAGERT
   Kevin A. Furniss, ALA/NMRT (absent 1/19)
   Margaret Shen, ALA/PLA (absent 1/21)

Non ALA Liaisons present:
William Benemann, AALL
Judy Knop, ATLA
Anne E. Champagne, ARLIS/NA
Laurel Jizba, ARSC
Judy Knop for Gertrude Koh, CLA
Robert McDonald, MedLA
Nancy E. Lorimer, MusLA
Ann Caldwell, PCC
Sandra McIntyre Colby, SLA (represented by Cynthia Whitacre on 1/21)

CC:DA Webmaster:
John Attig

Notes:

I. The minutes do not necessarily record discussion in the order in which it occurred. Material may have 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 interns regret 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 Cataloging Rules
AACR2 = Anglo-American Cataloging 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 of 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 Standardization
ISSN = International Standard Serials 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
SCCTP = Serials Cataloging Cooperative Training Program (CONSER)
SAC = ALCTS/CCS/Subject Analysis Committee
UBCIM = Universal Bibliographic Control and International MARC Programme (IFLA)
VRA = Visual Resources Association

Saturday, January 19, 2002 – 2:00-5:30 p.m.
Morial Convention Center, 286-287

750. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Kristin Lindlan opened the meeting in room 286-287 at the Morial Convention Center.

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

Committee members, liaisons, and representatives introduced themselves.

752. Adoption of agenda: Chair

[CC:DA/A/45/Rev./2]

It was moved the agenda be adopted. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

753. Approval of minutes of meeting held at 2001 Annual Conference, San Francisco, Calif., June 16 and 18, 2001: Chair

[CC:DA/M/724-749]

After corrections received via e-mail were noted, it was moved to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded and approved.

754. Report from the Chair: Chair

Lindlan passed around copies of a survey from the AACR Committee of Principals to solicit feedback regarding a plan to release AACR2 as an annual publication. Lindlan encouraged everyone to fill out the survey so that catalogers' opinions of the plan could be taken into account before publication.

Lindlan reviewed the work of CC:DA task forces in the six months following the 2001 Annual Conference:

- The Task Force on Alpha Prototype of Reorganized Part One was formed after Annual and chaired by Robert Maxwell. CC:DA approved its report and sent the report to the JSC. The report included recommendations for follow-up by ALA. Lindlan thanked and discharged the task force for its work.

- Cynthia Whitacre replaced Lindlan as chair of the Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes. The task force prepared a second revised version of the appendix. This version did not include the sections on edition statements and 24.1C that were in the first revision. CC:DA approved the revision and sent it to the JSC as 4JSC/ALA/34/Rev/2. The task force prepared separate proposals for edition statements and minor changes of corporate name in 24.1C. CC:DA approved the proposals and sent them to the JSC as 4JSC/ALA/40 and 4JSC/ALA/39.

- The Task Force on ISO Harmonization, chaired by Michael Chopey, worked to identify standards relevant to AACR2 resource description, particularly standards for abbreviation, symbolization, and punctuation. Its report was submitted to CC:DA.

- The Task Force on ONIX International, chaired by Brad Eden, worked on evaluating the relationship between library metadata (AACR2, MARC 21) and the ONIX International standard for representing and communicating book industry product information in electronic form. The goal was to determine how well it maps into AACR2 and MARC. Its report was submitted to CC:DA.

- The Task Force on Specific Characteristics of Electronic Resources, chaired by Laurel Jizba, worked on issues involved in expressing specific characteristics for electronic resources in areas 3, 5, and 7. The task force made eight recommendations that CC:DA approved. CC:DA sent the task force report to the JSC as 4JSC/ALA/36/Rev.

- The Task Force on the Review of ISBD(CR) was chaired by Mary Larsgaard. Adam Schiff, past chair of CC:DA, sent interim comments to Ingrid Parent at the end of June. The report was later finalized and approved by CC:DA. Lindlan discharged the task force with thanks to Larsgaard and all the task force members.

- The Task Force on the Review of *Revising AACR2 to Accommodate Seriality: Rule Revision Proposals,* chaired by John Attig, completed its report. CC:DA approved its report and sent it to the JSC. Matthew Beacom reviewed the clean copy in Nov. and sent it back to the JSC as an ALA representative response. Lindlan discharged the task force with her thanks.

- The Task Force on the Rule of Three, chaired by Steven Arakawa, made comments on 4JSC/ACOC/1. CC:DA approved the comments and sent them on to the JSC. The task force remains active but in a resting state for now.

- The Task Force on Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2, chaired by Shirley Lincicum, will present a verbal report later in the meeting and a final report shortly after this Midwinter meeting.

Other CC:DA actions since June 2001 were:

- CC:DA approved the clean copy of chapter 3 which was sent on to the JSC. Lindlan thanked Larsgaard and Elizabeth Mangan for all their hard work.

- CC:DA sent comments to John Byrum on June 21 on draft ISBD(M) based on Jizba's report that was discussed in San Francisco. Lindlan thanked Jizba for the report.

- CC:DA approved a 9.7B17 rule revision on summary notes for electronic resources proposal by Schiff and amended by Chopey. The proposal was sent to the JSC as 4JSC/ALA/38.

- CC:DA approved a 25.2E1 rule revision proposal by Kate Harcourt on added entries. The proposal was sent to the JSC.

- Harcourt volunteered to be the CC:DA representative to ALCTS 2003 Preconference Planning Committee.

Attig moved to re-affirm all the votes taken by CC:DA during the previous six months. Eden seconded the motion. The motion was approved. After this meeting, Lindlan will provide in a Chair's report a detailed list of all the motions and votes taken.

Lindlan ended by noting that CC:DA is co-hosting with the Serials Section Committee to Study Serials Cataloging a program in Atlanta on revised chapter 12. It will be held from 1:30 to 5:30 on Monday June 17, 2002. Speakers will be Jean Hirons, Regina Reynolds, and Rhonda Lawrence.

755. Report from the Library of Congress Representative: Tillett

[http://www.ala.org/alcts/organization/ccs/ ccda/lc201.html]

Tillett passed out copies of the report. Some of the items she highlighted were:

- The *Class Web* pilot was successful and CDS plans to offer the service on a subscription basis this year. CDS hopes to have it available in early spring. The year 2002 marks the hundredth anniversary of the sale of cards from LC. There will be celebration activities for that at ALA Annual this year.

- Mail service to LC has been suspended since October 17 due to the anthrax scare. Buildings reopened in late October.

- The February implementation of Voyager 2000 will not include vernacular display of JACKPHY nor access to authority records. The "Web Authorities" feature will not include support for the MARC21 character set nor access to authorities via Z39.50.

- Cataloging production reached the highest level since 1998 showing recovery from the ILS implementation. Divisions were able to complete 95.4% of current receipts. LC management is asking staff to be accountable for meeting arrearage and current production goals and also is encouraging the staff to enhance access by adding 505 fields for tables of contents. That data can be quickly added since it is available in electronic form.

- LC will not use the 856 field in name, series, or subject authority records. LC is seeking the addition of a newly defined subfield $u in the 670 to provide a link to the URL for those needing additional information.

- LC is not planning to supply the new geographic area codes for Earth, Moon, Sun, Solar system, individual planets in the solar system, Outer space, and Deep space, as well as the Australian Capital Territory until Mar. 2001 and the upgrade to Voyager 2000.

- AACR2 2001 Amendments were implemented by LC effective Dec. 1, 2001. The 2002 amendments package is targeted for implementation on Sept. 1, 2002.

- LC Classification conversion to machine readable form is complete with the CDS publication of the 2001 editions of classes BL-BQ, G, and KL-KWX. Weekly lists of additions and changes are posted on the CPSO web site as they are approved. The publication *LC Classification: Additions and Changes* ceased with List 284 (October -December 2001).

756. Report from IFLA Section on Cataloguing: Patton

[http://www.ala.org/alcts/you/ifla/iflareport2001.html]

Patton noted that the full text of his report is available online. He highlighted the following items:

- Tillett was re-elected to a second two-year term as chair of the section. She is also now serving as the secretary for Division IV, the Division of Bibliographic Control, of which the Section on Cataloguing is part.

- ISBD(CR) and ISBD(M) are in the final revision stages; Dorothy McGarry is doing the yeoman service for the review group. After approval process is complete, these will be available on IFLANET. On behalf of the review group, Patton thanked CC:DA for its comments on the documents.

- Upcoming and continuing work in the section are: to revise ISBD(ER) in part to incorporate FRBR principles and in part to deal with some issues such as area 3; to address inconsistencies and problems in series treatment that were identified in the revision of ISBD(CR); to monitor AACR2 and the JSC regarding GMDs; to work on guidelines for publications requiring multiple ISBDs; to continue to look at a multilingual dictionary for cataloguing terms and concepts; to publish a revision of one of the set of IFLA documents on Anonymous Classics; to continue working on a conceptual model for authority information and how best to deal with an international number for authority entities by the Working Group on Functional Requirements of Authority Numbering and Records (FRANAR); and to have a draft for review in the coming months for Guidelines on OPAC Displays.

One bit of news since the report was written is the creation of a new working group on the maintenance, promotion, and use of FRBR. There is enough interest in and exploration of implementations of the model to warrant the establishment of the working group. The group is to be chaired by Patrick Le Boeuf of the Bibliothèque nationale de France.

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

Don Chatham presented a report on the plans for the first of the annual editions for AACR2. ALA Publishing met with Matthew Beacom, Barbara Tillett, Brian Schottlaender, and Ann Huthwaite about marketing and competitive position. ALA wants to incorporate a newer, more contemporary look with text in a sans serif font. It will be reviewed by the JSC. There will be a new index created from scratch by a professional indexer, Janet Russell, who is a librarian and has experience cataloging. The updates will have single page insertions so the user will not have to annotate or cut and paste. Pagination will start over with each chapter; letters will be added to the page numbers when the amendments push the text over to a new page. There will be a 5-hole, 8 ½″ x 11″ version for the U.S. market with a printed binder, but it will be compatible with the standard U.S. 3-hole binder if the customer chooses not to buy the special binder. The format of the international version will be determined by the U.K. and Canada. There will be annual editions using the year in the edition statement, such as "2002 edition," with a new index. There will also be an updates package available for those who do not wish to buy a new edition each year. The review and work of the JSC is on schedule and ALA is looking at a release date of July 2002.

An audience member asked the reason behind having an annual edition when there will be loose-leaf updates since a loose-leaf publication consists of the basic text and then is kept updated by adding the updates. Chatham replied that part of the reason is the educational market and part of the reason is to keep a fully integrated and complete text in print. Rhonda Lawrence stated that law librarians don't understand why ALA can't produce a loose-leaf edition of AACR2 that interfiles; Chatham responded that it would interfile. Another audience member stated that ALA's current loose-leaf products do not

work well now and suggested that the full section, not just the changed pages, be replaced when updates are done. Lindlan responded that there will be an option to buy the full edition and the option to buy only the update pages. There was a statement from the audience that the phrase "update pages" is not the same thing as the phrase "updated pages." Chatham responded that there will be new full replacement pages. Someone from the audience stated that it is not a new edition if it has updated pages. Someone from the audience stated that it doesn't have to be two different publications; library students or whoever needs a new copy should be able to buy a fully interfiled up to date copy that isn't necessarily called a new edition. It would be identical to the volume that someone has kept updated and interfiled. Chatham stated it would be the same in terms of the content and numbering but the folios would be different.

Lindlan asked whether the updates would be available over the web. Chatham confirmed that ALA does plan to make the updates available for download as well as in printed form. Attig pointed out the ALA survey implies that the update packages would only be available online. Chatham confirmed that was the original idea, but ALA reconsidered. Attig stated that since the pages needed to be printed on both sides an extra step is added to printing a PDF file. Chatham stated he hesitated to make a commitment about the exact details of the downloads since ALA is unsure how the web implementation is going to go.

Lawrence suggested that ALA contact legal publishers to see how they successfully publish loose-leaf publications; she and other law librarians would be happy to provide a list of publishers. Schiff suggested contacting LC since it does updating of loose-leaf publications with the LCRIs without re-numbering of pages with letters. Chatham responded this was a point of discussion, but he thought the conclusion was to go with two numbering systems. Schiff asked how users will refer to page numbers if they are different on the "updated" versions and the annual editions. Attig responded that a solution is to update the entire chapter every time. Then Attig asked if there would be an electronic version and whether its updates would be coordinated with the updates to the print version. Chatham responded that the electronic product would coordinate and be available simultaneously with the print version. Lindlan thanked Chatham.

758. Report of the ALA Representative to the Joint Steering Committee: Beacom

[CC:DA/JSC Rep/MLB/2001/1]

Beacom reported on the JSC meeting held 15-17 October 2001, Ottawa, Canada as follows:

2002 rule revision package including Chapter 12 and Chapter 3

The revision package is out for review by the national libraries. The review is a late look for layout, format, typos and small, slight clarifications. The content of the revision package is set. After this line of review, the revision package will be made ready for printing and then the national libraries will have another chance to take a look. The package is to go to the publisher in February. The revision package will not be sent to CC:DA for review. Beacom stated that Chatham had already covered the issues regarding format.

There are a few issues with respect to chapter 12. The issue of the use of the word "oriental" in the footnote for 12.0B1 and in a few other places has been noted by LC and others. The term is offensive to some, plus it is not clear to which countries and to which languages this term applies. Beacom has been in touch with CC:AAM about what it would like to see done. CC:AAM will be looking at that during this conference and will get back to Beacom.

ALA follow up is needed on proposal 4JSC/ALA/35 regarding changes to 21.30J1. The proposal was rejected by the JSC and CC:DA needs to withdraw the proposal. Attig moved to withdraw proposal 4JSC/ALA/35. The motion was seconded and unanimously approved. Since proposal 4JSC/ALA/39 making rule 25.2E1 consistent with the withdrawn proposal 4JSC/ALA/35 is no longer relevant, it too

needs to be withdrawn. Attig moved to withdraw 4JSC/ALA/39. Hayes seconded the motion; the motion was approved 8 to 0.

Part of CC:DA's response to the clean copy of chapter 12 regarding 21.30L2, added entry for series for an integrating resource even if it wasn't on the latest iteration, is not going forward in the JSC.

With respect to chapter 3, Beacom thanked Larsgaard, Mangan, and all those who worked so hard on bringing that work along. He held them up as outstanding examples of the kind of volunteers who make the rules what they are.

Format Variation Working Group

> [4JSC/Chair/71]
> [4JSC/Chair/71/Chair follow-up]
> [4JSC/Chair/71/Rev]
> [4JSC/Chair/72]
> [4JSC/Chair/72/Rev]
> [4JSC/Chair/76]

The report of the Format Variation Working Group was well received by the JSC, which found it especially valuable. Beacom thanked the chair Jennifer Bowen and Pat Riva, who is an outstanding contributor to that group. Attig stated the report is available on the JSC web site as 4JSC/Chair/71/Chair follow-up.

In 4JSC/Chair/71/Rev, the working group was given a new charge to:

- pursue its work on the experimental database to test the feasibility of grouping records for manifestations into displays that illustrate expression-level relationships

- consider if the rules are sufficient for expression-level collocation, where the rules need to be changed if not, and if collocation in catalog displays are sufficient to explain relationships to users

- develop guidance for catalogers in determining when an item in hand represents a new expression

- investigate the concept of uniform title to determine if the rules in chapter 25 could be re-stated to identify distinctions between different types and different functions of uniform titles (collocation vs. differentiation). Rule revision proposals to clarify these different purposes may result. The group should explore the concept of a "citation" for an expression to determine if this is the most appropriate mechanism for organizing expression-level displays, the basic idea being that a heading will be needed under which to group the related manifestations.

A second group split off from this group, really just Riva, is to prepare rule revision proposals to incorporate FRBR terminology in AACR. Her charge, as outlined in 4JSC/Chair/76, is to look at terminology in parts I and II with a view to align with terminology used in *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* – in particular, the terms "work," "expression," "manifestation," and "item." She is to define "Work," "Expression," and "Manifestation" for the AACR Glossary and review the current definitions for consistency. She is to propose new wording for AACR to make explicit the relationships between entities – in particular, manifestations of the same expression.

Appendix of major changes

> [4JSC/ALA/34/Rev/2]

The JSC had no time to seek comments from constituencies on the appendix. The JSC found the appendix valuable but unwieldy and difficult to use and felt that it may take away from cataloger's

judgment. The JSC felt parts of the document were so important and essential, it was inappropriate to put those parts in an appendix at the back of the book. One of the follow up actions from the JSC discussions is to put section F.2 into an introductory conceptual chapter which the British Library is doing. A new draft of that chapter should be available to the JSC at the May meeting.

The JSC has asked for constituent feedback on the appendix as a concept rather than "as is." Rhonda Lawrence asked the exact status of the appendix and what is happening in term of guidance for the cataloger for the 2002 amendments. Beacom responded that the appendix is on hold.

Lawrence commented that the rule interpretations as they currently stand will be out of sync with chapter 12. Beacom responded that the rule interpretations are currently being revised and will be in sync with the 2002 amendments. Tillett followed up with a reminder that LC is targeting September 1 for implementation of the revised chapter 12 including updating the rule interpretations for that chapter. Lawrence asked if the new rule interpretations will incorporate what is in the current draft of the appendix. Tillett responded that the rule interpretations will not entirely incorporate the appendix. Lawrence stated the guidance that the appendix would provide to catalogers will not be available in the rules nor the rule interpretations. Lindlan stated that catalogers will be in the same situation that currently exists; the appendix is on hold and it wasn't planned for the LCRIs to cover this information. Lawrence asked about the void of guidance for catalogers. Beacom responded that guidance isn't available now and hasn't been available; the appendix was a draft document going through the review process for AACR. It hasn't been available to anyone so no one will be missing anything that already exists.

Mary Woodley asked if the work that has been done on the appendix will dovetail with the LC action plan that asks this same question on how to help people to know when to create a new record. Tillett responded that one of the recommendations in the action plans is to try to issue more general guidelines for catalogers on different issues. LC heard repeatedly that would be helpful. That then leads more and more to telling catalogers how to do it rather than allowing them to use their judgment. Our colleagues elsewhere in the world feel that is a bad idea and that is a large part of why the other constituencies of the JSC did not agree this was a good thing to include in the rules. However, to include it as a separate guideline was not seen as a problem. Also taking pieces of the appendix and putting them into the introduction to the rules is something that will be pursued. Woodley asked if that might be part of LC's action plans and Tillett indicated it might be.

Beacom summarized the status of the appendix as being on hold, but not dead. The JSC doesn't want ALA to do any more work on it at this time because the JSC will not be spending ALA's time wisely. The JSC will get responses from the constituents, which may be different from those of the JSC representatives. Once the JSC has the constituencies' responses, it will be in a better position to make decisions regarding what to do next.

Specific characteristics of electronic resources

[4JSC/ALA/36/Rev]

The report wasn't received in time for constituent responses. The JSC members agreed with recommendation 1 which eliminates area 3 from chapter 9. Then the question is where to put that information and the report did not make a decision on that question. The JSC did not feel it could make that decision for the constituencies. The JSC noted that options 2A and 4A were the most preferred of the options put forward in recommendations 2 and 4. At the end of January, a straw poll of the JSC will be done to determine which of the options in recommendations 2 and 4 are preferred. If there is agreement on which of the options are preferred, the JSC will move forward in analyzing what should be done with those options and recommendations. The results of the straw poll should be known in early February. If there is agreement, the next step will be to go to the constituents for responses. If there is not agreement,

Beacom doesn't know what will happen. The JSC is requesting that the task force put its work on hold. The JSC is hoping constituent responses will be back in time for the May JSC meeting.

Chopey asked if the JSC is discussing interim measures for including, in chapters 8 and 6, instructions on how to handle remote access graphics or sound recordings. Beacom didn't think so; the JSC doesn't discuss something unless there is a rule proposal. Chopey asked how a proposal would be received by the JSC. Tillett reiterated that the JSC is asking CC:DA to hold up for now since there wasn't time to let the constituents think about it. There is no point in sending more to the JSC when it hasn't had a chance to respond to the first round. Tillett requested CC:DA allow the JSC to read, respond, and get feedback to ALA on the current proposal. Chopey commented that he brought it up because he thought of the option after the report had gone through CC:DA. Beacom suggested that Chopey hold on to the idea and see if it continues to make sense as a viable option after constituencies' comments are received. Beacom suggested that if it does make sense, Chopey make a rule proposal with good background support and rationale.

Prototype of reorganized part 1 of AACR2

[4JSC/Chair/75/ALA response]

The JSC requests that ALA use the prototype as a tool to review inconsistencies in rules across chapters in AACR and develop appropriate rule proposals. Attig moved that a task force be appointed to use the prototype as a tool to look at inconsistencies in rules across chapters in part I of AACR. Eden seconded the motion; the motion was approved 8-0. Lindlan sent around a sign-up list for the task force, which will require a one-year commitment. Lindlan asked that the names of those who would be especially knowledgeable be added to the list even if they aren't at this meeting. Nine to fifteen people will be appointed to the task force. The goal will be to have two areas of description be investigated by this summer.

The JSC agreed with the idea of ALA recommendation 1 to improve the electronic version of AACR2, but the JSC is unsure of the technology available and which business model to follow. One idea is to brainstorm or survey people, maybe online. The JSC has asked Beacom to follow up on that idea and provide some possible directions for online access and on how the rules can live in a more integrated way online.

Chopey commented he couldn't imagine an improvement to *Cataloger's Desktop*; it has links to all the tools and it may be a good model to use. Beacom commented that the JSC wants to get ideas from all parts of the publishing world, but Chopey's comment indicated a model that licenses to another entity like CDS may be a good business model to follow rather than a separate publication model. Beacom asked the committee and the audience how many have bought the stand alone electronic AACR. Only one person in the room indicated he had bought the stand-alone product, but he didn't use it. Beacom then asked how many use the CDS product. An overwhelming number of people in the room indicated they use it. Attig stated the platform that is used for the CDS product does have its limitations and other technology and functionality need to be explored.

9.7B17, Summary notes

> [4JSC/ALA/38]
> [4JSC/ALA/38/ACOC response]
> [4JSC/ALA/38/BL response]
> [4JSC/ALA/38/CCC response]
> [4JSC/ALA/38/LA response]
> [4JSC/ALA/38/LC response]

The proposal 4JSC/ALA/38 for 9.7B17 was not approved by the JSC. The JSC asked that ALA withdraw this proposal and propose the examples for chapter 12. Attig agreed with withdrawing the current proposal and starting over. He suggested three possible options that could be implemented: to propose the same examples be added to the corresponding rule in chapter 12; to propose examples of summary notes that are definitely for finite resources as additions to chapter 9; and if not convinced by the JSC argument, to restate that it is not appropriate to exclude examples for integrating resources from a chapter that covers all types of electronic resources.

Chopey pointed out there was an example for a finite resource in the proposal. Beacom clarified that the finite resource example from the proposal had been approved. Beacom again requested the proposal be withdrawn. Attig asked if the proposal should be considered at Annual. Beacom suggested it could be considered before Annual. Schiff, who made the proposal initially, commented the purpose of the proposal was to include additional examples for continuing electronic Web resources, and it would be simpler and best just to reissue the examples in chapter 12. Schiff asked if the JSC could just make the changes in chapter 12 based on the current proposal. Beacom stated it would be more efficient to do it that way, but that it is not a consultative process and the JSC would become the authors of AACR. Schiff agreed CC:DA should withdraw the proposal. Attig moved that CC:DA withdraw 4JSC/ALA/38. The motion was seconded and approved by a vote of 8-0.

Chopey commented that maybe there should be a note in chapter 9 to refer to the examples in chapter 12. Beacom stated that the practice is catalogers need to use all the applicable chapters. Attig moved to propose the examples in 4JSC/ALA/38 be submitted for 12.7B17. The motion was seconded. McGarry asked if someone would rewrite the proposal and then CC:DA would vote on that proposal. Attig stated he would be more comfortable looking at a document. Schiff agreed to write the proposal and submit it to CC:DA. Beacom encouraged Schiff to include rationale, and to remind the JSC it wanted this proposal made. The motion for Schiff to write the proposal was approved 8-0.

24.1C, Changes of name

> [4JSC/ALA/37]
> [4JSC/ALA/37/ACOC response]
> [4JSC/ALA/37/BL response]
> [4JSC/ALA/37/CCC response]
> [4JSC/ALA/37/LA response]
> [4JSC/ALA/37/LC response]

Constituency responses to 4JSC/ALA/37 were received by the JSC. LC, BL, and LA did not agree with the proposal; ACOC and CCC were in partial agreement with the proposal. The JSC requests that ALA withdraw this proposal. Since the proposal was related to the Appendix of Major Changes, the proposal had trouble going forward. There were other objections to the proposal: LC thought the existing LCRIs were adequate; LA felt it was covered by judgment; BL felt it wasn't needed. A motion was made to withdraw 4JSC/ALA/37. The motion was seconded and approved 8-0.

Edition statements, 1.2B3

> [4JSC/ALA/40]
> [4JSC/ALA/40/CCC response]
> [4JSC/ALA/40/LC response]

The JSC requests that 4JSC/ALA/40 be withdrawn. This issue should be addressed by the task force reviewing inconsistencies in rules across chapters in AACR. Beacom suggested the task force might want to address area 2 first. Attig noted the CCC response to this proposal contained a suggested revision that most members of the JSC appeared to look upon favorably. He suggested that ALA look at that when the task force addresses this area. Attig moved that 4JSC/ALA/40 be withdrawn. Eden seconded the motion. The motion was approved 8-0.

Dates or names to heads of governments, 24.20C1

> [4JSC/CCC/5]

CCC has proposed, through 4JSC/CCC/5, changes to 24.20C1 to allow the addition of dates or names to a head of government acting in an official capacity who is not also a head of state. This is a problem in Canada because the prime minister is not the head of the government, the queen is the head of the government. CCC felt other nations could benefit from this change as well. LC felt it could be more general and could be expanded to include the entire range of elected officials such as mayors of cities. The JSC has asked all constituencies to respond to this proposal by July 31, 2002. Attig asked if LC intends to include a response to make this more general. Tillett stated LC has intentionally withheld its response so as not to influence CC:DA's discussion and decision. Attig suggested that the proposal be discussed online, considered at Annual, and documented by July. Beacom requested there be a response by July 13, 2002.

Making the "rule of three" optional

> [4JSC/ACOC/1]
> [4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up]
> [4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/ALA response]
> [4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/BL response]
> [4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/CCC response]
> [4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/LA response]
> [4JSC/ACOC/1/ACOC follow-up/LC response]

Proposal 4JSC/ACOC/1 to make the "rule of three" optional is on hold. The JSC felt that the proposal was a short-term solution and that a long-term view should be taken with regard to chapter 21 as a whole. Schiff asked if ALA should form a task force to revise chapter 21. Chopey thought Beacom's report indicated the JSC will form a task force. Beacom responded that the May meeting of the JSC will focus on chapter 21, a new introductory conceptual chapter, reorganization of Part 1 of the rules, and the 5-part model proposed in the prototype report. Attig summarized that the JSC hasn't decided how to proceed with issues concerning chapter 21, but it welcomes the opportunity to do so before anyone else starts working on the same issues.

Multipart items

[4JSC/LC/51]
[4JSC/LC/51/ACOC response]
[4JSC/LC/51/ALA response]
[4JSC/LC/51/BL rep response]
[4JSC/LC/51/BL response]
[4JSC/LC/51/CCC response]
[4JSC/LC/51/LA response]

Constituents differ in how multiparts are described. Almost all except BL describe multiparts based on the first part and then add added entries as needed. BL describes multiparts based on predominance; it creates a record that it knows may likely need to be adjusted later based on predominance. Beacom believes that BL is going to look at how it is describing multiparts and think about it in terms of what others are doing and in terms of its own workflow to see if there are advantages to working from the first part. The JSC noted that there is no section in AACR that deals with multipart items and agreed there was a need to codify practice. The JSC has asked LC to prepare a specific rule revision proposal based on the first recommendation in 4JSC/LC/51 [multiparts], and to include in that proposal a definition for multipart items and the basis for making the decision on when to make a collection record.

The JSC put on hold recommendation 2, which proposed a new conceptual chapter relating to this topic. The JSC noted that recommendation 3, which covers the reorganization of part I related to the ideas raised in the alpha prototype report, will be worked on at the May meeting.

Role of GMDs, Principles of AACR, and Status of conceptual introduction to AACR

The role of GMDs, the principles of AACR, and the status of the conceptual introduction to AACR are on the JSC's May agenda. There was not time in Ottawa to address them and questions raised are part of a larger discussion tied into the reorganization of the rules. The JSC wants to talk about these in a coherent fashion at the May meeting. The JSC did not make any decisions with respect to Tillett's paper on the GMDs or Jean Weihs' survey on the GMDs, but the JSC will take into account what information those documents have provided and what the documents reveal about the rules and the issues related to the GMDs. The BL initial draft of the introductory chapter, Tillett's paper on the principles of AACR, and the basic guidelines from the Appendix of Major Changes are being folded into the new draft of the introductory chapter. Therefore, the new draft of the chapter will look considerably different from the current draft. The new draft may be available to the JSC as early as the end of January for discussion at the May meeting. The document will only be available to the JSC, not the constituencies. At the May meeting the JSC hopes to develop that document further so that shortly after the May meeting a document will be available to the constituencies for review. It probably would not be available in time to discuss at Annual.

Attig commented that ALA did discuss online the documents on the principles and the GMDs, but never did formulate a response. He felt ALA should have a response before May and that a structured discussion could be done online. Beacom brought up that these are discussion papers not proposals and that needs to be kept in mind if a formal response was written. Beacom did think that it might be valuable to have a structured conversation on those topics before May and that the more guidance he has from CC:DA, the better he can represent ALA. Tillett asked how the discussion would be done. Attig suggested that e-mail be used with a time limit set on the discussion. Beacom asked if that would be workable. CC:DA members nodded yes.

Strategic planning for the JSC and AACR

Part of the Ottawa meeting was spent in a strategic planning session discussing items such as: where should AACR be at the beginning of the 21st century, how to deal with the publishing environment changes, what are the perceptions of AACR, and how to manage the perceptions and reality. More of that will be done in the May meeting. The discussion took place in executive session so nothing has come out on it in the JSC's minutes. The strategic planning effort is an on-going effort of the JSC.

Next JSC meeting

The next JSC meeting will be in May in New Haven. It will mostly be in executive session. Attig commented that the tracking against the agenda that came out of the Toronto conference is getting tenuous and a new agenda needs to be developed. Beacom agreed, but many task forces have resulted from the Toronto conference and the JSC is still living in the aftermath of Toronto. Attig commented that the agenda has been reformulated.

New JSC secretary

The JSC has a new half-time secretary, Nathalie Schulz. Schulz is outstanding and has really done a good job on the minutes. She has shown that hiring someone for that position was a good idea.

759. Other announcements: Chair

Lindlan reminded everyone to be sure to sign up on the sheets and to fill out the survey from the AACR Committee of Principals. Lindlan adjourned the session at approximately 5:15 p.m.

Monday, January 21, 2002 – 8:00 a.m.-12:30 p.m.
Morial Convention Center, 286-287

760. Welcome and opening remarks: Chair

Lindlan welcomed the committee and audience. She commented that CC:DA will be called on to participate in the discussion on the LC Action Plan for Bibliographic Control of Electronic Resources. She then passed around the roster and visitor attendance sheet.

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

[CC:DA/TF/ONIX/4]

Task Force Chair, Brad Eden, submitted the final report of the task force. The task force is not recommending any rule revisions because LC is actively involved. Eden thanked the task force members and asked for questions. Attig asked if the task force was finished. Eden replied it was unless anyone had any more concerns. Attig moved to accept the report of the task force. The motion was seconded and approved 8-0.

762. Report of the Task Force on an Appendix of Major and Minor Changes: Whitacre

[4JSC/ALA/37]
[4JSC/ALA/37/ACOC response]
[4JSC/ALA/37/BL response]
[4JSC/ALA/37/CCC response]
[4JSC/ALA/37/LA response]
[4JSC/ALA/37/LC response]

Current Task Force Chair, Cynthia Whitacre, thanked the members of the task force especially Lindlan who chaired the task force until June of 2001. The other task force members are: Everett Allgood, Carroll Davis, Brad Eden, Mary Grenci, Laurel Jizba, Judy Knop, Judy Kuhagen, Elizabeth Mangan, David Van Hoy, Jay Weitz, and Mary Woodley.

CC:DA originated the task force at the request of the JSC. The JSC is now unsure that it wants such an appendix and is still waiting for constituent comments on the revised appendix. It is likely that the JSC will incorporate parts of the appendix in other parts of the code revision, so no further work is needed at this time on the appendix.

Besides the appendix itself, two other rule proposals came out of this task force. One was a revision to 1.2B3 on edition statements that ALA withdrew at the request of the JSC. The proposal may be used in the work of the Task Force on Consistency Across Part I of AACR2 when it looks at area 2 across the chapters. The other proposal was 24.1C, changes of name, which ALA also withdrew at the request of the JSC. ACOC and CCC supported categories a).-c). of the proposal while LC preferred keeping the proposal as an LCRI. The British Library and Library Association did not support the proposal. The task force asked for guidance from CC:DA on whether to proceed with a new proposal that would include categories a)-c) and omit categories d)-g). Lindlan asked for comments from the committee. Arakawa recommended CC:DA not pursue this because he didn't think it would get very far. Beacom agreed that, given the opposition from BL and LA and the fact that LC wants an LCRI, the task force not go forward with another proposal. Lindlan stated that at this point nothing further will be done on a new proposal. Lindlan thanked Whitacre and the task force.

Whitacre stated that it appeared that the work of the task force is done. She added that it was unfortunate that this will not be put into the appendix since some catalogers were eagerly looking forward to the guidance that would have been provided on when to create a new record. She hoped that the work will eventually be incorporated somewhere.

Attig stated that if the implication was that the task force was done and could be disbanded, he thought that might be premature. Comments are expected from the other JSC constituencies and CC:DA will need a group to evaluate those comments. Also, once the JSC has had its discussion on AACR reorganization, it may very well be that some work will need to be done re-casting the appendix. He suggested that it would be better to keep the task force inactive but in existence rather than starting over with a new task force. Whitacre answered that she thought everyone on the task force would be amenable to that if that was what CC:DA preferred.

Beacom stated this was a situation where it would be better to have the work put on hold for a while rather than to continue to do work when it cannot be seen how the work will be used. He agreed with Attig that there will be constituency responses coming in and the task force will need to respond. Lindlan stated the task force would be put on hold and she hoped that some of the work will appear in the rules at some point. Beacom reiterated the value of the work of the task force, and stated how valuable its work was to the cataloging community. He thanked the task force and stated his appreciation for the work it had done.

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

[4JSC/ALA/36/Rev]

Task Force Chair, Laurel Jizba, passed out a handout and reported the task force had met on Saturday from 8:30-10:30, with 20-30 people in attendance. At the meeting the group reviewed the timeline for the task force report and discussed key issues of the recommendations in detail.

Jizba stated some of the points of agreement. The first point of agreement was the group wanted to accommodate the cartographic materials community. Secondly, the group also wanted to give the same options to the generalist electronic resources community. That is, the group wants to use conventional terminology in order to be flexible enough to accommodate rapidly changing technology and future developments.

The task force thinks that the problem for mainstream electronic resources catalogers is in the details. In executing the option there is a need for clearer language that gives the mainstream generalist cataloger more direction regarding what are essentially two sub-options: a) to use area 5 judiciously when clearly applicable, but also b) clear permission to use area 7 as needed, leaving area 5 blank.

Jizba stated there is a need for clarity because even experienced mainstream electronic resources catalogers are not experienced in this particular point of decision-making and are asking for more guidance to avoid time consuming decision-making or the setting aside of problem titles, creating backlogs or the need for supervisory decision-making. A solution put forth by the task force was to reword the rule change proposal at 9.5B3 so the two verbs "record" and "use" are modified by the adverb "may." This softens the instruction and avoids the imperative tonality.

The new wording proposal for 9.5B3 proposed by the task force is:

> *Optionally*, for direct and remote access electronic resources, the actual content, in addition to the specific material designation (where appropriate), may be recorded in subrule .5B in the relevant chapter of part I; if none of these terms is appropriate, conventional terminology may be used.

Jizba stated that one of the charges of the task force was to ascertain how these areas are being applied and used by catalogers of electronic resources and to examine and test alternatives to current practices.

Another solution proposed by Jizba was widespread cataloger training. This new point of decision-making about physical description is so different that the task force feels there will be much confusion in the cataloging community.

The task force also recommends the text at 9.5B1 be changed to "1 DVD-ROM" instead of "1 DVD." The rationale for making this proposal is that LC has chosen to use "1 DVD-ROM" in its training and GPO uses "DVD-ROM" in its records, including those for digital land use mapping resources. Also an OLAC CAPC task force has done research showing that "DVD-ROM" appears widely on such titles and is widespread in the industry.

The task force determined there are some outstanding issues. One of those is finding other solutions, most likely through cataloger training, that clearly enable mainstream electronic resources catalogers or even catalogers working in chapter 7 or 6 to leave area 3 blank for remote resources. Another outstanding issue is realizing that by adding a term for content in area 5, there may or may not have to be a term for carrier. For example, using a term qualifier, like the adjective "online" might be an option to qualify content for remote resources. At 9.5B3 there would be "1 digital photo (online)" or "1 sound file (online)" for remote resources, avoiding the necessity to deal with a carrier that does not have an acceptable common name.

Jizba stated CC:DA needs to start a dialog with catalogers using chapters 7 and 6 regarding the relationship to chapter 9, because historically these communities have no tradition of turning to chapter 9 for completing the description.

Attig stated it was hard to absorb all this quickly, but Jizba made many good points. Some of the points have to do with a proposal already under discussion, and some probably should be new proposals, though some of them are going to emerge in other ways. He stated that he thought the AV and music communities were already looking at conventional terminology in their chapters. He agreed "1 DVD" is a bad example, and changing to "1 DVD-ROM" would be wonderful, but since that was the original proposal, the JSC is unlikely to change its mind.

Attig asked for advice from CC:DA on how to proceed. He stated that on a number of these issues CC:DA is waiting for comments and then it can proceed. Some of these issues that aren't covered by existing proposals could be developed for discussion at Annual. He asked Jizba if that was what the task force had in mind. Jizba answered that this was as far as it had gotten. She stated that the task force knows it is in a holding pattern. Part of the change here is in rule change proposals the task force has made, not in the options, but in the actual rule change proposals put forward.

Chopey stated it is a problem that the document originally sent forward by the task force is in a holding pattern, but there is nothing that can be done about that. He said that not only has Jizba proposed changes but also, as Attig stated, other communities are looking at this. Chopey stated that this went through CC:DA very quickly and he wondered if the thinking on this had changed. He has had some other ideas that might be solutions to the areas of disagreement. On the philosophical question of whether one can have a physical description for a remote access resource, it would be easier if one could look at other chapters. There is not an elegant way to say "1 web resource," but if you have a sound file, treat it like a sound recording and also refer to chapter 9. It would be incongruous with the rest of the code if one couldn't use "1 sound file," and the same thing with a digital photo. Chopey thought it was misleading that the instructions are in chapter 9. The way this will work eventually is if you are describing a digital photo, you will use chapter 8 and then you will use chapter 9 in the second instance. He wondered if 1 digital photo and 1 sound file really belong in chapter 9. If there was a physical description for an Internet resource, catalogers could move along in the other chapters. He stated that people really are describing these things. He is using "1 sound file carried on the Internet" and he wondered if allowing area 5 everywhere would make things easier.

Chopey added that as far as using "may" and "might" so there is not an imperative tonality, many catalogers he knows love imperative tonalities. He stated this is not as much an issue of cataloger's judgment as an issue of catalogers not knowing what to do. Catalogers like clear instructions in some cases. He also thought there is a problem when CC:DA presents this to the JSC, aiming to provide an interim solution for cartographic computer files; a rule revision is not an interim solution. The cataloging community may be moving toward a bigger goal, but if that is the case, then the JSC must see the whole thing. It is better to say this is the rule revision proposal and map catalogers need this, rather than this is a short-term solution and eventually the bigger problem will be solved. Many revisions to the code are interim solutions to long-term problems. Jizba replied the group did talk about permission to leave area 5 blank.

Lorimer stated she strongly agreed with Chopey's first comments about including examples of physical descriptions for remote access resources in chapters other than chapter 9. She felt whether the item is an online digital photo or an online sound recording, people are still looking for a digital photo or a sound recording and they need to be able to find that information in area 5, where it is for everything else. She stated the music community is looking at the issue of using chapter 9 to complete the description of music electronic resources, but the community has just begun discussions on the feasibility. She thought the

principles of AACR2R are that one first deals with the chapter for the type of material being described and then when the item is an electronic resource, one goes to chapter 9 to complete the description.

Woodley supported the idea that catalogers need guidance. She stated that locally people were being turned away from cataloging workshops because the workshops were filled, demonstrating the crying need for more guidance. She stated that often a cataloger had a cataloging class in library school, but once a cataloger is on the job there is no mentor and no guidance on how to apply these growingly complex cataloging rules. She added she knew CC:DA didn't want to put it that way to the JSC, but the motivation for much of this is that the catalogers need it.

Attig stated that he didn't see any action and Lindlan agreed.

Lindlan asked Beacom when CC:DA would get a response. Beacom stated that he would conduct a straw poll before the May meeting. He added that there was not much time between the May JSC meeting and the June CC:DA meeting. At the June meeting there would be a chance to discuss what came out of the May JSC meeting.

Beacom agreed that there should be no action at this time since the JSC is waiting for responses. He added that the need for training ideas should be taken to the ALCTS program committee and groups that are working on continuing education. He thought CC:DA could play a role in that and could also look for partners to help fill training needs. One of the things CC:DA does is to work on the publication of the rules, but another thing the committee does is to assist in the training of catalogers, and right now it doesn't seem to be happening in library schools. He knows that new catalogers need on-the-job training. Given the staff cuts in many institutions it is hard to provide mentors for new catalogers. This is a very different problem than a rule revision proposal, but it is not something CC:DA should stay away from completely and hope someone else will take care of. CC:DA can propose a program.

Jizba stated that she thought CC:DA should hear more from the music and video cataloging communities. The liaisons could go to their constituents now and report back to CC:DA on how people are feeling or what they would like to share with CC:DA.

Chopey thought he understood what Woodley meant when she talked about guidance, and he knows catalogers also need training, but in some ways it is a worse thing when you have to tell a cataloger "that's not what the code says, but that's the way it's done." He thought that was what Woodley meant by guidance. Woodley agreed.

Jizba stated there is a magnitude of catalogers judgment going on now that is so different when you have to consider choices between supplying a physical description or not and how to construct that physical description. That is what is causing the problem. Schiff stated CC:DA might consider having a forum to bring in that community and see what kind of rule revisions it needs and what kind of problems it has. The liaisons might want to go back to their communities and have a discussion about their needs and then come back and report at the next meeting. Lindlan agreed that sounded like a reasonable idea. Lorimer stated this will probably be discussed in detail at the MLA meeting next month.

Mangan stated that it sounds like CC:DA is coming together on its thinking and there is more support for having area 5 for remote resources than is presented in the report. She stated that normally ALA would not take part in the straw poll because it is our document, but she asked if it would be appropriate to let the other JSC members know that at this meeting there is growing support for the use of area 5 for remote resources. Beacom agreed that was a very good idea. One of the things he needed was the current thinking of CC:DA and he was happy to see that the task force did have an opportunity to talk today and he stated that this gave him more information about the current thinking of the ALA community. He also stated that he will include in his report what was said at this meeting.

McGarry asked if Beacom needed a vote or a straw vote of CC:DA members to know how the committee is leaning at this time. Beacom answered he thought that made sense, but he added there are several things in the report and, as Attig said earlier, it is difficult to digest all that in an oral report, and to tie everything together. Lindlan asked if the committee wanted to discuss it on the electronic list after this meeting, and if there was something to be done.

Chopey replied that there were a few questions that were clear questions. He stated that there were some basic questions such as whether area 5 is legitimate for remote access resources. Although in September it wasn't stated very clearly how the Committee felt, Chopey felt the answer to that question was clear now. Attig thought CC:DA should be looking at the question to which Beacom would likely have to respond: Which of the options under item 2 was preferred by the JSC member? If he was understanding correctly, he thought the preference expressed was for option 1 in the report. Attig asked Jizba if that was correct. Jizba answered that the preference of the task force was option 1, to allow the use of area 5. Attig clarified by stating that the use of area 5 would not be confined to cartographic materials and Jizba agreed.

Attig stated that if a motion was needed, and he wasn't sure it was, it should be for option 1, to allow the use of area 5. Beacom asked if the task force fully supported option 1. Jizba answered that it was not that simple, the whole document must be considered. She agreed with Woodley's statements earlier about the magnitude of difference. The task force does support option 1, but something else has to be done to make this practical and applicable to people using the other chapters.

Chopey asked if the question was whether or not the task force supported option 1. Beacom replied that it was whether or not CC:DA supported option 1. Beacom stated that it was hard for CC:DA to go further. Chopey answered that the task force gave a very informative report to CC:DA. The original report said that one member felt this way, three members felt this way, etc., which was great for informing CC:DA how they felt. But if CC:DA is to serve as a conduit to the JSC, it would be better if CC:DA could agree on this.

Beacom stated that if CC:DA could vote on the alternative rule proposals it would be very helpful to the JSC. Eden asked if this was appropriate since earlier Attig had stated that time was needed to digest everything. Attig replied that when he said that he was thinking two things. As Jizba had said the issue was in the details, there could not be a simple endorsement of a particular position. CC:DA has gone over that, and Beacom has heard it. CC:DA will be turning it into a document that Beacom could use. Attig wasn't sure a vote was necessary, and if there was a vote taken, it would be on a very narrow issue at this time. Attig wondered if CC:DA was ready to do this or if it was necessary. Eden answered that he didn't think a vote should be taken at this time.

Attig stated that the discussion could be continued on the electronic list up until the point Beacom had to put something together to respond to the straw poll. Beacom stated that the date for that was at the end of January.

Lorimer added that for the outside communities, especially music, this is a very complex issue. They had not really dealt with electronic resources until recently and the implications of this have taken a long time to sink in. The implications finally have sunk in and that is why they are coming in rather late and expressing what they would like. Beacom stated that Schiff had earlier suggested having representatives take this issue back to their constituencies. Attig answered as someone taking the question back to a constituency not represented here, he would like some brainstorming, not at this meeting, about what the constituents should be asked. There are several members who could be getting useful information from their constituencies.

Chopey asked if the question is whether CC:DA still feels that allowing area 5 for remote access resources will be helpful. He envisions that appropriate chapters would have something like "1 digital

photo" in chapter 8. Attig agreed that is probably the question, but said it could be discussed on the electronic list rather than at this meeting. Chopey agreed with the suggestion.

Lindlan thanked Jizba and the task force.

764. Report of the Task Force on ISO Harmonization: Chopey

[CC:DA/TF/ISO/3]

Chopey began by stating that a final report was distributed and he would only talk about the highlights. This task force began with the proposal by John Hostage regarding abbreviations and metric symbols and AACR. What AACR considers abbreviations, like "cm." and "mm.", are considered symbols "cm" and "mm" in the metric system and in ISO 31 and 1000. The task force was charged with examining other ISO standards with regard to abbreviations and symbols and to see if there were other areas in AACR that could benefit from harmonization with ISO. The report lists the standards investigated, though more were looked at. The task force solicited input from various catalogers' lists for ideas on ISO standards that should be included. The first section of the report lists abbreviations, symbolization and punctuation.

Chopey stated that the task force received many responses from people who wanted ISO harmonization for things that had nothing to do with AACR. Many people were very dissatisfied with the ALA Romanization tables, but that is clearly not an AACR issue. Some were more MARC issues than AACR ones; some were language codes issues; and Patton pointed out the ISO date format. Chopey stated the bibliographic descriptions constituents of CC:DA create are English language and there are many ISO standards for saying things in other languages, but the task force focus was on descriptions in English. Patton sent some comments to the CC:DA list about ISO 690, the date standard. Chopey felt that the AACR way for saying dates was better than the ISO way.

Chopey felt that the key question was about consistent metric symbols to be used as symbols and not abbreviations. Chopey added that in the report he pointed out a few other things that ISO 31 would call symbols, such as: "h" for hour or hours, "min" for minutes or minutes, "s" for second or seconds. The task force rejected the use of these symbols because it thought they would not be understood in the catalog record.

A few people said they would like to see the metric system used throughout the code in every chapter. The task force did consider that. This discussion has been raised in CC:DA many times before. Chopey felt that there is a good reason for using "in." where we use it now, because it is easily recognized by catalog users.

Another part of ISO 31 prescribes printing numbers without a comma. With this and a few other ISO standards, the task force felt it should be up to the specific community that uses the convention to put forward a rule revision proposal. Chopey thought that Larsgaard mentioned this in the first discussion concerning scale statements. He thinks that MAGERT did examine this issue and decided it wasn't appropriate to make a rule revision proposal at this time.

Chopey spoke to the standards for constructing standard numbers. He stated that there was not much to explain and he felt that the rules seem to be sufficient in describing which standard number to transcribe. One of these new standard numbers might merit an Area 8 instruction. Chopey stated that CC:DA recently discussed a draft statement called ISTC, and there is also an international standard musical work code. Chopey said it was approved very recently and Lorimer said she knew nothing about it. Chopey answered it never came to CC:DA.

Chopey reported that the rule revision proposal that the task force was making was to list all the places that metric units are used in AACR, and suggested that "cm.", "mm.", etc. be replaced with metric symbols. The task force did receive a comment from John Byrum on behalf of the ISBD Review Group.

It expressed support for what the task force was doing and stated that this would not only be harmonization with ISO, but also with ISBD. ISBD already does what is being suggested. Minutes, seconds and hour are not ISBD abbreviations, but ISBD does use metric symbols like those being proposed here. Chopey reported that Hostage had expressed a concern about the many pages of the code that would have to be revised. Chopey didn't really think that was a concern, especially since there will soon be annual updates to the code.

Chopey wanted to know how to proceed with the rule revision proposal. He also stated that these were not really proposals that needed to be looked at one at a time, they were all about the same thing.

Chopey pointed out a typo in the proposal at 1.5E1. The first time it occurs on p. 11, Accompanied by: A Demographic atlas, the "d" in demographic should not be capitalized.

Attig suggested that first CC:DA be asked if it agreed with the decision on what to include and what to exclude. He asked if there were additional things to be examined. Attig stated that he had thought of pursuing the date issue, but had since been convinced that was not appropriate. He asked if everyone agreed on the decisions on what to exclude. Attig then asked if CC:DA was down to the revision proposals.

Lorimer said she had a question on p.10, for the index. Her question was for meters per second, should it be underlined and not crossed out. Attig answered that that was something he did editorially in order to express it as an addition and a deletion, and he only got it half right.

Mangan stated that in chapter 3 many things have already been corrected. She doesn't want to see those get changed back. Mangan stated that she could send Chopey a copy of the revised chapter 3.

Attig asked Chopey if he was going to do a revision of the document. Chopey answered that he was going to leave that to Attig since he has the official document. Attig then asked Beacom if he wanted the revised task force document. Beacom said yes. Mangan answered she would send the document to both of them.

Arakawa wondered how this would work in practice. When "cm" is the last element and when it is followed by notes there would not be a full stop. Attig answered that it was his understanding that if you did not have a full stop, there is a space dash space and a full stop in front of the next paragraph. Arakawa asked what if there was a series. Attig said if you were using the dash, the full stop is part of that prescribed punctuation. Chopey stated that there still would be a full stop after "cm," it just wouldn't be because "cm" is an abbreviation, it would be because it is the end of an area. Attig stated that it is a little confusing because although the full stop is there in the created record, the examples in the rules do not routinely put a full stop at the end of an area. Chopey added that in the rules the full stop is only there if the next area is there. Attig answered that in practice when creating a record it is included and it would really make no difference. Arakawa then asked if he was missing something. Attig answered that if it occurred at the end of an area it would not be different, but if it occurred within an area it would be. Chopey replied that in most cases in the catalog record it would look the same. Arakawa asked if this would require a lot of re-training. Chopey replied that he didn't know about a lot of re-training, but it was a conceptual leap. He could think of bigger changes.

Schiff stated that if the JSC approved this, then the people who maintain the MARC standards for bibliographic format may want to examine their documentation. That is where many catalogers go to see whether to put a period at the end of a MARC field.

Arakawa stated that this is not consistently harmonizing symbols with ISO. He wondered if symbols are not consistent everywhere, why be consistent here? Chopey replied that many catalogers did not understand about full stops. This proposal harmonizes with the ISBDs; the proposal uses the symbols that ISBD uses. If we are using these symbols then we should be using them correctly. He also stated that

one could say AACR does not use minute, hour and second correctly, but there is a good rationale not to since catalogers would not usually understand what "25 s" means. If the task force felt it was reasonable to harmonize further, then the task force would be proposing that.

Lindlan asked if these were the only areas we were out of sync with ISBD. Chopey replied that the proposal would put us in harmony with ISBD, which does not use the metric symbols for seconds and hours and minutes.

Mangan stated that on a personal level she appreciated not changing how numbers are punctuated. She doesn't think there will be a proposal from the map community, but she will take it back to them.

Beacom stated that if CC:DA is deciding not to change to the symbols for hour and minute because of its communities, he didn't really see the difference with "cm" and "mm." He stated that AACR is currently not using the symbol, it is using the abbreviation. He also stated that AACR has been using this abbreviation longer than the ISO standard for the symbol has existed. CC:DA is continuing to use its own communities' conventions that are understandable to its users. With respect to harmonization, fundamentally the harmonization we are seeking with ISBD areas is in terms of the order of the areas and what the areas are in the sense of ISBD(G), rather than trying to harmonize all the chapters. Beacom also stated that Brian Schottlaender used to say, "Harmony doesn't mean identical, it means there is a happy relationship between the two."

Grenci stated that she wanted to respond to Beacom's statement that the community knows that AACR is using the abbreviation and not the symbol. Grenci stated that when she learned the metric system in school she was taught not to put a period at the end of "cm" and "km." She had to get used to it in library school when she had to start putting periods after "cm." Lorimer stated that Canadians do not use periods after these symbols, so someone needs to talk to the Canadians and British and find out what they are doing. Chopey asked Beacom if he had any sense how other JSC members would respond to the proposal. Beacom answered that he did not.

Chopey added that at least we are not changing to an unfamiliar thing. This is an international standard and it should be used in the internationally accepted way. He said that he saw Beacom's point, and it was a good point. Chopey then stated that he was probably wrong by saying AACR uses it incorrectly, but many international catalogers might construe that it is used incorrectly.

Beacom stated that CC:DA is ALA's organization and the community it represents is essentially the Unites States. The United States community seems willing to drop our nation's conventions and begin to use the international codes. Chopey said that ISBD did express its appreciation, they think this is a good harmonization. Lindlan said that as younger catalogers are taught the international convention it may be more appropriate to move to this. Grenci stated that she learned in middle school that "cm" and "mm" were symbols. Peter Fletcher stated that because AACR is an international document, the correct international code should be used.

Attig said that if there were no further comments he would move to approve the revisions proposed in the report of the ISO Harmonization Task Force. Eden seconded the motion. Mangan added "as amended with appropriate changes from chapter 3." The motion was approved 8-0.

Attig stated that Beacom would have to determine how much of the preliminary materials to include in his document to the JSC and Beacom agreed. Attig suggested that he should include some of the information about what was excluded from the scope of this and why it was excluded, and definitely that this was a partial harmonization.

Chopey thanked the task force members: Beth Guay, John Hostage, Gabriele Kupitz, Aimée Quinn and John Sluk. Lindlan thanked Chopey and the task force.

765. Report on ALCTS 2003 Preconference Planning Committee: Harcourt

Harcourt reported that the ALCTS/SS/Committee to Study Serials Cataloging had proposed a pre-conference for 2003 and as of Saturday the title was "Knowledge Without Boundaries: International Libraries in Collaboration." Harcourt read the description of the preconference. She added that this program will present current projects that impact library methods in providing access to information and will present changes and trends in cataloging. CC:DA is one of the sponsoring groups. One of the main objectives of the program is that participants will have a better understanding of current changes in cataloging. The target audience will be academic, public, and special librarians. Harcourt reported that it is still very much a work in progress. The target date is June 19-20, 2003 in Toronto. The committee is hoping for 250 attendees and is estimating 16 speakers. The focus will be international. Harcourt will keep CC:DA informed on developments.

Attig asked if there would be financial support for international speakers. Harcourt replied that she hoped so since the focus was international. Attig stated that it required a special effort to get the funding. Beacom asked Harcourt who was the chair of the committee. Harcourt replied that Sally Tseng was the chair.

766. Report of the Task Force on Uniform Resource Identifiers and AACR2R: Lincicum

   [CC:DA/TF/URI/1]

Lincicum began by apologizing for not having the report completed in December. She reported the task force had a face-to-face meeting and she should be able to get the report in shortly after she gets home from this conference. She will get the final report to CC:DA on the list. Lincicum thanked the members of the task force, including Matthew Beacom, Brad Eden, Robert McDonald, Cecilia Preston, and John Radencich.

Lincicum stated that the task force was charged with several things, but the most important was defining the terms: URI , Uniform Resource Identifier; URL, Uniform Resource Locator; and URN, Uniform Resource Name. The task force was also charged to explore the potential role of URIs within the bibliographic universe and how the bibliographic and metadata standards handle URIs, and most importantly, to answer the question: should AACR2R have rules about URIs in AACR2R bibliographic description and access points?

Lincicum then went through a PowerPoint presentation and distributed copies of the slides. The definitions of the terms were as follows:

- **URI**: A compact character string that provides a simple and extensible means for referencing a resource within applications. According to the IETF, URIs form a superset of two distinct classes of identifiers, URLs and URNs.

- **URL**: A type of URI that references a **network accessible location** where a resource can be stored.

- **URN**: A type of URI that references a **particular network-accessible resource**. The IETF stipulates that URNs be both "globally unique" and "persistent."

Lincicum covered the role of identifiers. FRBR considers manifestation and item identifiers high value attributes; access address is considered distinct from an identifier but high value for obtaining electronic resources. She reviewed the attributes of standard numbers: unique, persistent, assigned to a particular manifestation of a resource, constructed and assigned according to a formalized scheme, and internationally recognized. She stated that URNs resemble standard numbers while URLs differ. She reviewed how other standards handle URIs and how AACR2 could handle them. The task force recommendations are:

- Treat URNs and URN-like identifiers like standard numbers in AACR2.

- Add a definition for URN to the Glossary.

- Work jointly with the IFLA cataloging committee to consider expanding the scope of area 8 to incorporate other types of URIs.

- Appoint a CC:DA task force to examine expanding the specific types of standard numbers eligible for inclusion in area 8 in AACR2.

After the presentation Attig asked Lincicum if she could send him a copy of the PowerPoint document so he could add it to the web page. He thought it was a useful representation of the report. Lincicum replied that she would clean it up a little and submit it.

Lindlan thanked Lincicum and the task force.

767. Revisions to "How to Submit a Rule Change Proposal to CC:DA": Attig

[CC:DA/Webmaster/2002/1]

Attig began by stating that this is clean-up that has long been needed because the details given in the document bear little resemblance to what CC:DA has been doing. Attig also stated that when he looked at the details of the document, he discovered that CC:DA has not really been doing what the JSC has asked.

Attig remarked that most of the changes have to do with the way proposals are marked up. He also stated that there were a couple of errors that needed to be corrected. There was one question that he didn't do anything about. That is, the document still calls for a paper copy of proposals to be submitted, if at all possible. He doubted if this was still being done, but he didn't know if CC:DA was ready to admit that they no longer needed a paper copy. Attig asked if anyone still saw a need for a paper copy of a proposal. Lindlan stated that as Chair she didn't. Arakawa asked if there was ever a problem with diacritics in electronic copies that would cause a problem. Attig answered there was, but he could probably work around it by asking for a file he could work with, or he would work directly with the person submitting the proposal to make sure the diacritics were right. Lindlan asked if the procedure should say the Webmaster should contact the poster to make sure that the final posted document was correct. Lindlan stated Attig always contacts her to make sure something looks correct before it is posted for everyone else. She stated that should be part of the written process because it is the current practice. Beacom agreed that would be a good idea.

Attig stated the document was drafted before the role of the Webmaster was established so there is no reference to the role of the Webmaster, and he didn't want to introduce it without instructions to do so. He stated that he could draft something and send it out.

Aimée Quinn asked if the paper copy was for archival purposes. Attig asked Lindlan what she was doing with paper copies. She answered she had those she had received in a folder. Lindlan asked if the website was now the archive. Attig stated now that the documents are prepared electronically, and to the extent that the paper copy is needed for archival purposes, it will be generated from the online version.

Chopey stated that he had a few editorial comments. He noticed the document did not use the term AACR2R. Attig stated that he wanted to go back to AACR.

Attig stated that at this meeting there would not be a document to approve. He will do another draft and it will be discussed electronically. He asked if there was agreement that paper copies of rule change proposals were no longer needed. There seemed to be agreement from the group.

Robert Maxwell asked if paper copies would still be allowed. Attig answered paper copies would be allowed, but his preference is an electronic copy, and so far he has always gotten an electronic copy. He stated electronic copies would be encouraged but not required. Grenci asked if it was time to start requiring electronic copies. Jizba answered that electronic copies should not be required. Grenci answered that the Webmaster should not have to make an electronic copy of a rule change proposal. Jizba answered that she was on the original rule change revision committee in 1987, and one of the principles of the document was that anyone should be able to submit a rule revision in any form. The committee felt that form was less of an issue than content. Attig answered that electronic would be strongly preferred, but making it required would be going too far. Lindlan asked if the Webmaster got a paper document would he then have to make it an electronic document. Attig said he would have to make it an electronic document.

Attig stated that he will look at Schiff's proposal to make sure it is compliant. Attig added that he has not had a chance to revise the examples yet, but he will be doing that and will post them on the web page.

768. Revisions to CC:DA *Procedures*: Adam Schiff

[CC:DA/Schiff/2001/2]

Schiff reported that at the annual meeting in San Francisco in June 2001, CC:DA considered a proposal by Mary Larsgaard to review and revise "How to submit a rule change proposal." At that time Schiff noted that this was another document that didn't really match actual practice, and he was asked to work on *Procedures*.

In the process of working on the document, he discovered that CC:DA needed to confirm votes taken between meetings. This is an ALCTS policy that CC:DA had not been following.

Schiff stated that he corrected some minor things and updated the text to reflect actual practice.

Schiff went through the document section by section. If there were no changes or discussions of a section it is not listed in the minutes.

Section I. Membership

Arakawa asked about the change to part B; he wondered if the number of interns should be stated as "two" since the wording "one or more" seemed fine and there might be a time when three interns were needed. Schiff replied that this is the number of interns that CC:DA has been having, where some committees only have one, and some have none. Lindlan asked if the language should be "two or more." Schiff answered that in practice, at least as long as he has been associated with CC:DA, there have been two interns. He added that a single intern would find the duties very onerous. Arakawa replied that he didn't think the current language said that it should only be one and Lindlan agreed. Chopey added that one advantage to Arakawa's suggestion would be if two interns continued to be appointed and one of the interns were gone, it would still be an official membership. Schiff answered that that would be fine. It would just have to be institutional memory that the Chair elect of CCS in consultation with the Chair of CC:DA will always have to remember that the plan is for two interns.

Someone asked if Schiff would do a revision to his proposal. Attig stated that he would take notes and it will be decided in the end if Schiff needs to do a revision.

Section II. Officers

Schiff noted that Wilt, who had looked at the document, pointed out that under the circumstances delineated in part A.1 Lindlan could not have been appointed Chair. Schiff stated that was something he missed. II.A.l calls for an appointment from the nine voting members, and Lindlan was an intern when

she was appointed Chair. Schiff noted that should be examined and a decision made on whether or not to change it. Attig stated Lindlan was appointed a member of the committee and then named Chair. He did not see this as a conflict. Schiff answered it was a matter of semantics and that it made sense when it was explained that way. He suggested that Lindlan answer Wilt's comment about that.

Schiff noted that it had already been pointed out in part B that something needed to be done with the singular and the plural.

Chopey asked if there was really a CC:DA secretary. He thought part B should be eliminated altogether and the interns should be referred to elsewhere. Attig agreed that it should be deleted. He agreed that the interns were not officers as such. He suggested adding under Section I.B "The interns shall serve as secretaries." Schiff answered that it sounded like a good idea.

Section V. Agenda

Chopey stated that under part F the word "agenda" was not capitalized, but it was capitalized every other place. He stated that he was not arguing to make it upper case, he was just pointing out that it was capitalized in other places. Attig stated that he would edit it for consistency.

Chopey stated that under part D. he liked the addition of the "(s)" to "person". He then asked if "his/her" should be replaced by "their." McGarry asked if the document should instead say "a designee" instead of "his/her." She added that would make it simpler. McGarry added that under part G instead of "incorporated to" it might instead say "incorporated into." Schiff answered that was fine.

Mangan asked if in part C should there be a minimum time to have the agenda before the meeting. She suggested two weeks. Schiff answered that two weeks was practically impossible if one wanted the agenda received two weeks prior to the meeting to be the same as the agenda on the day of the meeting. Mangan asked if it could be a preliminary agenda. Schiff answered that the draft or preliminary agenda should be available two weeks prior to the meeting. He also stated that in his experience as Chair he was deluged with agenda changes in the last two weeks before the meeting. Grenci stated that she found the agenda much easier to use because the documents were hot linked on the web. She added that she greatly appreciated that. Glazier added that later in Section IX. Documentation it talked about electronic documents with hot links. He would like to see in the Agenda section the recommendation that the agenda be presented electronically with hot links. Schiff said he would work with Attig and add that.

Section VII. Discussions

Schiff discussed adding part E because more information was needed about the fact that much of the business is done online between meetings. Chopey stated that he had a hard time imagining how this would work in practice, a discussion becoming closed by a vote of two thirds of the members, especially on the electronic list. He stated that currently the members discuss items for a time determined by the Chair. The Chair then calls the question and the discussion is over. He asked if part E says that this is not valid. He also asked if it meant that wasn't valid, if Lindlan wanted to call the question she would have to call for a vote to call the question.

Attig stated that he interpreted it differently. He said he would interpret it as a mechanism in case it was needed, and it was almost never needed. Schiff added that it say may be limited, which allows a voting member to say "This has gone on for two weeks and I would like to move that we close the discussion and move on." But the question of how one figures out who is out there in cyberspace responding or not responding is hard. He stated it is hard to know if someone is on vacation, or something like that, so he put in the number of two thirds, or six, votes. Lindlan stated that she thought this was very important. She added that the committee has a huge number of time zones, and she sometimes had a hard time telling if everyone has had enough time to respond. She said sometimes she gives a deadline, but she said

sometimes she can't tell if she has given everyone time enough to respond. She stated having a number would help her.

Maxwell asked about the third sentence in part E: "All motions, discussions, and votes shall be made via the electronic list." The word "shall" seems to preclude starting a discussion on the electronic list and continuing it at a meeting. Schiff replied that the intent of the sentence was for all motions to be seen by everyone on the electronic list not just voting members. He stated that it was intended to provide more open sharing of information. Attig added that he would look at this and see if there was a better way to express it. Lindlan asked if they should change it to "shall be made public via the electronic list." Schiff answered he didn't think that would make it clear. His understanding of what Maxwell asked about was, if you started something on the electronic list, could it be continued in person at a meeting? Attig replied that they would look at it.

Section VIII. Voting

Schiff stated here he was flying by the seat of his pants. He couldn't find written documentation on this either in ALCTS or ALA guidelines. He asked if VIII was ok, and got nods of yes.

Section IX. Documentation

Schiff stated Chopey had pointed out that in part A "a minimum of one month" should have been double underscored because it is new. Schiff added that the language should be changed to interns instead of Secretaries.

Chopey added that the last sentence of part B sounded a little clunky. Schiff stated that he would change "are" to "shall be." The line would read: "Electronic versions of documentation shall be greatly preferred over print copies."

Section X. Communication of Decisions, etc.

Schiff stated he had added part E about the Chair reporting on the decisions and actions taken by the Committee and the Chair since the last meeting and asked for comments. There were no comments from the committee. Lindlan stated that for this meeting, she would supply a written report after the meeting. In the future, she planned on having it before the meeting, but she said she did not want to have to read through it each time. Schiff answered that it did not say a verbal report had to be done, just that there should be a report. He felt that this was important because so much goes on between meetings on the electronic list. He added that those who are not privy to the electronic list, and who come to a meeting, should be able to know what has gone on between meetings.

As to part C, Whitacre asked if that was how decisions to the JSC were really communicated. She thought the JSC representative did the communicating. Schiff answered that the Chair does inform the JSC representative of ALA policy or decision on a certain matter. He asked if this language would work: "The JSC representative in conjunction with the Chair." Whitacre answered that would be better.

Glazier stated that at the beginning of the Saturday meeting there was an affirmation of the electronic votes. He wasn't sure why that was, and if it was necessary. Schiff answered that it was in Section VIII part A. Eden commented Section VIII part A says that for electronic ballots to be valid, a minimum of five voting members must vote. He stated that some of the voting members might be on vacation, and miss the whole discussion. So he thought this was very valuable to have an affirmation of the electronic votes. Schiff answered that he learned the term "consent agenda" yesterday. He said that was the term some groups were using to consent to decisions made between meetings. Mangan asked if it also meant that the report would get into the minutes. Schiff affirmed the report would get into the minutes.

Maxwell added CC:DA might want to consider doing something with the discussions from the electronic list. Lindlan answered she was planning on writing up a list of all the recommendations, motions, and votes. Attig pointed out that Maxwell was talking about the discussions, and that would be harder. He added that it should be thought about, but not now. Schiff agreed.

Section XI. Parliamentary Procedure

There were not changes in this section, but Lindlan had had some communications with Wilt about this. Lindlan pointed out that CC:DA should be following Sturgis and not *Robert's Rules of Order*. Schiff stated he had assumed CC:DA had decided to follow Robert's and not Sturgis, and since the Procedures were approved by ALCTS, ALCTS approved of using Robert's. Now it seems that ALCTS is asking CC:DA to use Sturgis.

Section XII. Amendments

Schiff asked if the committee agreed with the changes made in this section. There were nods of approval from the group.

Addendum

Schiff stated he had added wording to make it clear that correspondence included email. He added that Attig and he would consult on all the changes that had been suggested by the group.

Section VI. Task Forces of CC:DA

There was one proposal made in this section. Originally, there was nothing in the document that said the Chair wrote the charges and deadlines for the task forces, but that is the practice. Schiff added that ALA documents also seemed to support that.

Attig stated that in part D "chair" was lower case, but not in other places. Attig asked Schiff if that was intended. Schiff answered it is lower case because it is the chair of a CC:DA task force, not the name of a person nor the Chair of CC:DA.

Lindlan asked whether a person needs to be made a consultant if he/she is the chair of a CC:DA task force and moves off CC:DA because his/her term has expired. Schiff stated that this document and ALA policy make it clear he/she did not need to be appointed as a consultant, but he added that he/she could be made a consultant.

McGarry asked about making "members" singular in part D. Schiff replied it should be singular and there was a line through the "s," it was just hard to see.

Schiff discussed the section in general. He was somewhat shocked when he read it initially. The current bylaws say that persons who are not actual members (members of CC:DA means both the voting members and the non-voting representatives or liaisons) may be appointed to task forces, but they are appointed as consultants who do not have voting rights. He doubted if most task forces made a distinction between voting and non-voting members. He added that in the eight years he was on CC:DA he couldn't recall those persons being referred to as consultants. He looked at other ALCTS documents and couldn't find anything similar. He did find a policy that talked about subcommittees and task forces, and appointment of consultants, but nowhere could he find this specific language. Instead of putting a proposal into the document, he wanted to hear from the committee first.

Attig stated when he first got involved there was a distinction between voting members and non-voting members. It was indicated clearly on the rosters the difference between members and consultants. At some point it was realized it made no practical difference, and so the distinction was dropped in the

documents. He added that formal votes in task forces happen very seldom, so the distinction between voting and non-voting doesn't really matter. It is just a difference in name that has no practical implication. He thought there was an ALA policy that said CC:DA should do this, and if CC:DA is wrong he doesn't see any reason to do it.

Jizba said that she would like to second that. In the beginning, it depended on the chair, but there was clearly a distinction, and actual discussions about why. She thought they naturally got away from that about 1990, and she personally would welcome the change.

Schiff stated if this is changed it has to go through approval at the CCS and the ALCTS level. So if CC:DA proposes to make a change, and it is wrong, CC:DA will find out about it.

Bruce Johnson added it was his understanding that it has to do with who is eligible to play what role. He stated that a consultant is someone who is not currently on CC:DA and this person is being brought in because of their expertise or their ability to devote time to the issue. He thought it was up to the task force to decide what role the consultant would play. He thought it was unnecessary to speak to whether the consultant is eligible to vote or not, and he thought any task force doing its job properly would come to agreement by consensus and not by vote.

Lindlan added that she considered people who were not CC:DA members to be volunteers, not consultants, and CC:DA is happy to have volunteers.

Schiff stated that he looked at task forces like subcommittees. He stated that the ALA policy manual says that subcommittees are appointed by the chair of the parent committee, but are not limited to members of the parent committee. This is not about consultants, this is about members of a subcommittee drawn from both the membership of the parent as well as people outside, to bring in more participation.

Grenci stated that when one considers a résumé, the term "consultant" means something different than the term "member." She added that considering the number of task forces CC:DA has, she didn't think the role of people outside CC:DA should be limited because it wouldn't be practical. Mangan stated that part of the reason it has gone the way it has is because we have so many consultants. McGarry stated that the idea of a consultant was that they would not really be participating. She thought there could still be consultants, but they wouldn't be ordinary task force members.

Schiff stated that what he thought he was hearing was that non CC:DA members should be regular task force members, not consultants.

Glazier said the way it currently reads the only person who has to be a CC:DA member is the chair. He asked if parts B and C should be merged. Lindlan added that interns were non-voting CC:DA members, but she had served as chair of a task force while she was an intern. Schiff answered that interns have formal appointments to the committee, and are considered non-voting members.

Johnson stated that the current language was written to conform with what were thought to be the ALCTS rules at the time. He suggested Schiff or Lindlan discuss this with Wilt and find out if the current structure is really necessary. Schiff answered that he thought the Chair should do that. Lindlan said she would, and Schiff remarked that he thought that seemed like a reasonable way to proceed. [During the break, Lindlan and Schiff talked to Wilt and clarified a few things in the procedures, so the next draft should include those clarifications].

Quinn asked for clarification. She wondered if volunteers or consultants still have to be members of ALCTS. Schiff answered the ALCTS policy and procedures manual on the appointment of consultants does not say they must be ALCTS members. Quinn replied that she raised this question because on occasion she wanted representation from GPO since they catalog government documents, and they could not serve because they were not members of ALCTS. Schiff repeated that nowhere in the policy does it say they must be ALCTS members, but Lindlan can ask Wilt about that as well. Schiff summarized that

Lindlan will ask Wilt if there is any reason to retain the language regarding both the voting participation of outside members as well as if those outside members have to be named consultants, or if they can just be members and whether or not they can vote.

Attig stated that in general we are headed toward a definition that is similar to the ALCTS level for subcommittees. He stated that after listening to all of this, he didn't think he was ready to deal with this. Schiff stated that he and Lindlan will work together and take a first crack at a revision. Chopey added that they needed to clean up the copy.

Schiff thanked the committee. He stated that he was trying to make the document reflect the reality of the way the committee works today.

Lindlan thanked Schiff for taking on this task.

769. Report from the CC:DA Webmaster: Attig

Attig reported he is informally working out a way to deal with liaison reports given at meetings. He is currently posting them on the website before the minutes are out and this gets the reports out faster. He is then adding a link in the minutes instead of actually incorporating the text.

Attig stated that he has been thinking about what to do with completed reports, such as things like the ONIX International report, which CC:DA just accepted. Attig stated that he will now bury that report, that is, take it off the webpage and put it with completed task force reports. He is thinking of starting a new page for those that have permanent interest.

Attig stated since he has been working with the JSC documents, he has been creating and working with style sheets for rule text. He has been using those for proposed revised text. After further consultation with the JSC Chair, he thinks this should be made available to people developing proposals. He added he will find a way to make this available for people to use. Beacom added that if the style sheet templates were available they could be linked to "How to make a rule change proposal." That would not only make it a little easier, but it would encourage people to use this. Attig thanked Beacom for the suggestion.

Attig stated that he wanted to take stock of where CC:DA was with document distribution, and to see whether the new procedure of direct distribution of documents from the JSC secretary was working, and whether or not CC:DA could get out of that business. If that is the case, he could free up some server space. He asked if anyone had any experience with the JSC distribution that indicated this would be a problem. There were not any responses.

Lindlan thanked Attig for all his work as Webmaster. She stated that without Attig's support her job would be very difficult and she appreciates him very much.

770. Report from the MARBI representative: Watson

[CC:DA/MARBI Rep/2002/1]

During the break, Mark Watson distributed the CC:DA MARBI rep report. He stated he found it hard to do justice to everything that MARBI accomplishes during any given conference. He named all the other MARBI representatives in the room and welcomed their comments while he was making his report. At the last meeting, MARBI dealt with nine proposals and seven discussion papers. All the proposals were discussed and decisions made.

Watson raised the idea of a joint meeting in Atlanta for CC:DA and MARBI to discuss the Delsey's work on FRBR, AACR, and MARC. Lindlan said this could not happen on Monday afternoon because of a program CC:DA is sponsoring with the Committee to Study Serials Cataloging at that time, although she agreed a joint meeting would be helpful.

771. Proposal to change rule 7.0B, Source of information: McCafferty

[CC:DA/MRC/2001/1]

Brian McCafferty reported this proposal originated from a long-standing frustration for moving image catalogers. The current rule provides too much latitude in choosing the chief source for the title and statement of responsibility. The latitude the rules allow makes shared cataloging very difficult, and it makes it very difficult to identify whether a record matches the item one is cataloging. McCafferty stated that he wasn't sure what the committee was expecting him to present.

Eden answered that everyone has read the proposal so it should be discussed now. Attig added that it had been discussed by the OLAC Cataloging Policy Committee on Friday night and there was agreement that this proposal does represent best practice for describing this type of material, and there was support for the change. Chopey stated that he liked the idea. He doesn't like the heading for 7.7B3: "Source of title proper and transcription." Although he knows what is meant, he wondered if there were a clearer way to indicate what it really means. He thought maybe "The source of title proper and basis of description" would be better. He wondered if these should be combined or if they should be separate. Chopey asked if the basis of description note should be a new note added and if there was a precedent for this.

Mangan stated she had some of the same problems with this as Chopey did and she didn't understand what this had to do with transcription. The fact that one hasn't viewed the film is not transcription. She also had a problem with combining it in one sentence. She thought it would be better broken apart. One part could be the source of the title proper and then the part that it wasn't viewed. She saw some parallels with the revised chapter 9, with noting when the website was viewed.

Attig asked if the group could discuss specifically whether or not the item has been viewed. He saw this as a different issue that did merit discussion. He thought the precedent for this was the rule in chapter 9 where you acknowledge that you might not be able to view the internal sources. He noted that that rule was no longer in the revised chapter 9 so this proposal is going in the opposite direction of where we have gone with chapter 9. He was a little skeptical about it. He added that it was something that catalogers had to deal with, but he wasn't sure that the rules should acknowledge this practice.

Arakawa stated that he was puzzled and bothered by not bracketing the title when it wasn't viewed. He thought the rationale for that in the introduction was that it was a disservice to the user, but it seemed to him that if the cataloger hasn't viewed the item, this is already a disservice to the user. He realized that sometimes it is impossible to view the item, so bracketing the title would call attention to the fact that it hadn't been viewed. Lindlan stated that if it isn't viewed and the title is taken from somewhere else the source is noted. Arakawa answered that according to the proposal the only chief source is the title screen.

Chopey stated that he saw a parallel to serials cataloging. His suggestion was that if someone doesn't view the item, s/he should make a minimal level record; when someone else comes along later and views it, s/he upgrades the record. As for 7.7B3, Chopey thought it should be higher up in the order of notes given because it is an important detail. He agreed with Mangan about two separate sentences or if it stayed one rule, two separate paragraphs. He thought the first one giving the rule about title proper and the second paragraph about not viewed or description based on. Arakawa asked Chopey if he went along with not bracketing the title if the item wasn't viewed. Chopey answered it would be ok to not bracket the title if the item wasn't viewed. Lorimer stated that it is still coming from a prescribed source even though it is no longer the chief source and prescribed sources do not usually get bracketed.

Attig asked if there was any thought given to doing something like chapter 9 and requiring that the cataloger identify the source of the title proper. He continued that it would not be an optional note, but rather a note that is expected in every case. Lindlan asked if one would still know if one had a different manifestation. Attig answered the possibility is still there, but he thought it was also there with electronic

resources. Jizba stated that this was the same as electronic resources. She would argue that there should be parallels with chapter 9. Eden stated that at LC they do not view computer files, and those titles are not bracketed. In his career as a non-print cataloger, Eden rarely saw records with bracketed titles. Eden stated that we should be looking at the broader applicability here, and not just videos. When catalogers are asked to put more information in notes, this takes more time and effort, and as a manager that means more work. He stated that he wanted the correct record as quickly as possible. He also added that many non-print catalogers are cataloging various formats, and keeping all the specific rules in mind is almost impossible.

Jane Johnson stated that she was the chair of the Cataloging and Documentation Committee of the Association of Moving Image Archivists and said that her group had done some surveys. She didn't have the statistics with her, but the vast majority of the archival community do not view the majority of the works in their collections. If they used brackets for unviewed materials, brackets would be everywhere. She stated they did discuss using the note in every case. She added this discussion has been going on for years. She personally would be fine with using the note in every case. She also wanted to remind everyone that this proposal originated with the PCC Core Bibliographic Record for AV Materials Task Force.

Attig stated he didn't think the Committee was ready to edit or approve this. He suggested that it be sent back with comments and ask them to revise and present it at Annual.

772. Proposal on Changes to 26.3A6 Abbreviations: Caldwell

[CC:DA/PCC/2002/1]

Caldwell began by stating this rule change proposal came out of the PCC Standing Committee on Standards Task Force. She stated there were a number of recommendations that came out of that report. Some of them have resulted in rule interpretations and there are some remaining recommendations for rule interpretations. This proposal deals with abbreviations, 26.3A6 and its corresponding rule interpretation and proposes the rule interpretation be part of the rules rather than a rule interpretation. The task force felt this would be simpler.

Caldwell stated originally the task force was only moving the text about abbreviations and symbols, and the task force was going to get rid of the rule interpretation completely. Then the group realized everyone would be making cross-references from department. Obviously this would not be acceptable, so the wording about abbreviations being represented in Appendix B was added into the new version of the rule. With the new wording in the rule, the rule interpretation could be completely eliminated. She added that there is a typo in the proposal: where it reads "if in the catalog abbreviated words are files differently" it should read "if in the catalog abbreviated words are filed differently."

Chopey had a couple of suggestions for things that should be in boldface and in italics and some that should not be. Attig asked people to send editorial changes to him.

Mangan hadn't heard the statement made about the reference that was made about department. She added that she didn't understand in the impact statement where it said that those would have to be made even though their full form is in Appendix B. Caldwell answered that originally they were only going to include the portion of the rule interpretation that dealt with symbols and the "and." Mangan replied that was not what the impact statement said. Caldwell answered the impact statement needed to be rewritten.

Chopey stated he thought the task force was originally going to recommend doing away completely with the LCRI and then if that happened every occurrence of "department" and "corporation" would have to be spelled out. Chopey stated that is why the task force did not recommended getting rid of the LCRI. Mangan stated that's the way the rule is proposed, since "department" and "corporation" appear in

Appendix B, the rule instructs no reference needs to be made. Chopey reiterated that is why the task force is proposing this, and not asking to get rid of the LCRI.

Grenci asked Caldwell if the task force is proposing to get rid of the LCRI and Caldwell replied in the affirmative. Chopey answered that he misunderstood. Caldwell stated there had been so many versions of the proposal, the wrong impact statement was mistakenly inserted.

Schiff stated a report was heard earlier that stated that symbols are not abbreviations, so he had a little problem with including symbols. He suggested that it might be changes to "Abbreviations and symbols." He doesn't believe that "appendix" is capitalized when referred to in the rules. Finally, he checked the headings in the authority file and one of them in the rules does not have a period after St., but in the authority record it does.

Arakawa felt this proposal limits cataloger's judgment. In light of the JSC and problems with proposals that limit cataloger's judgment, he wondered about the proposal's prospects. He asked if this would apply to corporate names that are named in honor of someone, where the practice is often to give the person's initials in the official form of the name. Caldwell answered that was a good question. Arakawa answered that he agreed that simplifying the decision would save some time spent agonizing, but research is still needed to figure out what the abbreviations stood for. Caldwell stated that she would like to defer to Beacom on the first part of the question on cataloger's judgment. Beacom stated that he was not sure what the response from the JSC would be. He stated that our British colleagues greatly favor leaving the rules open for catalogers' interpretation.

Attig added the JSC has expressed a negative response to the way the United States interprets the code. He stated the JSC theoretically welcomes using the code instead of rule interpretations. He also stated those two are often in conflict, but it is hard to predict what the reaction will be. He would not suggest using that as a reason for not submitting a proposal if the group thinks it is a good revision. Beacom agreed with Attig; CC:DA should not censor or second-guess itself.

Caldwell stated that Arakawa had raised an issue the task force had not covered. She asked if there was anything else the task force had not considered.

Schiff stated he didn't recall any instruction where if the spelled out form isn't known, the spelled out form had to be found and added, particularly for initials in a corporate body. He added that, with the full form of name of a corporate body, there is a rule interpretation that says to provide references through the last name, but not the reverse. He also added the rules say to make a reference when judged to be useful.

Attig stated the most useful or objective part of this proposal is distinguishing between abbreviations and symbols. He added that by not separating that out, but making it clear that although the detailed guidelines may or may not be necessary, making that change would definitely be beneficial.

Caldwell asked Attig if he meant doing that and leaving Appendix B in a rule interpretation. Attig answered one could reject the specific guideline but still make the change to say abbreviations and symbols. He was not suggesting abridgement of the proposal.

Grenci stated her reading of this revision was that it would require the cataloger to research and find the fullest form. She added if that was not the case maybe something should be put in about that. Schiff responded the wording "if available" could be added. Jizba stated that the phrase that is in AACR quite often is "readily available." Paul Weiss suggested "when readily apparent or available."

Mangan stated she was a little concerned with the use of the word symbol. The only symbol they use in this proposal is the one that is used for the word "and." She asked about other symbols such as the use of a heart for the word "love." In title transcription the symbol is described rather than giving its meaning; specifically, "heart" would be in brackets and not "love." The term "symbols" can be interpreted very broadly, and Mangan is unsure that is the intent. Caldwell answered that the task force included the

ampersand example because the ampersand is the symbol most frequently used in a heading itself. She stated other symbols are used most often in transcribing description. Mangan answered that that was true, but she could also see them in a corporate body that would have to be established. She stated that she just felt uncomfortable using symbol for basically any kind of symbol that could be included in a heading. She stated they have had some strange headings such as a corporate name that started with the symbol for a star and that may happen more, particularly in the .com world. Caldwell replied that she would like to see some examples to incorporate into this. Attig suggested putting a message on the electronic list asking for examples. Maxwell stated that since CC:DA declared "mm" and "cm" symbols they could be used for examples. Lorimer asked if superscript and subscript count as symbols. Attig answered no.

Lindlan stated that at this point the proposal will be sent back to the task force to do a little more work.

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

Lindlan asked for reports and announcements from the floor. There were no responses from the Committee or the audience. Chopey moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved. The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
    Cheri Folkner, CC:DA Intern
    Lynnette Fields, CC:DA Intern